

a certain degree of improvement is witnessed which is purely seasonal. The situation, however, is definitely bad on the economic front. Our revenue receipts have gone down. While non-development expenditure has been stationary, the cash balances with the different States are still high. We are now having something like over Rs. 80 crores in many of these States, instead of Rs. 50 crores. There is also this other point which we have to realise, that so far as the absorption of treasury bills is concerned, we have absorbed only to the extent of Rs. 20 crores and not to the extent of Rs. 100 crores as anticipated at the time of the last Budget. So we have not spent even a fraction of what we anticipated, the economy continues to be in a stationary condition, and investment has not increased. How is it possible to assume that employment has increased?

I shall deal, rather briefly, with the threat to the very concept of a secular State. It is clear that the constitutional provisions allowing a place to English for fifteen years concerns all States and the Union. When one particular constituent unit like Bombay passes an executive order or a legislative enactment affecting this policy we have a right to expect from the Union Government a clarification of its views and standpoint. I want that clarification to be made. Such a clarification need not, and should not, be a review of State action; nor need our views on policy be binding on our courts of law. Parliament has a definite responsibility which it cannot avoid. We must have a discussion on this policy as affecting us. It is in the context of this responsibility, in the context of the background relating to the continuance of English for fifteen years, that we will have to be concerned with articles 29 and 30 relating to minority protection and find out how far we are respecting the spirit and intent of the constitution. It is not only appropriate but desirable that both the Union Executive and the Union Parliament should have an opportunity of expressing their views on this matter, at least as a guidance to

individual State action. Especially let us remember that courts of law are concerned with the limited question of constitutional validity whereas we will have to be concerned with broader issues of high policy. The very continuance of a secular State has of late been brought into jeopardy, by the recent order passed by the Government of Bombay segregating Anglo-Indian children from children of other communities. Besides the concept of a secular state relates not to individual federating units but to the Union as a whole, and the actions of a State sometimes have as in this instance far-reaching repercussions on a secular State—just as policies and actions of individual States might have repercussions on foreign relations, foreign trade and other matters of national importance. In fact, the Prime Minister who is the fond parent of the Directive Principles and the concept of a secular State in our Constitution should be the first person to intervene and save his creations from asphyxiation and doom.

I have not the time to refer to the Kumbh Mela tragedy. It is a sorry tale of woe. I do not wish to say harsh things which would add more passion to what is already in evidence. But I ask one question. How long are we going to have explanations of pathetic helplessness on this matter? Is it after all correct to affirm that we do not have responsibility for what has occurred? For instance, at an early stage when the Uttar Pradesh Government relaxed Cholera inoculation restrictions, many of us realised that there would be a great influx of population into the Kumbh Mela Area. Had the Central Government acted with promptitude, and insisted on restrictions being observed possibly, so many millions would not have congregated and the tragedy might have been averted. I do not want to elaborate this point, but I leave it to the consciences of Ministers to find answers to the doubts that I have raised.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru Sir, I am grateful to you for this permission to intervene in this debate at this stage.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

During the last few days a great many speeches have been delivered here, and many and diverse subjects discussed. It is rather difficult for me to deal with all those matters, and therefore, with your permission, I will only deal with some of them.

First of all, may I repeat what, I think, I said on a previous occasion in regard to the President's Address. Acharya Kripalani said that the President's Address was 'formal' and not 'inspiring'. Others have also said something to that effect. Now, if I may say so, the President's Address is meant to be formal. Of course, it is always better to be inspiring, but inspiration is not so easy to find as to express. The President's Address is a formal statement, naturally, for which the Government is responsible. Sometimes the hon. Members have thought, and sometimes even the Press outside has criticised it, that the President's Address has repeated what the Government have said. What else can we do? This is a Government statement of broad policy which the President lays before the joint session of the two Houses. It can be nothing else. It cannot be sensational, normally speaking. It cannot state any very novel fact, normally speaking. If any very important step is to be taken by Government, they would naturally come to this House, discuss it here, and not spring it as a surprise on them in the President's Address. Therefore, I would beg the House to consider the context in which the President's Address is delivered.

The hon. Member, Mr. Jaipal Singh, said that the President's Address should not deal with controversial matters. I agree with him, I believe in the sense he meant this, because obviously, if the President's Address refers to controversial legislation, that is a controversial matter. He gave us an instance—the reference in the Address to the Kumbh Mela tragedy and, he said that the President had given a 'chit' or a pat on the back of the U.P. Government. Well, I was surprised to hear that and I looked

back on the Address. All that the President said in that connection was that the U.P. Government had taken great pains to make satisfactory arrangements for this great concourse of human beings. But, the trouble occurred. I really do not know how anyone can call that 'lack of pre-judging'. The fact that the Government took pains—they might have failed, they might have committed mistakes subsequently—but the fact that it took pains is a fact which nobody can challenge or dispute. It is not a controversial matter. Well, I do not agree with him. Now, this debate has unfortunately been somewhat overshadowed by this Kumbh Mela tragedy which, important as it is and tragic as it was, really bears little relation to the wide topics that we are discussing. As my hon. friend Shri Tandon stated, we should await the results of the enquiry that is being held there. In regard to one aspect of it, which was specially stressed by Acharya Kripalani, a broader aspect, I hope to say something at a later stage. But, the main subjects that we have to discuss here, I submit, are the broad issues before the country, whether in the international field or in the domestic field and we should avoid going into narrow issues which we can discuss at other times.

If you look at the world today, it is full of problems, tensions and fears. It seems to be wrapped up by a mantle of fear and search for security, and, unfortunately, search for security often leads to an addition of the tension of the world. Obviously, no country, not even the greatest country and the most powerful country in the world, can have it all its own way; much less any country like India, with no power in the sense of military might or financial power, with the only power, if you like to say so, of our faith in some things, if that is any power. Therefore, we may well complain of things that we do not like; but, we should look at things in their true perspective, as to what can be done and what

cannot be done, and try to do our best. We cannot always bring about the results which we hope for. But, anyhow, I believe if we try to do our best some good results follow.

