

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

963

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 1st March, 1954

The House met at Two of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3-05 P.M.

STATEMENT RE U.S. MILITARY  
AID TO PAKISTAN

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful for this opportunity to make a statement in regard to a matter which is no doubt in the minds of most Members of this House as well as many people in the country. This relates to a recent letter which I received from the President of the United States of America, together with a copy of a statement which was issued by him. I received the letter on the 24th February, and both that letter and the statement, I believe, appeared in the public Press on the morning of the 26th February. Hon. Members have seen those and I do not propose to read them, but for facility of reference, I am placing copies of that letter and that statement, as well as

758 P.S.D.

964

a copy of my reply, on the Table of the House.

*Letter from the President of the United States of America to the Prime Minister of India delivered on February 24, 1954.*

"My dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I send you this personal message because I want you to know about my decision to extend military aid to Pakistan before it is public knowledge and also because I want you to know directly from me that this step does not in any way affect the friendship we feel for India. Quite the contrary We will continually strive to strengthen the warm and enduring friendship between our two countries.

• Our two governments have agreed that our desires for peace are in accord. It has also been understood that if our interpretation of existing circumstances and our belief in how to achieve our goals differ, it is the right and duty of sovereign nations to make their own decisions. Having studied long and carefully the problem of opposing possible aggression in the Middle East, I believe that consultation between Pakistan and Turkey about security problems will serve the interests not only of Pakistan and Turkey, but also of the whole free world. Improvement in Pakistan's defensive capabilities will also serve these interests and it is for this reason that our aid will be given. This Government's views on this subject are elaborated in a public statement I will release, a copy of which Ambassador Allen will give you.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

What we are proposing to do, and what Pakistan is agreeing to, is not directed in any way against India. And I am confirming publicly that if our aid to any country, including Pakistan, is misused and directed against another in aggression, I will undertake immediately, in accordance with my constitutional authority, appropriate action, both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression. I believe the Pakistan-Turkey collaboration agreement which is being discussed is sound evidence of the defensive purposes which both countries have in mind.

I know that you and your Government are keenly aware of the need for economic progress as a prime requisite for stability and strength. This Government has extended assistance to India in recognition of this fact, and I am recommending to Congress a continuation of substantial economic and technical aid for this reason. We also believe it in the interest of the free world that India have a strong military defense capability and have admired the effective way your Government has administered your military establishment. If your Government should conclude that circumstances require military aid of a type contemplated by our mutual security legislation, please be assured that your request would receive my most sympathetic consideration.

I regret that there has been such widespread and unfounded speculation on this subject. Now that the facts are known, I hope that the real import of our decision will be understood.

I am, my dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER".

*Statement made by President  
Eisenhower*

"On February 19, Turkey and Pakistan announced their intention to

study methods of achieving closer collaboration on various matters, including means designed towards strengthening peace and security. This Government welcomed this move and called it a constructive step towards better ensuring the security of the whole area of the Middle East. The Government of Pakistan has now asked the United States for grant of military assistance.

I have said repeatedly that regional groupings to ensure security against aggression constitute the most effective means to assure survival and progress. No nation can stand alone today. My report to the Congress on June 30, 1953 stated that we should strengthen efforts towards regional political, military and economic integration. I, therefore, under the authority granted by the Congress, am glad to comply with Pakistan's request, subject to the negotiation of the required Mutual Defence Assistance Program agreement. This Government has been gravely concerned over the weakness of the defensive capabilities in the Middle East. It was with the purpose of helping to increase the defense potential in this area that Congress in its last session appropriated funds to be used to assist those nations in the area which desired such assistance, which would pledge their willingness to promote international peace and security within the framework of the United Nations, and which would take effective collective measures to prevent and remove threats to peace.

Let me make it clear that we shall be guided by the stated purposes and requirements of the mutual security legislation. These include specifically the provision that equipment, materials or services provided will be used solely to maintain the recipient country's internal security and for its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part. Any recipient country also must undertake that it will not engage in any act of aggression against

any other nation. These undertakings afford adequate assurance to all nations, regardless of their political orientation and whatever their international policies may be, that the arms the United States provides for the defense of the free world will in no way threaten their own security. I can say that if our aid to any country, including Pakistan, is misused and directed against another in aggression, I will undertake immediately, in accordance with my constitutional authority appropriate action both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression. I would also consult with the Congress on further steps.

