

[Shri Joachim Alva]

building of mosques and churches etc. with timber and other building materials? This is our toleration. But across the border in Pakistan lift the veil and you will see the sword drawn and many places of religious interest trampled upon.

This is a grave moment in our history. We cannot trifle with it. As I said, the hon. President has said that we shall be ready for war if it is thrust upon us and we shall not run away from it. The psychology and the ideology that pervaded our land in the past hundred years culminated in the partition of our land. Other people's hand was in it. But for the secret moral and physical intervention of other people, I mean of Britain, we would never have been divided. They wanted to cut up and divide India and then pompously declare "Now, you live in Peace!" Thereafter the second stage came. They pitched one party against the other and said "Settle your quarrel". Hence the Kashmir problem came in. If the Kashmir problem is settled, there will be a corridor problem, and problems *ad infinitum* of that nature. Time has come when the Government has a serious and solemn obligation to discharge. We shall be embedded in the principles of Mahatma Gandhi. The day that the principles of a secular State are put in the dust-bin we shall cease to be a great people. The man who stands alone with a high prestige of moral fervour or who does not look for easy advantages, that man and that country which he adorns with his leadership has the greatest chance. So let no one say India is friendless and she will have to fight lonely battles.

I find there has been no reference to Goa and Pondicherry in the President's Address. Our problem is not completely solved until the Foreign Settlements on our land have been wiped off. We know how our young men were recently ill-treated in Brussels and Paris—forty or fifty young men were bundled away—and we allow our young men to be ill-treated in this manner in this year of 1951. Why then allow Goa and Pondicherry to be in alien hands?

Shri Naziruddin Ahmad: On a point of order. I respectfully raise a constitutional point of order. The point is that I have submitted an amendment to the Resolution. There are many others who have done so. I would like to know whether a Member who has been taken as having moved an amendment is entitled to speak upon it or not. I submit that it is meaningless to move an amendment without any words in support. I therefore want to

know whether I have a right or not. If I have no right, then of course I sit down and know what to do. But if I have a right I should be given an opportunity. There could be no right unless an opportunity for the exercise of that right is given. I ask for your ruling in this matter.

Mr. Chairman: I think it is no point of order, much less a constitutional point of order. It is our experience in the House that many movers of amendments, though they are entitled to speak, need not necessarily speak, because it may be that hundreds of amendments would have been given notice of, and it is neither possible nor desirable that every mover of amendment should be given a chance or could be given a chance. Therefore I do not think there is any point of order.

The hon. the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: During these two days of this debate many hon. Members have spoken and touched upon a large number of points. On the whole they had been good enough to express themselves in kind words about a large part of our Government's policy and more especially the foreign policy of this country. Much has been said about which I would myself like to say something in reply; much has been said which has rather embarrassed me more especially when it was obviously meant to be kind to me but which struck me as something as the very opposite of it like the hon. the speaker who spoke last. So I think perhaps it would be better for me not to cover a large number of subjects, to try to reply to many points that had been raised. That will become a very discursive argument and perhaps lose all point or substance. It will be better for me to confine myself to one or two major issues. Indeed the House itself has spent more time in discussing those major issues than the others. I therefore propose to say something generally about foreign policy and more particularly about our relations with Pakistan and the question of Kashmir.

I am grateful for the wide support given to that foreign policy in this House on this occasion as on previous occasions. I am grateful for something that I sensed that lay behind the words that we have said because even as such words carry much meaning behind them, but I had a sense of the real and substantial support in the minds of hon. Members than even what their words conveyed and I am grateful for that.

My colleagues and I during these days have had to carry a very heavy burden and heavy responsibilities and though sometimes we may appear light-hearted about it, nevertheless the burden is heavy and we want as large a support as possible, not support merely in kind words in phrases but intelligent support, understanding support, real support. I wanted that not only from this House but perhaps even from a wider circle. I have during the past few days ventured to go out into the market place and the field to see large numbers of the people of Delhi and roundabout, to tell them about these big questions that troubled us, the great burdens and great problems that we have to face and to ask for their support and wherever I have gone, it has heartened me to see the support of those people whom we presume to represent and whose ultimate will must count and whose morale counts more than any resolution.