Today, we have in Asia especially, special problems which we have to face. The geography of India, centrally situated as we are, apart from any other reason connects us with these problems both in the west of Asia, and in the south-east and east, and inevitably we have to shoulder this responsibility, apart from the mere size of our country, bigness of our population, and our potential resources, and all that. So, we have become tied up occasionally with external matters even though we have tried to avoid involvement as far as possible.

The House knows that only yesterday some of our troops that had been sent to Korea have come back. Others are following within a few days and that chapter in Korea is over, that is, the chapter in which our Custodian Force and our representatives in the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission functioned there. I need not say much about that now. Most of the facts are known to Members. They have appeared in the public Press. I hope at some later stage, in a few days time, to place a statement upon the Table of the House, more for record than for any additional information. In regard to Korea.

The object aimed at by this Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission has not been attained—or fully attained—and unfortunately, most of the problems remain unsolved. That is a misfortune. But I think most people agree that our representatives there on the Commission who had a very very delicate task to face, as well as our Custodian Force, did as well as they could have been possibly expected to do, with the result, I think that however much there might be differences in the view point that was taken up by our representatives, all parties concerned have paid a tribute to their impartiality in this

work. (Cheers.) The cheering of the House indicates that the House would like to send out its good wishes for their return.

5 P. M.

Although all or nearly all the problems remain, Korea had nevertheless one bright feature about it, namely, that the fighting there which was terrible for two or three years, stopped; at least, that slaughter ended. Only the problems remain, although the problems are difficult enough.

There is one thing in this connection that I might mention. The House probably knows that there was a difference of opinion about many matters but more specially as to how this Commission should end its labours about the prisoners of war that were with it, and the opinion of the Chairman, i.e. the representative of India, was that the various processes laid down in the agreement between the two parties had not been gone through; however, there was no alternative left to the Commission but to restore those prisoners of war to their own detaining sides.

One particular difficulty faced us in the past few days. That was in regard to seventeen persons—I am not sure about the figure, but I think it is seventeen—undertrial for very serious crimes, including murder. They were being tried under court-martial set up by our forces there. Unfortunately, those trials could not be completed, partly because of lack of cooperation by some parties. The result was that those persons charged with serious crimes raised the problem as to what should be done with them. It was patent that the Indian Custodian Force could not continue with the court-martial, because it was not going to remain there. It was patent also that it could not bring them with it to India. On the other hand, it seemed obviously right that the trial of those persons who had been so charged should somehow be completed and they should be punished or acquitted after trial, as the case may be. So, in this

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

dilemma the Indian Custodian Force decided to hand over those persons to their own detaining sides with a strong request that these trials should be proceeded with and completed. I do not know exactly what is likely to happen to them, but I do feel that it would be a travesty of justice if persons who *prima facie* have been shown to have committed those very serious crimes are merely discharged.

I mentioned Korea, but there are so many other places in the world which offer tremendous problems. Only recently, the House knows that the Four Great Powers met in Berlin, and for many, many days there was argument about Germany, about Austria, and about other matters. Unfortunately, that argument did not yield any substantial results except for one thing which was a bright spot towards the conclusion, that is, the four Great Powers agreed to hold a Conference in Geneva on the 26th of April to consider the Korean problem and also Indo-China. I presume that the Chinese Government has agreed to this procedure, because it is intimately involved and its presence is obviously essential.

Now, I just mentioned that in Korea, whatever difficulties there might remain, the fact is that war has stopped. It is a very big thing. Unfortunately, in Indo-China war has not stopped and is being continued in a very terrible way. It is six years now since this Indo-China war began and for the present I do not propose to say anything more about it, because of this that anyhow all of us here—and many others, I have no doubt—would obviously welcome some kind of ending of this actual war, but more especially when it has been proposed to discuss this matter two months hence by the Great Powers concerned. It seems a tremendous pity that this war should continue when a serious attempt is going to be made to find a way out. Now, it is not for me to suggest anything, and certainly it is with no desire to intervene in any way or intrude or involve ourselves or any-

thing like that, but I do venture to suggest to all the parties and the Powers concerned that in view of the fact that this matter of Indo-China is going to be discussed at the Geneva conference two months later, it might be desirable—it is desirable, I think—to have some kind of cease-fire without any party giving up its own position, whatever they might consider their right etc., because, once one starts arguing about rights, then there will be no end to that argument. So, I would make this very earnest appeal in all humility—and I am sure this House will join with me—to the Powers to strive to have a cease-fire there. Then they can discuss it in their own way. I repeat that so far as we are concerned, we have no desire to interfere or to shoulder any burden or responsibility in this connection.

Now, from this Korean war, even more so the Indo-China war—and if I may mention some other places where not a war of this kind, but nevertheless, continuous military operations have been going on, like in Malaya, like in some parts of Africa—one sees that nowadays once even a little war starts, it goes on and on; military operations start, they go on and on. It is difficult to stop them. It is difficult to conclude them, or to reach at any satisfactory solution of the problem through those means. Now, without going into this question of Indo-China, it is patent that for these last two years the balances have sometimes been weighted this side or that without making too much difference. Sometimes one party advances in a military sense, retreats a little. I do not know exactly what the military position is, I cannot say, but any person can see that for five years they have been fighting and killing each other without any decision being arrived at. That itself, I think, might lead us to certain conclusions. If even in these relatively small wars it is difficult to arrive at a conclusion by military means, what is likely to happen if, unfortunately, a big, global war