The United States earnestly desires that there be increased stability and strength in the Middle East, as it has desired this same thing in other parts of the free world. It believes that the aspirations of the peoples in this area for maintaining and developing their way of life and for realizing the social advances close to their hearts will be best served by strength to deter aggression and to reduce the fear of aggression. The United States is prepared to help in this endeavor, if its help is wanted."

My reply has not yet been published. It is a relatively brief reply and so I shall read it out to the House.

"Dear Mr. President,

I thank you for your personal message which your Ambassador in Delhi handed to me on February 24th. With this message was a copy of your statement in regard to the military aid being given by the United States to Pakistan. I appreciate the assurance you have given. You are, however, aware of the views of my Government and our people in regard to this matter. Those views and the policy which we have pursued, after the most careful thought, are based on our desire to help in the furtherance of peace and freedom. We shall continue to pursue that policy."

That is the reply. I should like to add a few more words in regard to

this matter. In his letter, President Eisenhower, as the House knows, gave certain assurances, and stated what his objectives or motives were. I have at no time in this House challenged any individual's or any country's motives—I cannot go behind their motives. We have to consider facts as they are. So far as President Eisenhower is concerned, on my part I am convinced that certainly he bears no ill-will to India; he wishes well of India, and that he would not take any step to injure India. It is not a question of motives, but rather of certain results which inevitably follow certain actions, and it has seemed to us in regard to this matter of military aid to Pakistan, that the results were bound to be unfortunate. It is stated that the aid is merely meant to strengthen Pakistan so that it can defend itself against aggression, and also to ensure security and peace. It is not clear to me what kind of aggression and from what quarter it is feared. I am unable to see any danger of aggression on Pakistan from any quarter; but perhaps to throw light on this question, the Pakistan delegate to the United Nations, Mr. Ahmed Bokhari, only a day or two ago spoke in New York, and made it clear as to what his fears were. He said: "We want the guarantee that the two biggest countries in Asia will leave us alone." He referred to China and India. Now, it is not again clear to me how China is going to invade Pakistan,—whether it is going to come over the Karakoram Pass into Pakistan, or how it is going to get there. As for India, it is not necessary for me to remind the House as to what our attitude has been. I may say a little about it later.

So far as ensuring security and peace are concerned, one need not go into any argument about it. It is a fact that since this aid has been announced there has been greater insecurity and greater tension. Whatever, as I said, the motives may be, the result, the fact, is there—that there has been in India, in Pakistan, an upsetting of things as they were and a sense of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

insecurity. In other countries in Asia, West and other, there has also been a sense of the situation becoming, if I may say so, "fluid", and a certain apprehension as to what the consequences might be.

Now, so far as India is concerned, the House will remember that for the last three years we have repeatedly offered a No-war Declaration to Pakistan. A No-War declaration is what is called in perhaps more precise language a Non-Aggression Pact. Now we have offered that repeatedly and Pakistan has been repeatedly rejecting that for whatever reason it may be. If there had been such a No-War declaration or Non-Aggression Pact, obviously that would have eased tension between the two countries and in surrounding areas and produced a greater feeling of security in both countries. It would have helped us to solve the problems that face us. Now it is in the context of this rejection of our proposal for a No-War declaration that we have to view this military aid from the United States to Pakistan. I venture to say that it is not easy to even imagine any aggression on Pakistan as things are, either from that great country China, or from India, regardless, I say, of motives about it. I am looking at the barest physical possibilities of the matter.

How then does this question of aggression arise and is made a pretext for this kind of military aid being given, from Pakistan's side? I am wholly unaware of any possible reason which I can understand. For my part, I would welcome the strengthening of Pakistan, economically, even militarily, in the normal sense,—if they build themselves up I have no complaint. But this is not a normal procedure. This is a very abnormal procedure, upsetting normality, and in so far as it upsets normality it is a step away from peace.

Now, the President of the United States has stated that if the aid given

to Pakistan is misused and directed against another in aggression he will undertake to thwart such aggression. I have no doubt that the President is opposed to aggression. But we know from past experience that aggression takes place and nothing is done to thwart it. Aggression took place in Kashmir six and a half years ago with dire consequences. Nevertheless, the United States have not thus far condemned it and we are asked not to press this point in the interests of peace! Aggression may take place again and be denied, as the previous aggression was denied till it could not be hidden. If conditions are created for such an aggression to take place it may well follow, in spite of the desire of the United States to prevent it. Later long arguments will be carried on as to whether it was aggression or not. The military aid given by the United States to Pakistan is likely to create the conditions which facilitate and encourage aggression.

