

[श्री टंडन]

के रूप में मान्यता प्राप्त होगी। आज वहाँ पर ५ भाषाओं को मान्यता दी गई है लेकिन वह दिन दूर नहीं है जब हिन्दी को वहाँ पर माना जायगा और वह दिन हमारे लिये गौरव का दिन होगा। हिन्दी को वहाँ पर मनवाना होगा। अगर आज हम अपनी लिपि को चीन को भेंट करें और इस भेंट को वे स्वीकार कर उस पर अमल करें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एशिया भर के लिए यह अच्छा मार्गदर्शन का काम होगा।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it has often been my privilege to address this hon. Lok Sabha and I have gladly availed myself of the opportunity. But, I confess that at the present moment I am rather performing a duty—and with little joy in it.

We have discussed for the last four days the President's Address to the joint session of both Houses of Parliament. That Address was referred to by the hon. Member, Shri Chatterjee, as 'a third class report by an Under Secretary.' The hon. Member, with his great knowledge of affairs and of the English language, no doubt is entitled to judge all these matters, and it is for us to listen to his advice. But, it does seem to me, if I may state it—or rather, understate it—, an odd way and perhaps not a proper way to refer to the President's Address in this way. Other hon. Members complained that the Address did not deal with this or that matter. Shri Asoka Mehta and I think Sardar Hukam Singh said that it gave too much space to foreign affairs and too little to other matters. Others said that it did not refer to Kenya or some other places.

I ventured on some previous occasions to submit to the Lok Sabha as to what the Government thought the President's Address was supposed to be. We are following parliamentary procedure and to some extent—not that we are bound by it, but to some extent—we have derived this procedure from the British Parliament and from the King's Address there. I do not mean that we should adhere to that, but normally speaking, the Head of the State does not, except in America and countries with a like Constitution where the Head of the State delivers "Message to the Nation" or some such name, give a long review of foreign and internal politics and an expression of his opinion on it.

The Head of the American State is the Head of the American Government also; he occupies a special position. Now, the Head of our State is not the Head of the Government, and he occupies a different position. He is analogous to constitutional Heads of State and in his Address to Parliament, according to our thinking, there are two matters which should be dealt with principally. One is reference to foreign affairs and the other is reference to the legislation that is going to be taken up by Parliament. Naturally, he may refer to other matters too. Therefore, that is the normal approach of the President to his Address. It is not normally right that the President should enter much into controversial matters, although he is supposed to express, broadly speaking, the viewpoints of the Government of the day. Therefore, if we keep this in mind, the President's Address has to deal with foreign affairs, because it is an Address not only meant for the Parliament, not only for the country, but for other countries also. It does so briefly and broadly refers to certain incidents. Whether the reference to foreign affairs is a little longer or shorter depends upon what has happened in the realm of foreign affairs of importance during the past year or so. Therefore, I would beg the Lok Sabha to remember this when considering the President's Address.

It is right,—it is true—that in this debate that we have had during the last four days, not too much has been said about foreign affairs; a little has been said about economic policy; but, mostly the debate has been an inquisition and an indictment on the question of States reorganisation. That is right because that is an important and vital issue which has affected all of us. Nevertheless, so far as the President's Address is concerned, we can hardly expect him to go into details even about a vital issue which affects us internally; he can broadly refer to it. I shall deal, naturally, with the circumstances that have arisen in regard to the States reorganisation, but before I do so, I would like fairly briefly to refer to some other matters which have been raised in the debate. I do not wish to say much about foreign affairs or about economic policy in spite of their great importance, because I take it that so far as the economic policy and the second Five-Year Plan are concerned, they will come up before this House and this House will have full opportunity to discuss those matters. But I would beg this House to remember all the same that:

whatever happens in this country, including the important occurrences in regard to the reorganisation of States, has to be viewed in a certain context and not isolated from everything else.

It is to be viewed in the context of these great happenings in the country or in the world, whether they are good or bad. After all, the reorganisation of States, howevermuch it may please us or displease us, is a thing of this year or the next year. The other things continue. The other things are more vital and are going to have a more lasting impression on our future. We live today—if we look at the world—in perhaps an odd and strange period of the earth's history. There is this drama—almost at every step, in every country—of an ever-changing situation going on; that drama often leading to tragic happenings and almost always hovering over the brink of disaster. That is the particular background of the world in which we live.

In our own country, we face tremendous problems—economic problems, social problems and the like—problems to which references has been made, of unemployment, poverty etc. We try to face them realising that there is no magic way of suddenly solving all these problems or untying all the knots, but that it will take us time and mean hard work to do so. That again leads us to the Second Five Year Plan and all the rest of it. But, looking at India's foreign policy, India's connection with international affairs, looking at India's attempts at improving her economic lot under the First Five Year Plan or the new draft Second Five Year Plan, some things, I venture to submit, may be borne in mind. It may be that some of us may take an unduly partial view about our own accomplishments. That is a human failing. It may be that some others may take an unduly critical view of these accomplishments. But, I think I may state it without the least exaggeration that the last few years in India, looked at as a whole, are considered in the world, I am not for the moment excepting any country in the world, as a story of success and considerable achievement. Whether those countries which have considered them lie in what is called the western world of America or England or Western Europe or whether they lie in Eastern Europe and the Soviet regions or in Asia, Western Asia or Eastern Asia or Africa or South America, from everywhere comes the cry that India has made remarkable

success. Hon. Members opposite have far greater opportunities of judging it than the people in America or England or Russia; I admit it, of course, because they live in the midst of these things. But, I think this fact need not be completely ignored.