descended upon us? Would it be an unending affair which went on and on with nobody to end it, no final conclusion arrived at, or what else would it be? It is dangerous today even to start a small war. People may think that it may be a small operation. It is not. It goes on and on regardless of the merits of the case. And therefore it is desirable to keep this in mind, and therefore, in Indo-China certainly, but I hope in the other places I mentioned also,—some other approach might be made, at any rate to end this killing, because there can be no doubt that, apart from the horror of this continuous killing in warfare or in military operations, this leaves a tremendous trail of bitterness and conflict behind. It does not matter ultimately what the result of military operation is, if in the minds of millions of people fear or bitterness remains, because that will give rise to all future troubles again, and there is no ending of that. Personally, I am convinced that there can be no true solution of these problems at this stage, by the method of warfare, whether it is in a small way or in a big way. So, I would appeal to the Great Powers and the little Powers and all concerned, perhaps, to make an effort in this direction, and to see in some other way, but anyhow to begin with to try to stop by cease-fire or otherwise these operations.

Now I refer to the Berlin Conference which was recently held, and which, if I may say so with all respect, was rather disappointing, apart from this final conclusion which we must welcome, i.e. a meeting will be held in Geneva. Nevertheless, I would like the House to consider that even that Berlin Conference, which brought no good result, itself is a good sign; the mere meeting together and discussing and considering various viewpoints—all these, at any rate, not only avoid any more tragic developments like war, but indicate this continued search for peaceful settlements. I have no doubt that the people of all countries in the world hanker after peace, hanker after real peace, not merely an absence of shooting war. What have we got to-

day? We call it the cold war; and the cold war is undoubtedly better than a shooting war, anything would be better than a shooting war. Nevertheless, a cold war is a pretty bad thing. It means obsession against each other, it means fear all the time,—fear of war and fear of losing one's security,—with the result that there is continuous tension; so far as the economic side is concerned, it is upset, of course, because it cannot function normally; politically, there is this tremendous tension, hatreds, dislikes and always living on the verge of violence on a big scale.

I wonder how this generation that is growing up in many parts of the world, thinking always in terms of the cold war, in terms of the possible big war, in terms of hatred of this country and that, those people and these people, will function when it grows up. The environment, the context in which the present day generations are growing up, seem to me a terrible thought. The other day, some hon. Members might have seen the Children's Art Exhibition that was held in Delhi, organised by *Shanker's Weekly* children's Number. There were thousands of pictures from all over the world, produced by children. It was an extraordinary collection, a very fine collection, apart from its artistic merits, showing what children all over the world were thinking. It was an oppressing thought, when I saw those pictures; how many of those children have produced nightmarish pictures, just some kind of horrible nightmares,—as if they had had. It showed possibly the fear of this environment in which these children are growing up, of hatred, of violence, of possible wars, and all that. So, this is what we are contending against, quite apart from the avoidance of war. Almost, one might think that there is some evil enchantment over the world, which oppresses us, and hence oppresses the widespread feeling of people all over the world, for peace and goodwill, and to live their normal lives; and we cannot go out of this enchantment. We meet in conference and the like-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and sometimes we talk to each other at long distances, much hoping for peace and settlement and some way out but somehow functioning so as to make this difficult. That is the basic problem before the world and with that, you come—that is somewhat complicated for us in Asia—by all kinds of new forces being let loose in Asia and to some extent in Africa. We are interested in the world's problems because they affect us as they affect the whole world. We are interested particularly in Asian problems because we are part of Asia. We are interested in African problems for a variety of reasons, a very minor reason being of course that, whether it is in Africa or parts of Asia outside India, large numbers of Indians live there. We are interested in them. But the real problems are not of Indian overseas but of the people who live in those countries overseas. None of these problems, I venture to say, is going to be settled now by compulsion and violent compulsion. Somehow, the forces which were kept in check in the past cannot be kept in check now. I may venture to put forward an objective analysis without really going into the merits. My sympathies are clear, the House's sympathies are clear, but apart from sympathies,—it is not an objective analysis,—I think, one cannot suppress, for whatever reason, these basic forces of nationalism, of freedom, that have arisen in Asia or in Africa or elsewhere. To that, of course, I would add the feeling, the strong feeling, against racialism which exists in those continents.

Now, that is the position. The House knows our policy. It is sometimes miscalled a neutral policy or neutralism, and we are told that we are sitting on the fence, that we are afraid of this country or that country, and that therefore we have not got the courage of our convictions. Well, we lack many things, and sometimes, maybe we even lack wisdom but I do not think we lack the capacity to express our thoughts clearly or to express them without

being oppressed by fear. I think that people in India, by and large, suffer less at the present moment from this oppressive fear which envelops great continents and countries than those in many other places.

This policy that we have adopted has grown naturally out of our past history, past tradition, past way of thinking, and present conditions. It is a policy which can be justified both on the idealistic grounds and on strictly practical considerations. We do not want to enter into this circle of hatred, violence and fear which the cold war embodies. As far as possible, we do not want other countries that remain out of it, to enter it, because if we are searching for peace, if the world is searching for peace, it may not get the peace it desires, certainly because the problems are terribly complicated. But anyhow one should do two things: one is to avoid doing anything which adds to the tensions of the world today, which adds to the fears of the world today. The other is of course a more positive approach of reducing those tensions. Now, if some step is taken which actually adds to those fears, then it is, I submit, an ill-service to the cause of peace. So in this context we have to function in this world, and to function with the courage of our convictions and without fear. At the same time, being friendly to all countries does not mean that we agree with the views or the activities of other countries; we have our own views. But it is my conviction and, I believe the House also agrees with me in this matter, that at any time, and more especially at the present time, it does not help even to say, if you like, even to express your opinion in condemnation of some other country, even though you might think that it is the right opinion; because that merely adds to those tensions, and when people are moved by so much anger and prejudice, their minds are not open to reason or logical argument.