Now, I claim no virtue for myself or for my Government or if I may say so with all respect for my country.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I suspect those persons who claim too much virtue for themselves or their group or even their country. We all get into the habit of talking big about ourselves; but we know that the noblest words sometimes become currency in the mouths of base men and lose their meaning. We talk about patriotism and love of the country and the like and often enough in the name of patriotism indulge in actions that are not good. Everybody in every country does that. So it does not very much matter what fine language I might use or other hon. Members might use in this or any other connection. Ultimately we are tested by action. It is in the hot fire of experience and trial. Many of us in this House in past years have had some kind of a test in our lives, and sometimes we have faltered and sometimes we have stumbled. Nevertheless we had that test and we were the better for it. We were the better for it because in spite of all our weakness we had some glimmering of principle to hold on to, some light through which we were drawn and we went in our weak way towards it and were strengthened thereby, and we did not mind then if sometimes instead of a garden we had to go through a wilderness. In this way many of my generations in India have been nurtured. I repeat this not as a personal matter. I repeat it because people even in this country and

people in other countries have short memories and forget this past which is not such an old past. They forget that we may be feeble, we may be weak in person or we may make mistakes but when we think that something is important, something is a matter of principle, then we have not learnt yet in our lives to bow down to evil, whatever it may be. We did not bow down to it when that was represented by a mighty force against us and we appeared feeble and unarmed. How then are we going to bow down today when we are stronger, at least in the normal ways of strength? Are we stronger in other ways, in our minds, in our hearts in the way we pull together or do not pull together? That is what gave us strength in the days of old. Does it give us strength today? It is that problem that has been troubling me in this and many other ways, because after all strength comes from that and not so much from our defence forces. I do not think that our defence forces without that basic strength of the people can go very far, if the time of trial comes. Listening to hon. Members here, I heard of many criticisms, of preparedness, of civil defence and the like and I heard of other things of somebody being totally unable to eat wheat or that they could only live on rice or something like that. It seemed to me that there is some hiatus, some gap when these petty things are brought up when big questions are at issue.

We may have to live on wheat or something else worse than wheat, if we are serious about it. There is no good of talking of rice or that we are not used to wheat. We will have to get used to many things that we are not used to. How many of us in this House had to live in jails which we were not used to previously in the last 10 or 20 years. Are we born all of us to live lives in the wilderness or prisons or the like? We did not complain. But if everybody wants the things to which he is accustomed, rice or wheat, the demand must be met at the cost of someone else. Are you prepared to pay that cost? One part of India may have to pay the cost of another part. I mention this merely just to beg of the House to consider these matters in proper perspective. Let us have all the rice we can and the wheat we can. I am not opposing that but let us remember that first things come first and other things come afterwards.

Now referring to our larger policies we have followed a foreign policy about which I have often addressed

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

this House and this House has, if not unanimously, well, with a very wide measure of support agreed with it. I have pointed out often enough, that that policy is not a negative, is not a neutral, is not a passive policy; it is a very active policy so far as I can see it. I am not going into the details of that; but I do feel after giving daily and hourly thought to it that the policy we have pursued has been the right policy, is the right policy and is going to be the right policy. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am going to follow it. I know that that has not met with the goodwill, sometimes, of other people and other countries. I know that it has been criticised by people. I know that sometimes an attempt has been made to bring some pressure to bear upon us in order to change it. Nevertheless, I am convinced that that is the right policy. Whether in the West or East, we do not wish to interfere with other countries. We do not wish to play a large part in the affairs of the world. We have troubles of our own. But, where our voice is sought, it will be given in accordance with our views and nobody else's views, whatever the pressure. Even if we have to suffer for that, I hope we shall be prepared to suffer rather than to give up our independence of judgment and independence of action.

What are our tests? What are our objectives? It is difficult to define them. But, broadly speaking, the last 20, 30 or 40 years of experience have, I think, conclusively proved to any person whose mind is not quite closed, that no big problem is solved by a big war. Wars have come: big and small. We have seen many of them. There have been great victories and great defeats. After a war is over, no problem has been solved; but a hundred new problems have arisen apart from the terrible misery that ensued. Therefore, it seems to me that every intelligent person should seek to avoid war. Every intelligent person should realise that apart from the inhumanity and apart from the terrible destruction and horrors of war today, it just does not solve any problem and the very problem you think it is going to solve, it makes worse.

Nevertheless, no country can do away with the apparatus for war. At least no responsible Government dare take that step. Because we live in a harsh and cruel world, if we value our freedom, we cannot depend on other peoples' good nature only. We have to depend on our own strength. It is a delicate balance, perhaps. Nevertheless, the emphasis should be clear. We try our

utmost to avoid war, world war or any other domestic war anywhere. Yet, we have to be prepared for it lest our freedom might be involved and suppressed. We have tried to follow that policy. In the counsels of the world, wherever we have been asked, whether it is in Korea or any other parts of the Far East, when questions come up, our answer always is judged by this yardstick: does this increase tension: does it lead to war: or, does it lessen tension and perhaps lead to a settlement or peace.

Now, I find that more and more the test of statesmanship in western countries is becoming what is called the military test. My hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee appealed for statesmanship in his speech. I shall come to that presently. I entirely agree with him. But, exactly what is statesmanship is not such a simple or clear matter. But, then, as I said, gradually, the minds of men in great countries think of statesmanship more and more in military terms and military language. That is to say, they think more in terms of war or preparation for war.