The hon. Member Acharya Kripalani mentioned,—I am quoting, I believe—that our brilliant foreign policy had not succeeded in stopping these military pacts being made. He is completely right. Our foreign policy has not succeeded in many ways in setting right the evils of the world, just as our internal policy has not succeeded in putting right all the evils of India. That is perfectly true, because nobody can claim that. The point is whether we are aiming right and whether in aiming right, the experience that we have gathered shows that we are achieving something here and there, something little, not big. I do submit that in this complicated maze of international affairs, where there is so much of bitterness and hatred, or even clash of arms, we have been a soothing influence an influence that has sometimes helped a little in improving the situation or in taking a step towards peace or in avoiding a step towards war. That is all the claim. Nothing more. If we have done that little bit, it is something. Anyhow, no one, even the great countries of the world, who have great power for good or ill, has succeeded in solving the problems of the world. It is no solution of the problem for me to say or for the hon. Members opposite to deliver a harangue as to the evils of other countries and the problems that exist elsewhere. It is no good my saying, I am very virtuous and saying that other countries have erred or are erring, and are misbehaving. We are all mixed up in virtue or lack of virtue that we possess of all countries. So, I should like this House, even when we are excited and distressed by these conditions that have arisen in this country about the reorganisation of States, to look at this broad picture of the world, and what we have done, what we stand for and the direction we are aiming at.

The hon. Member opposite, I think Shri U. M. Trivedi, made some fun and belittled the visit to this country of various Heads of States and distinguished statesmen. I do not mind what any hon. Member says about us or our Government. But, I do not think it is quite becoming for any of us to speak in that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

way about distinguished people who come from abroad as our honoured guests.

It has been during the last year an extraordinary sight, an experience in this country for us to be honoured by the visit of so many distinguished Heads of States, Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers and other distinguished men from all parts of the world. That is no small matter. It is not because of our Government or because we issued invitations to them that they came. It is essentially because in this larger picture of the world, India begins to count. India's opinion counts because India makes a difference sometimes whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere in the consideration of world problems. Because India makes a difference and because India's opinion is valued, important people, distinguished people who themselves play an important part in the world affairs, have thought it worth while to come and have a look at this country which is changing, which is progressing, which is already playing an important part and which is likely to play a still more important part in the future. That is the broad context. That does not mean in the slightest that we, as a Government, have not made mistakes, have not failed here and there, and that there are not any problems in India and abroad with which we have been unable to come to grips, or where our wishes have exceeded our achievements. That is so. And hon. Members may be right to draw attention to these problems and to criticise them, but in criticising them that criticism will have value if it has a little balance, if it keeps this broad picture in view and not merely, simply recites some old slogan which has been heard often enough like some, if I may use the word with all respect, bigoted religious fanatic reciting an old *mantra* without understanding it, which has no meaning today. Our Government does not claim to succeed always, or not to err. It errs often enough. But I do claim that we want to do our utmost and that we want to be judged by our success and failures. And certainly the failures should be pointed out, but when some hon. Members offer criticisms which have little relation to facts or to this broad context of world affairs that I have ventured to place before this House, then those criticisms do not have much value.

Shri Mukerjee in the flush of his oratory says many things which I am quite

sure he does not mean. In fact, some hon. Members opposite who have bitterly criticised us even in regard to the States Reorganisation Report have privately come to me and spoken in a different way, that is to say—I am not criticising anybody—recognising the difficulties of the situation and discussing the matter—not this kind of lop-sided attack with head down and without thinking of what the facts etc., are. Shri Mukerjee did not particularly like the reference to Malaya or the Gold Coast in the President's Address, and he said: what about Kenya? Well, I should say that what is happening in the Gold Coast is one of the most promising features in the African situation today. What is happening in the Gold Coast is not something that you and I could perhaps fashion out of our heads and put down that this is the right thing. The world does not function that way. I say in the context of Africa what is happening in the Gold Coast is something not only of hope for the Gold Coast but for the whole of Africa. What will happen ultimately I do not know, but we should welcome these things in this distracted and distressing world wherever a good step is taken.

In Malaya I am not quite sure because we have not the full details of what is likely to happen there, but at any rate, there is a ray of light, something that is pulling this terrible tangle from out of the mire.

About Goa I can say nothing more than what I have said previously. There is no difference of opinion between any hon. Member here and the Government broadly speaking, on Goa. The difference does come in perhaps here and there as to the line of action to be adopted in regard to Goa. Now, it is clear that any line of action adopted in regard to Goa or any other matter which is international has to be judged not from the point of view of some local affray, but from various international aspects. One hon. Member—I forget who, Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, I think—said something about this, that the application of the doctrine of *Ahimsa* to our foreign relations does not succeed at any rate in regard to our border problems. Well, I am not aware of our Government having ever said that they adopted the doctrine of *Ahimsa* to our activities. They may respect it, they may honour that doctrine, but as a Government it is patent that we do not adopt and do not consider ourselves capable of adopting the doctrine of