Now, so far as India is concerned, we try to avoid entanglement in foreign issues. We cannot hope to

wholly avoid it of course, because we have to play our part in this world, and no country can be isolated, much less India—whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere. But we are particularly concerned with our neighbour countries, and naturally we wish that our relations with these neighbour countries should be as close and cordial as possible. I am glad to say that they are so, unhappily with one exception. So far as Burma is concerned, we are on terms of great cordiality and friendship. There are at present some talks going on with the Burmese Government in regard to certain matters, certain issues between the two countries, and I have little doubt that they will result in a satisfactory agreement. So far as Ceylon is concerned, many hon. Members have referred to the recent Indo-Ceylonese Agreement and partly criticised it; partly, they felt that there might be something in it which might lead to wrong results. As a matter of fact, as I have stated previously, this Indo-Ceylonese Agreement in regard to the people of Indian descent in Ceylon is not a settlement of the problem at all; it is a first step towards that. In fact, it repeats what actually is the position: it only repeats that position in a friendly way, in a better way, in a cooperative way. In the solution of this problem, it is perfectly clear that the cooperation of the two Governments and the goodwill of the two Governments and of the people concerned is essential. Now, if this agreement leads to that atmosphere of goodwill and co-operative effort, we have achieved a great thing. Have we given up any vital principle in it? I submit, not. I will not go into the details of it. It is true that in some places in Ceylon some kind of interpretations have taken place which have extended the scope of this agreement. Obviously, we are not bound by interpretations with which we do not agree and which do not flow from that agreement. The main thing is that we have put this question after several years on a different level of approach, a friendly level, and I hope that this will yield results.

The House knows that for some time past, for a month or more, there have been discussions going on in Peking between our representatives and the representatives of the People's Government of China in regard to certain matters affecting Tibet. These discussions are still proceeding. They are proceeding on the whole satisfactorily and I hope that before very long they will also yield a satisfactory result.

Now, so far as these neighbouring countries are concerned, our relations are very good. They are very good with countries of Western Asia and with Egypt. It is unfortunate that with Pakistan, which is not only our close neighbour but which is more closely bound to us by past history, culture tradition and all manner of other bonds than any other country, there should be certain remaining problems which have affected our relationship. I shall not go into these problems.

So far as canal waters issue is concerned, it is still being discussed in Washington between the parties' representatives. I believe, considerable progress has been made, but that is all I can say. I do not know what the final result will be. Other issues like evacuee property are still pending and of late on these matters, there has been a great deal of frustration for us. The major issue remains—Kashmir. I shall deal with this matter a little later; and I shall also refer to certain new developments which have taken place in regard to Pakistan.

I have referred to foreign affairs; but the most vital thing for us, obviously, is our domestic position, the economic progress that we might make or try to make; that is the essential factor. You can measure it by production, per capita consumption, the reduction of unemployment, as you like, because they all go together. This is hardly the time to go into these matters fully. But, I do wish to lay stress that after all in this variety of problems that we are faced with, this is the most vital and major problem for us. The fact that I do not

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

deal with this at length in this present reply of mine does not indicate that our Government attaches any less importance to it; but, it cannot be dealt with in this scrappy way. For my part, I would welcome the House to discuss any aspect of it more fully, if and when we have the time for it.

But, I would like hon. Members to look at this picture a little objectively. It is the right—and may be the duty—of the Opposition to criticise and condemn. I accept that; I like that. If there is not that criticism—and even harsh criticism, if you like.—any government is likely to become slack. And, therefore, it is not with any desire to limit that criticism of the Opposition that I would submit that we might look at this problem a little objectively. It is very easy, in a very large country like India, passing through these difficult times, facing difficult problems,—to criticise and find fault, and that criticism may well be justified, and the faults that are pointed out may well be there. And, at the same time, you may well find other factors which are admirable or which are praiseworthy or which are worthy of commendation. They are both there and one can pick and choose; in a country like India you can make a list on either side. Ultimately one has to see, in the balance, what is happening, whether we are going on in a particular direction or not and whether it is the right direction. I think that if I could take hon. Members with me on a voyage of discovery of India as it is today, I have no doubt they could show me many things that I am not aware of, but I could also show them many things, of which perhaps they are not fully seized, although they read about them in newspapers. Nevertheless, it does make a difference when we see things actually in practice before us and have some kind of emotional awareness of what is happening instead of merely reading something, because I travel about India and see what is happening there both in regard to vast and magnificent undertakings that are now taking shape and that will give results very

soon, and, in regard to many small things and in regard to what our own people are doing themselves. It is not governmental effort; it is what the people are doing, maybe with the help of some governmental effort. I am excited and I have a sense of exhilaration—I wish to make it clear—not in praise of the Government with which I am associated, though I think in many matters the Government has done well, but I rather think not as the Government functioning, but as the people of India functioning. It is a matter of pride to me to see the millions of our countrymen and countrywomen gradually moulding this new India that we are striving for. It is to be moulded—I have no doubt about it—not only in the big places about which you read in the newspapers, but in tens of thousands of the villages of India today, and I hope that those tens of thousands will become hundreds of thousands in a year or two. When India is in travail of giving birth to new things all the time, a new India is taking shape, and I feel that all our old history—whatever it is, 5000, 8000 or 10,000 years—will stand as witness to see what is happening in this old, ancient country of ours which has put on a new garb. It is a magnificent adventure that all of us are engaged in, and when I look at this, I do not think of it as something for which my Government is responsible or the Party with which I am connected is responsible, but as something in which all of us here in this House and all over the country are responsible in some measure. Therefore, I would beg hon. Members to look at this picture in this way, not in the slightest degree limiting their criticism or condemnation—it is right, it is a democratic way of functioning, and I would welcome it, but nevertheless I think it is unfortunate that in criticising Government, very often hon. Members opposite criticise the people of India too.....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Not in the least.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ...and do not realise that it is ultimately the people of India who are functioning to-day.