The President of the United States has been good enough to suggest that he would consider sympathetically any request from us for military aid. In making this suggestion the President has done less than justice to us or to himself. If we object to military aid being given to Pakistan, we would be hypocrites and unprincipled opportunists to accept such aid ourselves.

As I have said repeatedly, this grant of military aid by the United States to Pakistan creates a grave situation for us in India and for Asia. It adds to our tensions. It makes it much more difficult to solve the problems which have confronted India and Pakistan. It is vitally necessary for India and Pakistan to solve these problems and to develop friendly and co-operative relations which their geographical position as neighbours as well as their long common history demand. These problems can only be solved by the two countries themselves and not by the intervention of others. It is, indeed, this intervention of other countries in the past that has come in the

way of their solution. Recently a new and more friendly atmosphere had been created between India and Pakistan, and by direct consultations between the two Prime Ministers progress was being made towards the solution of these problems. That progress has now been checked and fresh difficulties have arisen.

The military aid being given by the United States to Pakistan is a form of intervention in these problems which is likely to have more far-reaching results than the previous types of intervention.

At the present moment there is a considerable number of American Observers attached to the United Nations team on either side of the "cease-fire" line in the Jammu and Kashmir State. These American Observers can no longer be treated by us as neutrals in this dispute, and hence their presence there appears to us to be improper.

I have referred previously to the wider aspects of this aid, aspects which may affect that whole of Asia. Many countries in Asia have recovered their freedom after long years of colonial subjection. They prize their freedom, and any intervention which lessens their freedom is considered by us to be harmful and a step away from both freedom and peace.

Recently, on the 26th of January the Assistant Secretary of State in the United States, Mr. Walter S. Robertson, made a statement to the House Appropriations Sub-Committee of the Congress of the United States of America. Now, I have no official record of the statement. The statement was made on January 26th. It was released, I believe, on February 23rd or 24th. I have to rely on Press reports on which I have two, which are not identical though the meaning perhaps is much the same. One Press report states that he told the House Appropriations Sub-Committee of the Congress that the U.S.A. must dominate Asia for an indefinite period and pose

a military threat against Communist China until it breaks up internally. Another report says that the US must hold a posture of strength in Asia for an indefinite period till those results follow. Whether it is a posture of strength or clear domination,—I do not know what the exact words were,—the idea behind it appears to be much the same. This testimony, as I said, was made public about five days ago. It is known that India's policy in regard to the People's Government of China differs from that of the U.S.A. We have recognised this Government in China and have friendly relations with it. Our two policies, therefore, in this respect are wholly opposed to each other. What is more important is that a responsible official of the US should say that it is their policy that the U.S.A. must dominate Asia for an indefinite period. Whatever the objective may be, the countries of Asia, and certainly India, do not accept this policy and do not propose to be dominated by any country for whatever purpose. It is in this wider context that we must view these recent developments and more especially the military aid to Pakistan.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan has stated that by the receipt of this military aid, a momentous step forward has been taken towards the strengthening of the Muslim world and that Pakistan has now entered a glorious chapter in its history and is now cast for a significant role in world affairs. It is not for me to criticise what the Pakistan Prime Minister says, but I have endeavoured to understand how the Muslim world is going to be strengthened through arms supplied by a Foreign Power, and how any country is going to play a significant role in world affairs relying on military aid from another country.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan has also stated that this military aid will help to solve the Kashmir problem. That is an indication of the way his mind works and how he thinks this military aid might be utilised. Military aid is only utilised in war or in a threat of war.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

There is another aspect which I should like to mention. These separate pacts between countries take place, some of them in the nature of military alliances. It is for us and others to consider how far they are in consonance with the spirit of the U.N. Charter, even with the letter, I might say. But, I am not for the moment speaking in legal or juristic terms. The United Nations was formed for a particular purpose and the Charter lays down that purpose. I would like the House to consider—this is not the time to discuss this matter—how far those purposes are being furthered by all these developments that we see in regard to countries linking up militarily against other countries, both sides often being represented in the United Nations.

Also it is becoming rather significant how discussions on particular vital matters affecting world peace are avoided in the United Nations General Assembly, and when something is discussed, previous decisions have been taken which almost appear to be imposed upon the United Nations in the General Assembly. That, I submit, is not the way either to work the United Nations to fulfil the purposes of the Charter or to remove the tensions of the world.