Ahimsa. If we did, we would not keep an Army or a Navy or an Air Force. But it is quite a different matter not being able to adopt it in the circumstances of today, nevertheless not going to the other extreme of shaking about a sword or a *lathi* or whatever weapon you may have in your hand and threatening everybody and delivering a number of harangues and all that. Not only is that rather childish and rather foolish in the context of affairs today, but remember when you talk about violence, violence is only useful if it is superior violence. Inferior violence may make a fool of yourself. Violence has to be judged today in the ultimate context of the most violent things, that is, the hydrogen bomb, the atomic bomb. I do not say that every country has got it, but that is the final acme of violence today. Violence has arrived at a stage in the world today when it will either end in destroying the world, or in, well, I won't say putting an end to itself, but putting an end, at any rate, in men's minds to the age of violence. We are at the last edge of the age of violence. We may topple over into the dark pit, or we may keep back and see that violence is no longer a remedy for the world's ills. That is the broad picture. That has nothing to do with the doctrine of *Ahimsa*. It is a broad practical realisation of things as they are today. When heads of States which have the greatest methods of violence and weapons of violence at their disposal, and who have no inhibitions about violence or *Ahimsa*, have come to the conclusion that modern war with all the new weapons, must be ruled out practically speaking, something has happened in the world. It may be that everybody does not fully realise the implications of it, but something has happened, that is, violence essentially and basically is being ruled out for the solution of the world's problems. It may be that before it is completely ruled out, eruptions may occur, all kinds of things may occur. That is a different matter.

Now, if big violence means that, then you have to look at little violences in that context, more especially when the small violences are on the international sphere, because you immediately impinge on the big violence and it cannot be considered separately as something that we can indulge in whenever we feel like it. We have to consider the far-reaching consequences of this.

I should like the House to note that I am not basing my argument on any

high moral basis, although I would be right in even putting it on that basis. I would be right in saying that it is improper for us to say one thing to the wide world and act in a different way, to suggest and encourage in the world a policy of peaceful settlement of disputes and ourselves to settle a dispute that we have and in which we are right, —that is admitted— by way of violence and armed might and military measures. It does not fit in with what we say; we simply do not succeed in this or that; we fall between two stools. So, that is the broad background.

Now, may I say one or two things about Ceylon? An hon. Member referred to Ceylon and Burma and other places where he said Indians are being kicked out. He is partly right, though not wholly so; when he brought in Burma and all those places, I do not think he has right or fair. But it is true that people of Indian descent in Ceylon as well as others who are Indian nationals, who have gone there, have not had, and are not having a square deal.

I do not wish to go into this question except to say that here it is. How do we settle problems with Ceylon? Surely, the only way to settle problems with Ceylon is in a friendly way, and we shall continue to follow that. There is no other way. And I should like hon. Members to tell me any other way except delivering a brave speech, that is no way in international affairs. For instance, my hon. friend the Finance Minister, when he deals with foreign countries, when he is worried about foreign exchange while buying things, cannot pay in his own currency; he has to pay in somebody else's, he has to pay in some other coin for effecting that deal.

I shall just inform the Lok Sabha of one very small development on our side in regard to Ceylon. There was two years ago, or thereabouts, a kind of an agreement signed between the Prime Minister of Ceylon and our Government—I signed it—about certain procedures to be adopted, certain steps to be taken, which we thought would help towards the solution of this problem there.

Eversince then or soon after, there was a controversy between the two respective Governments as to the interpretation of that document. Well, we have written long letters to each other; and I wrote another long letter, about two or three weeks—may be a month ago—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

to the Prime Minister of Ceylon. In this letter, apart from the other points I raised, I suggested to the Prime Minister of Ceylon that 'if the interpretation of that document is an issue between us, for my part and for my Government's part, I shall gladly agree to refer the interpretation of this document to any eminent authority agreeable to you and me; I shall accept that interpretation, whatever it is; let us at least find out some way of ending a dispute about interpretation.' I shall accept that interpretation. The person to interpret must be chosen by me and by him, that is, by the two Governments. Whether he is a foreigner, or whatever country he belongs to is immaterial; whoever he is, whether he is a high mature judicial officer or not is immaterial. Here is a document of three pages, let him interpret it, and we shall accept his interpretation.

We have not had any reply to that. I have had an acknowledgment of the letter, but no reply. Meanwhile, as you perhaps know, Ceylon is going to have general elections. So, perhaps, that will delay any further development.

I referred just now to the great, moving and rather tragic drama of the world. It is an exciting drama all that is happening. One sees the headlines on the newspapers, but behind them lie all kinds of things happening in different countries, our country or any other countries.

Only recently, hon. Members must have read of the proceedings in Moscow of the Communist Congress there, where it would appear that considerable changes in outlook and approach have been announced. Now, it is not for me to interpret the significance of those changes. But I do think that it is an important matter not only for the Soviet Union but for other countries in the world at large to understand these great changes that are taking place there, which are, if I may use the word, taking the Soviet Union more and more towards some kind of normalcy, which is to be welcomed in every way.

The point is that even great revolutionary countries who have passed through very tragic experiences, and who have lived on a pitch of effort and excitement become normal, vary their policies, change their outlooks. I wish in this respect their example was followed by others also, who sometimes look up to them.