Shri S. S. More: No, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Members, who do not apparently agree with that statement, if I may say so, simply indicate that they are somewhat out of tune with the people of India. I do not mean to say that the Government's way is the best way. I am not referring to that. It may be a better way. This Government may adopt a better way or some other Government may adopt a better way, but after all, the amount of divergence may be considerable. Nevertheless, fundamentally, the work that is being done in India is the work that any government would have to do and it is the work which the people of India are doing. It is an essential item and I shall come back to it at a somewhat later stage in another connection.

It is an important thing that we should keep in tune with the people of India. My hon. friend Dr. Jaisooriya, was kind enough to say some good words about me, about my modern way of thinking and all that. Well, whether I am modern and to what extent I am modern is a matter which can be considered separately at leisure. But of one thing I am deeply conscious, that in this great journey that we are making,—call it a pilgrimage,—towards a better future, we have to go with 360 million companions. It is not my modernity, or anybody else's conservatism, or reactionary tendencies, whatever that might be, that matters. I am all for modernity. But remembering that we are fellow-travellers with hundreds of millions of our people, we have to go with them, carry them with us, or be carried by them,—put it as you like—and not isolate ourselves in that ivory tower attitude, or a feeling of being superior to others. We may be superior intellectually. But the journey is of the people of India, not of individuals, or a small group here and there, who may consider themselves superior.

Therefore, in that journey we have to convince them, we have to carry them with us. And how? We have adopted a democratic method here. Apart from this democratic method we have, even in the course of our struggle for freedom, adopted a peaceful method. Of course, normally speaking, democratic and peaceful methods have to go together.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Non-violently.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe the hon. Member does not like the peaceful method! If there are certain basic things within the context of a peaceful and democratic method, I believe much can be done. Indeed I believe that if you go outside that context we are not likely to do much. I am not for the moment discussing economic theories, whatever they might be, and I am not discussing anything for the wide world. I know my India. I hope, a little and I cannot, and I do not presume to advise any other country as to what they should do internally or externally. But looking at the picture of India as we have it, I have no doubt in my mind that any method that is not a peaceful method is likely to yield terrible results. And if you break up the unity of India, all your efforts at progress will be doomed, naturally. I want to keep these two things apart. I want to appeal to hon. Members opposite for co-operation in the fullest measure in these great tasks, keeping entirely apart their policies, their view-points—I do not wish to touch them—and their freedom to express them and to criticise us and condemn us. Nevertheless, try to separate the two things. If there are failures of, if you like, a Government that is not up to your high standards, or any standards, certainly, criticise, by all means. But a Government which for the moment represents the people of India, however humble, however little the members of the Government might be, however many failures they may have to their credit, nevertheless, because they represent the people of India, something of the greatness of the people of India comes to this Government.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

provided we represent the masses. So, I would beg to them, I would beg of the hon. Members to look at this tremendous adventure of India. It is an adventure and at the same time—speaking not only of India but of other countries also—it is, if you may call it, a struggle for survival for many of our countries, in Asia and elsewhere, either from the possibilities of war or from economic troubles. We have to fight this great fight and win—and we are going to win. Then why should we not have a common ground to fight this on all fronts in our democratic, peaceful way, criticising and holding to our different policies as much as we like? I do not suggest that any person or any group should give up his view-point; it is necessary that all view-points—even those view-points with which I may entirely disagree—should be fully expressed.

Some hon. Members spoke; I think it was in connection with the proposed military aid which possibly the United States Government might give to Pakistan and the consequences that might flow from it. They said, referring to this why our Government, or I, do not take them into confidence so that we may all function in unity. Of course I want all of us to function in any grave matter affecting the nation,—or for the matter of that, in any other matter—with as large a measure of unity as possible. And for my part, I will be happy to consult any Member of this House or groups in this House on such occasions. But it is obvious that a united policy must be based on some unity of outlook, basic unity of outlook. If there is divergence right at the base, it is difficult to build up a structure of unity and follow a united policy. If some hon. Members in this House tell us that our foreign policy has been completely misconceived and misguided and we should throw it overboard and do something else, obviously there is no unity of approach left there because that policy is not merely a tactical exercise but something based on our growth, our movement and our thinking as well as a number of other considerations. And

it has shown good results; that is my judgement—hon. Members may challenge it. There must be some unity of outlook like that.

If I criticise or feel that it is an unfortunate move for the United States of America to give military aid to Pakistan, one hon. Member gets up and says: why don't we also accept military aid from the United States? That shows that either it has been our misfortune not to explain our policy with the precision which could enable him to grasp what it is, or he considers me completely wrong; because, if I consider that military aid being given to Pakistan is wrong, quite apart from the question of India, from the Asian point, from a number of view-points, then if we commit that wrong we will be doomed and we will have no justification left for any policy after that. Therefore, we must be clear about that. Or, some other people would suggest; because the United States of America has done this, rush up to the Soviet Union and get their military aid! The whole thing is based on some kind of inverted thinking. What I mean is this, that the whole thing is entirely opposed to either approach. As I mentioned, it is entirely opposed to the basic policy that we have been pursuing. And if we take any country's aid—I am not going into the merits of it—any outside country's aid, well, our whole policy ends there and we have to consider afresh as to how we should proceed in the matter. Therefore I submit that there must be some unity of outlook.