The world suffers today from an enormous amount of suspicion and fear. And we have to judge every matter from this point of view as to whether it adds to suspicion and fear or lessens them. Can there be any doubt that the recent step taken in regard to military aid being given to Pakistan is a step which adds to suspicions and fears and therefore the tensions of the world, instead of bringing about any feeling of security?

There is another small matter—not a small but relevant matter—relating to Kashmir. The House will remember its long history and how for the last two years among the questions being discussed has been the quantum of forces to be left in Kashmir with a

view to having afterwards a plebiscite; that is, a reduction of forces—sometimes it is called demilitarisation. There has thus far been no agreement on that issue. Now the whole issue has to be considered from an entirely different point of view when across the border, across the “cease-fire” line on the other side, large additional forces are being thrust from outside in Pakistan and put at the disposal of Pakistan. It does make a difference. I said some time back, that this military aid was changing the balance of things in India and Asia. I was not thinking so much of the relative military strength of Pakistan or India, although that of course is a relevant matter, but I was rather thinking of all these other upsets, to some of which I have drawn the attention of the House.

India has no intention of surrendering or bartering her freedom for any purpose or under any compulsion whatever.

In this grave situation that has arisen this House and the country will, I have no doubt, stand united. This is no Party matter, but a national issue, on which there can be no two opinions.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram** (Visakhapatnam): May I make a submission to the Leader of the House? In view of the historic statement just made by the Prime Minister, may I request him through you to put a motion on the Order Paper for discussion of this matter in the House, so that the world can be informed that the House is entirely with him on this matter?

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall have to consider this matter before I say anything.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi** (Nellore): Amongst the papers that have been supplied to us on Saturday last, there is an item, *viz.* “Discussion on the Report of the Industrial Finance Corporation Enquiry Committee” put down for tomorrow. The time allotted for general discussion of the Railway Budget is only three days, and that will be about less than 12 hours.

*U. S. Military Aid to Pakistan*

If we have two hours cut off from that period of 12 hours it will be a great handicap to the House. I would, therefore, request you to tell the House whether compensatory time will be allotted on another day, or whether this item could be postponed to the end of the week.

**Mr. Speaker:** Instead of deciding this matter just now, let us proceed with the discussion. Let us see how we go, how many points are being made in the discussion, whether it is necessary to continue it for all the three days, and then we will decide. If necessary we might sit for some longer time. If necessary we can drop the question-hour. There are so many methods of doing it. We will see later on.

**Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore):** Apart from that, may I make a submission, through you, to Government to make more copies of the Report of the Industrial Finance Corporation Enquiry Committee available to Members, because only five copies were supplied to the Library and they have all been issued?

**Mr. Speaker:** Will the Minister, Mr. Guha, just attend to this matter? The hon. Member wants more copies of the Report to be supplied. Only five copies were placed on the Table.

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha):** I have just now received a letter from him. I think it will take some time. I do not know whether it will be possible today. Just now I have received this letter from him, I am trying to contact the Office to send the copies as soon as possible. If the hon. Member wants, I can give my personal copy on loan.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not a question of supplying a copy to an individual Member. As the report is printed, I presume there must be a larger number of copies.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Yes, surely.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** It may be circulated to Members.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not necessary to circulate to all the five hundred Members. The only thing is that every one of those that want it should get a copy. (*Interruptions.*) Those who want should get a copy.

**Several Hon. Members:** All of us want a copy.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Minister may see and then say whether he can supply copies by this evening. Will he?

**Shri A. C. Guha:** I shall try my best. I am trying to contact the office now, and I think it may be possible.

RAILWAY BUDGET—Contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the general discussion of the Railway Budget. I might state that according to the usual rule that we have followed, there will be a time-limit of fifteen minutes for each individual Member, and about twenty minutes to leaders of parties. That is the time-limit within which the discussion may be carried on.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore):** There are no two opinions, generally speaking, that the Budget that has been presented by the hon. Minister of Railways has been fairly satisfactory, especially when he dealt with the amenities that he has provided for third class passengers and also for the improvement in the welfare of railway workers. The promise, or assurance, of continuing the same policy of progressive help to these sectors is very welcome.

I do not want to deal with the smaller details in the Budget, but I would only touch upon a few important points relating to the Budget as a whole. For a long time, I have been wondering why there should be a separate Budget for the Railways. The Railways being a national enterprise, they could have been treated like other similar national enterprises that are under the