Now, may I refer briefly to the States Reorganisation Commission business, which has been discussed here during the last four days, and may I say that distressed as I have been about much that has happened—and it has caused me much unhappiness and produced in me a sense of failure, which I do not often have—nevertheless, what has worried me and distressed me is not so much the actual occurrences or the actual things that have happened, bad as they are, but rather this growth and recrudescence of a spirit of violence all over the country, or in various parts of it, this attempt to settle problems by violent methods? That is, I think, something very bad for this country, regardless of the merits of any cause, because once you enter that region of trying to settle any problem by violent methods, then you go towards something that is perilously near to civil war.

Our country with all its faults, all the Government's faults and failings, has shown to the world a certain stability, a certain peace, a certain measure of progress—may be, it is not as fast as you like—and through that established that reputation which it is proud to hold today; and all that is based on certain fundamental characteristics. If we enter into the region of violent explosions, because we dislike this thing or that, well, then, we lose not only that reputation—reputations do not matter much—but something much more important than that.

Are we going to enter into that and become that type of country where every month or two, we hear about some kind of violent revolution trying to upset the government? That is not democracy, of course; that is something, which is the very reverse of democracy. But apart from that—we need not for the moment apply any technical definition of democracy—I do submit that that is a complete denial of any idea of measured or ordered progress. I can understand an attitude, and I believe that some people hold that attitude, that nothing can be achieved by these slow democratic or parliamentary methods, nothing can be achieved by peaceful methods, nothing can be achieved, in fact, step by step; we must break everything and produce some kind of a clean slate. It may be, to begin with, an anarchic condition. Let us have that clean slate and then we shall have an opportunity to build. I do not agree with that, of course. But I can understand that; then the other thing follows. Let us encourage what is

called sometimes a militant attitude, whether it is in the workers or the students or anybody. Even now poor little children of 6, 7 or 8 are exploited for this. I think it is a matter for the Lok Sabha to consider very carefully where all this is leading us to, quite apart from the States Reorganisation Report.

There are always in great cities and elsewhere anti-social elements, goondas and the like. One can deal with them if society generally disapproves of them, as it does. But, when society or certain respectable sections of society approve of violent methods, then the goonda and the disruptive element can immediately have the chance of their lifetime. They come and they are bound to come in. What is happening today? It is a cycle. Some matter is disliked or disapproved of by some group. They say, we will demonstrate, we will have a hartal and we shall take out a procession. If shops do not close, they are forcibly closed. There may be some violence. If trams or buses are functioning, they are burnt. If an order is passed that there should be no procession, that order is broken. The result is conflicts. Police are there and police fire. Some people are hit; some people die and others are wounded. Then, there is an outcry against police action and a demand for an enquiry. This is the cycle. The police might have misbehaved or not; I am not mentioning any particular place; but this is the cycle of events—a deliberate challenge on the violent level usually accompanied by violence, burning, arson molestation of people, attacks on people who do not fall into line, burning of trams, buses etc., looting of shops and defiance of other laws like section 144 and the like and then a conflict, with the police firing; unfortunate tragic deaths, sometimes of possibly innocent people, sometimes of even small children who might be roundabout and then, naturally, a reaction against that and condemnation of the Government for resorting to these things; they have exceeded the limits of legitimate action and the demand for an enquiry into police misbehaviour. What are exactly the limits of legitimate action of the police or for the Army functioning? It is rather difficult to say. Obviously, they can be exceeded. When you are dealing with a limited affair somewhere it is rather easy to understand what are the limits. When you are dealing with conditions of uproar all over a great city like Calcutta, or Bombay or Madras, then it is a bit difficult to judge these things. Either you

allow those anarchical conditions, loot, arson etc., to gain the upper hand or you do not. If they gain the upper hand, then, of course, the whole city becomes at the mercy of the hooligan element. Mind you, when such things happen, the decent elements even in the crowd are pushed out; it is the hooligan elements that take the lead. The decent elements only have given them an opportunity to take the lead. They always take the lead, and—it may be expected rightly—some political elements who believe in this kind of thing. Either you allow that kind of thing to gain the upper hand; if they do gain the upper hand, it is then hooligan raj there and Government ceases to function. Or, Government has necessarily to take steps to stop this at any cost because the cost of not stopping it is too terrible and too great for citizens as well as for everything. Surely, no government can afford to do it.

I think Prof. Hiren Mukerjee referred to a speech of mine which I delivered in Amritsar in which there was something about the challenge of the streets to be met in the streets. I was laying stress on this very point. I was venturing to lay before the Lok Sabha that if people go in for violence in the streets that violence has to be met in the streets and has to be stopped. I cannot understand how even Prof. Hiren Mukerjee could object to my statement. (*Interruption*).

In this connection, may I also correct him? He referred, I think—I had not the good fortune to be present here but I have read his speech fully in the transcript as well as other speeches delivered by hon. Members—he referred to my having called the Akali procession in Amritsar as a *tamasha*. It is not correct; it is completely incorrect. What I said—speaking from memory, of course—was, referring to large gatherings including the Congress, I said, these are difficult questions which we have to consider seriously and decide not by having big *tamashas* and delivering long speeches. I was referring to the critical questions we were considering....

Shri Kamath: Including the Congress!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes; including the Congress? all big gatherings.