Apart from this, there are certain basic things which, I submit, must be borne in mind. If we are to proceed peacefully and democratically there is, under our Constitution, the authority of Parliament; our President who is the symbol of the State, above party and the rest of it. He may of course, as President in his Address represent what the Government wish to do. It is a different matter. But he is a symbol of the State. There is our Flag; our National Anthem. I am

mentioning obvious things. I am mentioning them, and what I say I am not saying by way of complaint but in sorrow: it is a matter of deep grief to me that at the beginning of this session some hon. Members deliberately and ostentatiously kept away when the President addressed the joint session of both Houses of Parliament. I am not going into the merits. But the President is a symbol of the State, of the dignity of the State. And it is not so much here, but in some of our State Assemblies also this is being done with the Governor there, who is also a symbol. It is totally immaterial whether you like the Governor, whether he is beautiful to look at or not so attractive to look at. These are symbols of the State, of the unity of the State. And if we do not respect that symbol we do injury to the conception of the unity of that State. If one party does it and another does it, it may well become a practice for some group or other to act in that way because they do not like something. I do appeal, not only to hon. Members here but elsewhere, that these conventions ought to be observed. Why is there a convention—which we have taken from other parliaments, notably the British Parliament—for me to say “the hon. Member opposite” or “the learned Member” or “my learned colleague”? These are conventions. It does not quite follow when I say “learned Member” that he is very learned! But these are conventions to promote, if I may use the word, civilised behaviour. Because, if we use these terms, it does pull us up; it keeps up a certain level of conduct which is becoming and dignified. We are the Parliament of India and high dignity attaches to us. And it is right that we should set an example to others.

I will not say much about the economic conditions except to say this on my behalf and on behalf of my Government, that in regard to economic matters we approach them with a completely open mind, with no dogmas, no fixed ideas about them. We are prepared to discuss anything with anybody—about our Five Year Plan, or

about our Second Five Year Plan—and prepared to change anything, accept anything, if we are convinced. Because the problem is a difficult one. And I hope the House will agree that there is no easy remedy for it. It does not matter what policy we pursue so long as we do hard work and have unity. It may be that some other approach other than the one we are pursuing might produce better results. Let us examine it. We are prepared to examine everything.

An hon. Member talked about our administrative machinery and quoted me at some length. Well, we are examining that and I hope that we will be able to improve it in that way. I would like to say this however—because the administration was criticised—that it is easy to criticise it and it is easy to point out some failures here and there. Nevertheless, I think our administrative machinery has adapted itself and is adapting itself to present day conditions, with some considerable success, and that as a whole our administrative machinery—not the machinery, but rather the people, the personnel of that machinery,—is as good as you can find in any other country. Naturally, I do not speak for all of them. When they are tens and thousands I cannot speak for all of them; there are people who are excellent, good, fair, and all that. But, taking it by and large it is so, and I submit with some respect that I speak with some knowledge of other countries as well as my own. But, anyhow, we have to improve it and we have to adapt it to the changing conditions. I entirely agree with the hon. Member who said something about our old rules and regulations and all that about the Services and the way the administration should function. I entirely agree that all this should be replaced. In fact, we are at the present moment engaged in that process and I hope, within a measurable distance of time, this would be done. It is a complicated structure and not so easy to change things because one change will bring about another change. Anyhow, I submit to this House that it is, at the present moment, open for innumerable

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

criticisms to be made. I criticise my own Government and that too frequently. I do not see why I should not. But, of course, there is a difference between my criticism and perhaps some other criticism. I criticise in a friendly way—often that criticism may be expressed in angry terms actually—because it is a matter between one's colleagues. But, we want to improve. We want the help of everybody to do that. It is a terrific job, this governance of India, at any time, more especially after these vital changes, more especially in the context of the world today. I believe, speaking with all humility, we have done rather a good job of it, in spite of all the failures. Maybe, somebody else would have done it better. But, let us consider this matter, economic, administrative and everything, with a view to find better ways of doing it and adopt that better way.

Now, I should like to refer to the proposed U.S. aid to Pakistan. Recently the House has seen that there has been a Pact between Turkey and Pakistan and it is said that this is likely to be followed by some kind of arrangement between the United States and Pakistan for military aid. I spoke about this matter in December last, before the House adjourned, and expressed our concern about it. That concern was not so much due to any ill-feeling against Pakistan—it was not at all due to that—and certainly not due to any ill-feeling against America. But, I felt then and I have felt strongly ever since that this step is a wrong step and a step which adds to the tensions of the world, to the fears of the world, a step which if it can be justified at all, can be justified only on one ground that it is a step towards peace and that it is a step towards ensuring security. No doubt I am prepared to accept that that is the feeling governing some of the people behind this step. But, I am quite clear in my mind.—I need not labour that point, it is obvious,—it seems to me that instead of adding to the security of the world or of Asia, it adds to the tension in Asia, it adds to the

feelings of insecurity in Asia and it adds, therefore, to the fears and apprehensions in Asia and elsewhere. Therefore, it is a wrong step from the point of view of peace or removal of tensions. It may be that from some military point of view,—I am no soldier—it may be justified. I cannot say that. But, I do submit that soldiers are very fine persons, and soldiers are very necessary, at any rate, in the present day world, but when it comes to the judging of world affairs through the soldiers' eyes and ears, it is a dangerous thing. A soldier's idea of security is one thing; a politician's or statesman's may be somewhat different. They have to be co-ordinated. When war comes, the soldier is supreme and his voice prevails almost, not quite. But, when it comes to the soldier's voice prevailing in peace time, it means that peace is likely to be converted into war.

How then do we balance? Here is this kind of evil enchantment over the world which prevents us from going in the right direction; here is the world with all the strength and power in it to solve the economic problems, poverty and all these things. For the first time in history, it has got strength and power to do it. But, instead of proceeding to do that and having a better future for the whole of humanity, we have these fears, and tensions and representations for war, and maybe war itself. It is an extraordinary thing.