I stated, we must look at these questions not in a demonstrative spirit, *tamasha* spirit but a spirit of critical, humble approach to the problem and decide it in this way and not in a slogan-like way. It is not the way to consider problems.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

So, I would beg the House to remember this that, I think, the major question today before India, internally speaking, is this question of what is going to be our policy in regard to this growing violence. I am not afraid of the violence of the hooligan, but this spirit of violence. The other day, or two days ago, on the occasion of the funeral procession in Lucknow of Narendra Deva, a person beloved of all, a policeman was blinded and others were badly injured. Why should this happen? Here is a funeral procession and it should be an occasion for solemnity. There people threw stones and pushed about a poor policeman lost an eye completely, apart from some police officers being rather badly injured by stones. This is what I cannot understand.

What is happening elsewhere? We talk about the split personality of India; we speak unctuously about non-violence and about these methods and all that and about our culture and *sanskriti* and in our daily behaviour we are coming down to a level which is not a civilised level at all.

5 P.M.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Is this applicable to Chief Ministers also speaking about non-violence and practising violence?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is applicable to everybody, including Shri More and me. We are all split personalities in that respect. But here I am venturing to place before the Lok Sabha this very dangerous development of associating any kind of dislike or anything, any kind of protest or anything with a violent demonstration or a demonstration which is inevitably likely to lead to violence. That is what is happening. I do not know what is going to happen. The other day in Madras at some places an organisation sponsored hartals and demonstration—an organisation which is openly committed to disruption of India, the separation of Tamil Nad from India and being an independent State. They raised various slogans and cries and anyhow there was trouble. Tomorrow I believe some kind of a hartal is being organised in Calcutta and I have no doubt you will see the whole cycle—the cycle I have just mentioned.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): How was it peaceful on the 21st January? Not a word had been said about it; not a word had been said on

the huge and tremendous success of the peaceful hartal on the 21st January. You are talking about violence (*Interruption*)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not mean to imply that people behave always at all times badly.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Did you try to find out why they were behaving badly?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is clear to Shrimati Chakravartty, who no doubt knows a great deal more of Calcutta hartals and the like, and probably knows what is going to happen there tomorrow.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Merger is responsible for it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyhow there has been an open declaration. . . .

Shri H. N. Mukrejee (Calcutta North-East): When your Home Minister says in Amritsar that the merger shall go through—that was what the papers reported—would you object to the people of Calcutta having a hartal to demonstrate their resentment against that?

An Hon. Member: Illegal hartal. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I will come to this merger business later. But these peaceful hartal sponsors have announced, as stated in the public press today, that they would defy section 144 and every order that is passed. I do not call that a peaceful approach.

An Hon. Member: Illegal hartal.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is true that this Parliament has to consider this question squarely and fairly. Are we going to encourage or promote this kind of spirit of violence and constant violent activity by hartals and agitations to continue?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Is there any way out (*Interruptions*)?

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Are we going to allow the police to fire?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Yes, if necessary.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): Check your violence.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should like hon. Members opposite, who seem to consider it as a kind of personal reference by me, to cite to me any example in the capitalist or communist world where such things are allowed, in any country, where this kind of activity is indulged in. I am not aware of any country.

Shri Kamath: There is no section 144 in England at all.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I ask the Prime Minister whether he will kindly enquire into one thing? I am only saying this because the Prime Minister just now said it should be stopped. Will he kindly enquire whether the Finance Minister of Madhya Pradesh, Shri Biyani had made an open speech in Akola in which he said that goondaism will be met by goondaism and that he will send goondas from Nagpur?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If anybody, including a Minister, has made such a speech, he has said something very wrong, very foolish and very objectionable.

Acharaya Kripalani: May I suggest that all this arises from the fact that Congress people think that you are speaking to the Opposition while you are speaking to them also?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member who just interrupted is completely right. And I was not referring to any particular group, although it is true that there is this difference, not among the Congress and others, but certainly some groups even in theory do not object to violence, much less in practice. In fact, they think that violence is the only way to lead to the goal which they may aim at.

Acharya Kripalani: They are reciprocated.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As Acharya Kripalani just got up, may I tell him that I was pained and surprised to learn from him that some C.I.D. officials had been dogging his footsteps because I can assure him that if he will be good enough to give me some information, I would be glad to enquire into it.

An Hon. Member: That is a privilege to some.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): For every one of us.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There might perhaps be some difference between

some hon. Members opposite (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nambiar rose—

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What I would venture in all humility and respect to place before the Lok Sabha is the dangerous trends that are developing in this country. I am not easily upset by any occurrence however bad it may be— one survives these things—but something has happened in this country which, I believe, is poisoning the whole community, poisoning in this sense in two ways. One is of course the spirit of violence. The other is poisoning against each other which is equally bad. And I have no doubt that this will go sooner or later. But we have to work actively to that and not encourage it. Therefore, I would again submit that an act which may be quite legitimate in a certain set of circumstances may become dangerous and objectionable in another set of circumstances. A hartal which may be legitimate as an expression of opinion in a certain set of circumstances may in another set of circumstances be dangerous and harmful. And I say that at the present moment with these big tensions and bitterness prevailing in various parts of India, it is not patriotic, it is not wise, it is not reasonable to do anything which may even by the fault of the Government lead to violence because there are some steps in which the possibility of violence is inherent whoever starts it—may be a policeman's fault or somebody else's fault—but one should be wary.

May I say a few words about the States reorganisation business? Slightly less than two months ago we discussed this matter in this Lok Sabha. At that time there was a very full debate, and I ventured to give expression to my own approach to that question then. I will just repeat it. It is true that as I have watched these developments in the various parts of the country, I have been troubled not by this occurrence or that, but by the atmosphere that was being gradually created in the country—not created all on a sudden but because there was something in our hearts which came out because of the circumstances. I have been troubled by that and the main problem before me has been—not any particular problem that is dealt with separately, but—how to meet this particular challenge—this challenge of violence and bitterness that was spreading. How can we possibly check this? How can we possibly soothe it? At any

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

rate we should not encourage it in any way. This is how I have tried to approach it.

Some hon. Members have referred, rather caustically, to some kind of a dictatorial approach of four men of the Congress Committee laying down this and that. What is exactly the procedure we followed? I referred to it on the last occasion, and to the multiplicity of these problems and the fact that the problem usually was not one between the Government and a certain group or a certain state. The problems were between two. So far as the Government is concerned they had their views, no doubt, about them but it was not important for them which way a certain border lay. What they wanted obviously was—the Government or most of us wanted—a settlement which was agreeable to the largest number of people.

I will give you a straight example. Yesterday, Shri N. C. Chatterjee said: "My Chief Minister is giving 500 square miles away". With all respect, I ask: what does that indicate? How is he thinking of giving 500 square miles away? To whom is he giving them away? The SRC Report had made some recommendations and Dr. Roy had apparently magnanimously given that away.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): On what grounds?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That was not the point. My point is this. Here was a conflict in the opinions of the State of West Bengal and the State of Bihar—not with the Government of India, not with the Congress or anybody because you will remember in this matter what the SRC had done. It is not—at least by and large, it has not been—a party matter. Parties have been split on this. (*Interruptions*). I mean to say that in one party, there were two opinions. They may pass a resolution by a majority but the point is that there have been several opinions in the parties themselves. Possibly—I cannot say definitely—the Communist Party may or may not have had, but they have adopted the opinion that there should be not only linguistic division, but a linguistic division of every village.

An Hon. Member: Not of every village. By villages.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is so. They want to carry the process of disruption to its extreme limits. (*Interruptions*).

They want to carry this process to its extreme limit—to carry this linguistic warfare to every village.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: No. It is incorrect. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no doubt that hon. Members opposite had the best of motives. I am only pointing out the natural consequence of what they stated or what they presumably still state. I say that the natural consequence of their policy was absolute disruption of India—every village. I do not doubt their intelligence and therefore, I presume they realise what the natural consequence of this policy, they aim at, was.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It is the border disputes you are talking about. You are misrepresenting what we have stated. There are disputes on no other issues.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know, obviously. Take this issue of Bengal and Bihar. Here the State of Bihar and the State of Bengal are thinking in terms of the same patch of territory or several patches. It is not a dispute of the Government of India. So far as Congress is concerned, the Congress of West Bengal is pulling one way and the Bihar Congress the other way. Presumably it is the case with other parties too. All parties or most parties, therefore, could hardly function uniformly. The provincial pull was greater; the State pull was greater in their minds than any other pull. Now, one can understand that. There is no harm in the State pull being there but it is harmful—it is very harmful—if the State pull is so strong that it leads to violence in speeches and words and deeds and then to this kind of violent demonstrations.

Take the case of Orissa. According to the SRC Report, no change has been made in Orissa—this way or that way. Orissa had claims on West Bengal, Bihar Andhra and M.P., I believe. I am not going into the merits. Those claims were not accepted in that Report nor did Government wish to go behind the Report in that matter. As I said, I am not going into the merits of the case. The Orissa Government supported those claims. Everybody did it—the Congress and the Government in Orissa. Then, there was this rioting in Orissa. Against whom? Against their own Government supporting that claim. There was no reason or logic in it. They broke into the police station and destroyed things.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

What exactly has been done by young people aged from ten to twenty years—children, boys and girls and others? This is the spirit which, I say, is deplorable.

Take another case, again. I can understand the dispute between—let us say—Kerala State and the Madras State about a small patch of territory on the border. One could understand the proposal: "Let the patch decide."—I mean, the people there. But that is not the question. Everybody wants to bring pressure. Somebody in Madras wants to bring pressure by violent activities in Madras so that a small patch of territory five hundred miles away from Madras may be attached to Madras State. I am not again going into the merits. I want you to see what it is leading to. Whether it is in Bengal and Bihar or Kerala and Madras or Madras and Andhra claiming the same area, you gradually develop a feeling which is primarily a feeling which leads to a civil war. (*Interruptions*). You cannot have a civil war in the circumstances; but that is a different matter.

Practically speaking, mentally you have a civil war between Bengal and Bihar or Bihar and Orissa. That is the kind of feeling which is aroused.

Shri K. K. Basu: The Pradesh Chief Minister accuse each other.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That was what I am venturing to point out myself. That is what we have to deal with now. I can assure this Lok Sabha—it may remember—that all the innumerable problems that the SRC Report brought out—some of them were very major problems and very difficulty problems—a great majority of such problems has been settled satisfactorily. It is a thing to remember. We cannot be overwhelmed by catastrophe here and there. The problems have been settled, and I should like to congratulate those people. They have been settled by agreement even though one party did not like that settlement at all. I could give you examples. Take this proposed new Madhya Pradesh. Madhya Bharat fought against it. It was perfectly justified to do so. Ultimately they all met together and in the larger interests of the country, or, whatever you like, they came to a settlement and they are pulling through. Take Vidarbha.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: They have not come to an agreement. It is a tragedy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I entirely agree that Shri Trivedi has not come to an agreement. We are talking about the others.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I am saying that the majority in the Assembly in Madhya Bharat has not agreed, and the reports provided to us say that they have not agreed. But because there were no incidents, you say that they have agreed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I venture to say that even though this was their strong view, and the Assembly said no, yet, they agreed in the larger interests of the country. There is no doubt they have agreed, because they are working together and fashioning and working out the union. They have not gone out into the streets to fight.