How are we to lessen these tensions? Not by thinking in military terms all the time. I agree, and I accept this, that no country can ignore the military aspect. No country can weaken itself and offer itself as a target to some other country to take advantage of that weakness. Having accepted that, nevertheless, if one is to try for peace, it is not by talking of war, by issuing threats and by all the time preparing for war in a rather loud and aggressive way, whatever the country involved might be.

6 P.M.

I have stated before that Prime Minister of Pakistan, I believe and I

am convinced, earnestly wishes, as I do, that there should be good relations between India and Pakistan. I have no doubt about his motives in this matter and I hope he has no doubt about mine. It is not a question of motives. If a step is taken which necessarily has some harmful results, all the best motives in the world cannot prevent them. Mr. Mohammed Ali has made various statements about this matter. He has stated, first of all, "Why should India object?" Of course, they are a free country; I cannot prevent them. But, if something affects Asia, India specially, are we to remain silent about it, if something, in our opinion, is a reversal of history after hundreds of years? We have thought in terms of freeing our countries, and one of the symbols of freedom has been the withdrawal of foreign armed forces. Of course, there may be a lack of freedom even then possibly, but, anyhow, an external symbol is the withdrawal of armed forces. And whatever the motive, I say the return of any armed forces or anything like it from any European or any American country is a reversal of the history of the countries of Asia. It was suggested some two or three years ago in connection with Kashmir—and I saw it was suggested by somebody only the other day—that some other countries send forces to Kashmir, some European or American country, whatever forces they might be. We rejected that completely because, so far as we can see, on no account, whatever the occasion, may be, are we going to allow any foreign forces to land in India.

Now, that is our outlook, and that is something more than Indian outlook. It is an outlook, which, if I may say so, applies to the whole or a large part of this continent of Asia and therefore we viewed with apprehension—we viewed with regret as one views something which may not be perfectly clear but which is pointing in a wrong direction—this business of military aid coming from the United States to Pakistan. I am sure the United States Government had not these considerations before them because they think,

718 P.S.D.

naturally, in their own environment, and that is the difficulty. I dare not, and I am not prepared, to express my opinion except in the most philosophical manner, about problems—distant problems—of Europe. I do not consider myself justified. But I do consider myself justified in expressing opinions about my own country, and to a slight extent, about my neighbours, and to a slightly less extent about Asian countries, not because India has the slightest desire for imposing its views or wishes on any other country—I have denied that; we seek no leadership; we are going to have no leadership over any other country—but because we have passed through similar processes of history in the last two hundred years or so, because we have had similar experiences; therefore, we can understand each other a little better. Therefore, if I speak, to some extent I may be in tune with some of my neighbour countries. If the Prime Minister of Burma speaks, he, or the head of any other country round about, is likely to be in tune with my thinking—I do not say I am the leader of Burma or the Prime Minister of Burma is the leader of India—because we have had this common background, common experiences. Therefore, it has led us to think to some extent in a common way, because we have common problems.

Now, the problems of Asia, therefore, have to be solved, and Great Powers and others should necessarily, because they are great Powers, have a great interest in solving them, but if the great Powers think that the problems of Asia can be solved *minus* Asia in a sense, or *minus* the views of Asian countries, then it does seem to be rather odd.

Now, I refer to Kashmir. I should be very brief about Kashmir. First of all, the House knows the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir has just passed certain resolutions, or certain parts of its Constitution which it was considering. This is a process which started two or three years ago. It was halted in between, but it started then. We

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

made it clear then that it is perfectly right, it is perfectly open to the people of Kashmir to frame their Constitution—in fact, they were hanging in the air—but that so far as our international commitments were concerned,—i.e. India's—we naturally would honour them, unless something else happened. But the fact that the Constituent Assembly decided something was a fact, an important fact, because it represented the wishes of elected people in Kashmir. But it cannot come in the way of our absolving ourselves from our international commitments, in regard to the plebiscite, in regard to anything. That was the position, and that remains so. To ask me, as I have been asked by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to repudiate the Constituent Assembly's decision, is manifestly, if I might use the word with all respect, quite absurd. There is no question of my repudiating what the Constituent Assembly expressed as its wishes. But as I said, our international commitments remain, and we are going to proceed with them, in due course, always in consultation with the Government of Kashmir.

Now it is true I said this, and I referred this matter to the Prime Minister of Pakistan, that this U.S. aid has somewhat changed the context of events. I do not yet know what this aid will be, what shape it may take, or in what form it will ultimately be. When I expressed with all respect our views about this matter, I dealt with the whole question, not from the quantitative point of view, if I may say so, but the qualitative point of view. The thing itself is so bad. Whether quantitatively it is exceedingly limited did not matter to me; a thing so bad is, as I said, itself a reversal of history. It is a qualitative matter, but the quantitative matter is also important; both are important. Now, Mr. Mohammed Ali made the other day a remark, which rather surprised me, that if we get this military aid from Kashmir, this will make it easier to solve the Kashmir problem.

An Hon. Member: It is a threat.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a remark which is odd. It can only mean one or two things. It either means that with the help of the military aid, the military way will be easy of solution, or it means that with the help of that aid, a certain pressure can be exercised in order to solve the problem. It can mean nothing else. So, these things have to be considered carefully.

Hon. Members say, as they often say, withdraw this from the United Nations, or do this and that. Well, we are not going to do something which is against our assurances and our commitments. India has a certain reputation in the world. There is no good discussing now what was right or wrong five or six years ago. We have to consider the position as it is today. As I said earlier, we propose to honour our commitments, and stand by them to the extent that is possible, in the sense of the removal of the difficulties that have stood in the way.