Take Vidarbha. They were keen on having a separate State. But, at our request, they ultimately agreed to join the Maharashtra State which we thought was right. These are instances of people not getting lost in their own rather narrower desires, but looking at the broader picture and ultimately agreeing to something even though they did not like it originally. So, I would like this House to remember that, by and large, quite a large number of very difficult problems have been solved by agreement. That was our approach throughout. Settlement by agreement could only be done informally, and in the course of these talks, we must have met not dozens or hundreds but over a thousand persons, not of the Congress only but of all groups and parties. Many hon. Members here in the Opposition and others, we have met them, and discussed this matter with them separately, because as I said, it was not a party matter. It was a matter in which we are seeking some kind of broad agreement in so far as it is possible.

Shri S. S. More: May I know, apart from the Congress, what parties were consulted in regard to Maharashtra? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Reference was made to the proposal of a union of Bengal and Bihar. I can assure this House that at no time did it strike me or occur to me or to anybody. The first time this matter came up was as a result of a terrible shock to us, and others too, by the occurrences in Bombay: not the actual occurrences only, but we felt, with the occurrences in Orissa and Bombay, where we are going to. It was a shock, and we felt that in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

this linguistic direction we will be quite lost and will continue to break each other's heads if once we give vent to the terrible bitterness and anger. So, the desire to stop this trend and make people think in a different direction came.

In this particular matter, I do not know and I cannot even say exactly who started this idea; not I. It was not to my knowledge. Anyhow it so happened that Dr. Roy and Shri Krishna Sinha and some of their colleagues were here, and they discussed it. I did not start it. Then they did not immediately do anything. They went back to their respective headquarters and then came back five or six days later, having discussed it and seen their colleagues, and it was only then that they formally broached it to us. Our answer was, "If you are willing, we are very happy". We did not take any single step about it. There was no kind of imposition. It was they who did it. Then they issued a statement. That was the second time when they came here. Obviously, a thing like this can only take place with the goodwill of all the persons concerned. There can be no impositions of these things. But what is the test?

Shri K. K. Basu: The test of the people.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What is the test of the people, and why? You see the whole object of the talk about the linguistic provinces. I think Shri N. C. Chatterjee has told us about the Congress decisions and all that. Now, Shri Chatterjee is not perhaps well-acquainted with the development of the Congress outlook on this subject. Undoubtedly, in the 1920's, we were strongly in favour of it. We were strongly in favour of the work being done in the language of the area, to enable the people of the place to take their part. In so far as that point is concerned, that is, the importance of the language in doing the work is concerned, we hold to that thing. But do not mix up the two things, namely, the importance and the development of the language and these boundaries. The two are not synonymous. Later on, if you will see the resolutions of the last three or four years, the Congress resolutions, and in fact the resolutions before the appointment of this Commission and the resolutions just after it, you will find that all of them have stated quite clearly that language is an important factor but that there are other factors which are equally important, the other factors be-

ing economic, geographical and economic development. Finally, the most important factor, the over-riding factor, is the unity of India. That is what the Congress has been saying all along. Now, seeing all this happening since the publication of this Report, naturally, and even more than previously, our thoughts went towards laying a greater stress on the unifying factors and other things. That is a relatively recent development, since we have been discussing the Five-Year Plan and the rest, and recently we have been thinking more and more in economic and developmental terms.

Take Bengal and Bihar. The area between Bengal and Bihar is the richest industrial area of India, and no doubt in a few years' time it will grow to be the most heavily industrialised area. Now, we could not do things in a huff and do something there in a hurry. So, for developmental reasons, it was of very great advantage to Bihar and Bengal to work that area jointly.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The Central Government owns those resources.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have enough experience, in the last five years, of small matters being delayed because of two Governments having to deal with matters and pulling in two different directions. However, I am merely pointing out that there were valid reasons for that. It is not just some kind of sentimental approach to the problem. So, in the first place, we said: "Go ahead". Everywhere you will find that this economic approach has to be considered now much more than previously, always making sure that the language approach is there, not as a boundary but for the purposes of doing the work in that language so that the cultural aspect of the language could always be encouraged. Occasionally it may be that two languages overlap. Suppose Bengal and Bihar form a union. Nothing happens to the Bengali language or to the work done in Bengali. Nothing happens to the Hindi language in Bihar. They function in their respective areas as they did, but in regard to developmental matters it will be a great help. Apart from that, personally, it is very desirable that we should have the multi-lingual areas where people automatically get to know more than one language. It does help. This kind of absolutely linguistic barriers does create a certain narrowness in approach.

Acharya Kripalani: In what direction is the mind of the Government working? We want to know how the Government's mind is working in this matter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not quite understand Acharya Kripalani's question. I have been trying to explain not only the direction of the Government's mind but the decisions. The Acharya knows what decisions have been taken.

Acharya Kripalani: I do not know.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They have been published in the public Press.