Now I have taken a good deal of time of this House, but I must say something about what my friend Acharya Kripalani said in regard to the Kumbh Mela. I am not dealing with the Kumbh Mela as such, because, let us wait for the inquiry. But one thing I would like to say; the great Acharyaji referred to Government as inviting and encouraging and pushing people into the Mela, because we had special trains and the like. I do submit that this is not a correct appreciation of the situation. The Railways make arrangements, wherever large crowds are expected—we have to,—and as a matter of fact, hundreds of thousands of people could not come on this occasion because there was no accommodation in the railways. The hon. Member referred to people travelling on the roofs of carriages, it was true especially on the metre gauge section. It shows the pressure on the railways was such that people simply went up and stood on the roofs of carriages. There was this pressure,

and the railway had to make the best arrangements possible. All these arrangements had been made ten years ago, I forget now, at the last Kumbh Mela at Hardwar,—I believe hundreds of special trains, 300 or 400 special trains, were run. One has to do that.

I wish to deal with another aspect of the matter. There was an accusation that Government rather wanted to exploit this Mela apparently for some party advantage. I was surprised to hear that. It is not my view nor is it the view of the Uttar Pradesh Government. If I may say so, so far as I am concerned, I am in agreement, at any rate, with my friend Shri Purshottama Das Tandon on what he said just now about this business of people going and imagining that their faith or the country's faith or anybody's faith is governed by the planets, the sun or the moon, and they could wash away their sins in the Ganges, and that kind of thing. I do not wish to shock anybody's faith or to pain him, but perhaps many Members in this House know that I seldom let to go an opportunity to escape when I don't say something against astrologers and the like. I think they are a most undesirable crew. Further, they do a lot of harm to the country.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): They continue to flourish.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No; I hope they will not. I have no doubt about that. One hon. Member referred to superstitions. Well, I agree with him, but I would add this: there are very few of us who are free from some kind of superstition or other. It is always the case of one's own orthodoxy and the other's heterodoxy; one's own superstition which is justified and the other's is sheer superstition! There are, of course, religious superstitions, but there are political superstitions and economic superstitions,—all kinds of superstitions. Let us fight all these superstitions, and, if I may say so, the only way to fight them really is to

increase what I call the temper and the climate of science. And that is why the best thing that this Government has done, I think, is the establishment of those National Laboratories where scientific experiments are carried on.

But there is another aspect I would like to bring out here. I went to the Kumbh Mela, as I have been previously. Well, as the House perhaps knows, I was born and bred in Allahabad; well, more or less you might say, born and bred on the banks of the Ganga and the Yamuna, and the Ganga and the Yamuna are very dear to me as companions from my childhood. Whenever I have had the opportunity, I liked bathing in the Ganga. But I made it a point of never bathing there on a sacred occasion, so as not to mislead others. If I get a chance to go there—unfortunately I do not have many chances, and I do not mind it—on such occasions, I go, but on such occasions, I deliberately do not bathe there lest I should be misunderstood as encouraging that.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): But others do the opposite.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be; of course, I cannot answer that. But the point I was going to put to the House was this: that the stars or the bathing in the Ganga do not affect me in the slightest, but I am very powerfully affected by this huge course of human beings, of Indians, wherever they are. I am affected by them, and I want to be in tune with them, to understand them, and I want to influence them in the best manner possible. Therefore, I try to go there—not to the Kumbh Mela—if I have the chance to meet them I have gone to Melas previously, but not with the idea of merely condemning them. They are a very fine lot. They have their superstitions. If I can convince them of what I consider is wrong, I try to convince them. But it doesn't do me much harm if they go and have a dip in the Ganga, and I do not see why I should waste my energies over it; there are many other things that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

perhaps I have to fight. Ultimately, one does this, I suppose, more positively in other ways. And here I must say all my sense of history comes up before me and when I think of the long course of years and centuries that these people have behaved in this way, well, I want to understand that—why that has happened, why that is happening, what force there is, apart from the superstitions, in that? There must be something else about it, because—to come back to what I said at an earlier stage—I want to be in tune with them, being myself what I am, not in tune with their superstitions but be in tune with them, because I am their fellow-traveller, and I have to understand them.

That is by way of a personal explanation, if I may put it so, to the House. Sir, I have taken a good deal of the time of the House and the House has been good enough to listen to me patiently. I thank the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Velayudhan.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : सभा-
पति जी,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have not called the hon. Member. I called Mr. Velayudhan. Does he want to speak?

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): No, Sir.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मुझे यह कहना
है कि.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Veeraswamy.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मुझे भी अपने विचार यहां रखने का कोई चांस मिलेगा। शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के ऊपर बड़ा अन्याय हुआ है। पंडित जी उनके बारे में कुछ नहीं बोले, इस अलये में कहना चाहता हूँ कि

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Mr. Veeraswamy.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, it is a great honour to me that I was called upon to speak just after the reply of the Prime Minister of India to the debate on the President's Address which has been going on for the past three days.

I want to confine my attention only to three aspects of the Presidential Address. But before that, I want to make some observations with regard to the foreign policy of our Government. Sir, I am convinced that everybody in this House and outside will endorse the foreign policy of the Government of India and appreciate the efforts of the Prime Minister of India who has been straining every nerve of his for establishing peace throughout the world. Sir, I need not go very deep into this point to state that the country is with the Prime Minister of India and the Government of India with regard to its foreign policy. From Kashmir to Cape Comorin, from the eastern border of West Bengal to the western border of East Punjab, everybody in this country and every party—I do hope,—stands with the Prime Minister of India with regard to foreign policy. If there is anybody, who may, of course differ, but who does not endorse the policy of the Prime Minister of India, then I need not say that he is an enemy of this country. If there is any country in the world which is under the impression that the people of India, as a whole, do not endorse the foreign policy of India, it is thoroughly mistaken.

Now, I want to go into the three aspects with which I want to deal. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Presidential Address was a bitter disappointment to the people of this country. The speech was dry and without any substance. The people would have expected with much eagerness some