Shri K. K. Basu: They have been changing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not at all. All decisions have been taken. There is no question of change. Of course, some decisions have not been taken. About Punjab, I think that by agreement we shall arrive at some suitable solution. One or two minor things remain; other decisions have been taken. About this question of Bengal and Bihar...

Shri K. K. Basu: It is an imposition.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of imposition. The proposal was made and we welcomed that proposal. Naturally, it is subject to its acceptance by the concerned people. We cannot impose it upon them, but we welcome that proposal.

Shri Kamath: Parliament should accept it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Ultimately it will come before Parliament. Naturally, what the Government has got to do now is to frame a Bill which will ultimately be placed before Parliament. But before that, it should be sent to the State Assemblies concerned for their consideration and their reactions. Then Parliament decides.

Shri K. K. Basu: In the case of Bengal, the S.R.C. recommendation was different. Has this decision now been arrived by the high command or...

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The proposal is for the union of the two States, presumably with language regions, regional councils etc. I cannot go into these details here.

I am sorry I have taken so much time, but yet I have said

nothing about Bombay, about which I wish to say something, not much. It is quite wrong for any of us to go about censuring any community or group about it. That is a wrong approach completely. There is no doubt that what has happened in Bombay is disgraceful. There is no doubt about it.

Shri S. S. More: Even firing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: About that probably I and Mr. More will differ. I was not there to see how much firing took place. But I say that for what happened in Bombay, in any other country the Army and tanks would have been used. I am quite sure about it. If in any country such arson had taken place, the Army and tanks would have come into the stage....

Shri Kamath: Not in democratic countries.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:... but, in Bombay, only police force was used. Bombay has been a tragedy for all of us. It does not help much blaming anybody. I think I should just mention one thing which should be borne in mind by all of us, namely, the trend towards violence disturbs everybody, whatever be the merits of it. The most important thing now is to calm and soothe the people to get rid of this bitterness as much as possible. These are the two basic things. I do not know how some people have been saying, and Mr. Chatterjee also told me, that in my broadcast about the States re-organisation I have used the words "irrevocable decisions" and all that. I was quite surprised. I have looked through my broadcast and it is not there. I do not know wherefrom Mr. Chatterjee got it. There is nothing irrevocable. There is nothing final in this sense that if we have a democratic structure of society and a democratic Government, we can sit down and consider any matter at any time. The point is that we must have the atmosphere to do it. You cannot do it by people beating and quarrelling with each other. We must calm down. It is obvious, as Mr. Asoka Mehta said, that no decision about Bombay which is a decision which is looked upon by a large section of the people as an imposition of one or the other is a happy decision. It may be an unfortunate decision, an inevitable decision, but it is not a happy decision. If the Gujaratis feel or the Maharashtrians feel imposed upon, it is not a happy decision. They have to live together as well as others in Bombay. Now unfortunately

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

a situation has been created which makes it difficult for a cool approach to the problem. Let us cool down and become normal and then realise the fact that there is no question of one group dominating over another. I do not know, but some people say that some capitalists in Bombay wanted this to be done and that not to be done. I really do not understand it. But, for my part, I can say that in the whole of the conversation, I did not meet a single capitalist from Bombay. I know they presented a memorandum which I saw, but this is quite absurd. You can take it from me—you know it well enough—that the capitalists in Bombay or elsewhere would probably be able to function in any condition. I do not think there will be any difficulty about that. It is not that a handful of capitalists wanted this or that. But, it is a fact that today there is tremendous bitterness of feeling. Our function should be to lessen it and then we can move together and do it. There have been two types of proposals. One is about plebiscites. I cannot say that plebiscite should be ruled out in every case. I think in some cases it may be desirable. But it is a dangerous thing to say that you must apply the principle of plebiscite to all these areas, because it will produce all kinds of difficulties. In some cases it may be desirable. But we will have to think of these things not in an atmosphere of violence and extreme ill-will and bitterness and almost compulsion of the people to do this or that. That is the difficulty. There has been this proposal made about the judicial enquiry in regard to Bombay. My general reaction is that whenever there is trouble, there should be an enquiry. But I must say that my mind is rather confused when I think of an enquiry into the Bombay occurrences. It would be a tremendous enquiry which will last for ages. But apart from that, is it not obvious that this kind of enquiry will raise passions to the utmost? Every party will seek to cast the blame on the other and the result will be, that instead of that process of healing and soothing, —bitterness, charges and counter-charges. That, I think, will be terrible. Therefore, I do not see how it can serve any good purpose in that way.

I feel I have exceeded my time-limit: I am grateful to the House for its indulgence.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does any hon. Member want his amendment to be put to vote?

Some Hon. Members: All of them may be put.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put all the amendments to the vote.

The question is :

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

“but regret to note the growing imbalance in the approach of the Government to the problems of the country, international and national as reflected in the Address, wherein several pressing questions of the people have received little or no attention at all.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

“but regret that the Address has not referred to the complete failure of Government in tackling the problem of the reorganisation of States in a democratic manner after consulting all the responsible elements, parties and individuals in the country.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

“but regret that there is no reference to the appointment of a National Commission to go into the question of safety measures in the mines though the exploitation of enormous mineral wealth is recognised under the Second Five Year Plan.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

“but regret that the Government of India have failed to accept the democratic and legitimate demand for the reorganisation of States on the basis of language.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

“but regret that the Address fails to refer to and express disapproval