Now, countries have to be prepared for war if war comes and it is not for me to say that they should not prepare. But, I do wish to say that if it is statesmanship to begin to think only or largely in military terms, then, he who does so has ceased to be a statesman. He may be a good soldier for aught I know, because, the soldier's job is to defeat the enemy by any means. The soldier does not think too much of what happens after he has gained his victory over the enemy. The soldier does not think too much of what the masses of men think or feel or how they act. He only thinks of military objectives. When I see that more and more military objectives become the goals of statesmanship, frankly, I am a little nervous and I am a little afraid as to where the world is going. In our own feeble way, we try to put in the international assemblies some other points which we hope will lessen tension. Our voice does not go very far. But, anyhow, it does give us some little satisfaction that we have said what we feel is the right thing to do.

Now, this approach has governed our actions in foreign policy and we have tried to govern our actions even in our relations to Pakistan more or less with that approach. Of course, very special considerations apply to our relations with Pakistan, because of our past history, because of the conflicts between us, relations between us and a

hundred and one other things. Nevertheless, that basic fact remains that a major conflict between India and Pakistan would be a disaster of the first magnitude for us as well as Pakistan. I say that and I shall repeat it because, perhaps, many hon. Members and many people outside do not wholly appreciate or realise that. Because if it is suggested that a problem is difficult and therefore we should go to war to solve it, whatever the result of the war, that problem will not be solved. Other problems will also arise. War is not a solution of problems. It is only a solution in the sense that it puts an end to a large number of human beings and property. It is only a solution, if that is a solution, if you think of a war in terms of extermination of a whole population. That may be some kind of a solution. But, that does not happen even in these days of atomic warfare. So, one must not imagine that war is a solution of any problem. War, nevertheless, may come for various reasons, among them being that somebody else is foolish enough to have war. Well, if somebody is foolish to have war, you cannot run away; you have to face it with all your strength and put an end to it. Therefore, as we have envisaged it, we have always thought of war in India as a defensive war and not as an offensive and an aggressive war, not only vis-a-vis Pakistan, but anywhere in the world. I want to be perfectly frank about it, because the House and all must realise it. If we wanted to reduce our army it was from that point of view. Many hon. Members did not like that and I can very well understand the reason why they did not like it. However, in the balance, we decided to do that. Later we decided to stop that process and it is stopped, and obviously till there is any grave risk or danger, that process will remain stopped. Pandit Kunzru asked me that question. Well, this is my answer.

So, that is the basic approach and it is not, if I may say so, an approach of, shall I say piety or some kind of pacifism, good or bad. It is an approach based on hard facts, on a cool, cold-blooded objective realisation of facts, because there is always danger in such cases and in such matters of people being swept away by passion, by some notion, that by quick action or war, you can achieve your results. Well, you do not. Do not imagine that some kind of police work is war. That is a different thing entirely, whether the police functions on a small or big scale. When you think of war, you

come into another region. The qualities are different and the consequences are terribly different.

Now, that being our main approach, we naturally have tried to avoid war. We offered Pakistan a no-war declaration which Pakistan did not wholly accept or agree to. And even recently, a few days ago, this was repeated to them, and they would only agree to it if we kept apart Kashmir from it. Now, when we consider this question of Indo-Pakistan relations, let us look not only at the broad picture including not only Kashmir on the one side, not only Bengal and Assam and East Bengal on the other side and the many other problems that have arisen. Think for a while of past history too, because what we see to-day has grown out of the past. Now, I am not going into the story of the past; but I do wish you to bear that in mind, because it is important and relevant—not only the past four years, but the longer period of the previous twenty or thirty years. It is out of that that all this has come out. In those years, in those early years, some twenty or thirty years ago, most of us stood, as we stand to-day for inter-communal unity, for a peaceful solution of our internal problems, for a joint effort to win our freedom, and then to live together in that freedom. The predecessors of, or rather those who brought Pakistan, had a different gospel, not of unity, but of disunity, not of construction, but of destruction, not of peace, but if not war, at any rate, discord. Now, I do not think that they or the people of Pakistan are any better or any worse than we or the people of India are. I disclaim all special virtue. I want to make this perfectly clear, and if any man talks of our being more virtuous than others, then I suspect his virtue, because I know we have failed and failed quite often enough, and the person who talks most of his own virtues is the least virtuous. All the same, it does make a little difference what kind of ideals you put before yourself, and some groups or persons might function differently if given a somewhat different direction to look at. Fortunately for us, we had a certain ideal placed before us in this country during the last twenty to thirty years, and to some extent, naturally, it affected our thinking and our action. And in spite of everything, that continues to be our guiding star. That is the major difference between India's policies to-day and Pakistan's policies which are naturally derived from the previous record of discord and hatred, the deliberate propagation of hatred and disunity. It goes on. I am quite con-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

vinced that a country that follows such a policy will injure itself. If I am not convinced of that, then it would become my duty and yours to follow that policy. But I am quite convinced that it is bad for an individual and for a nation to follow that policy, and I do not want India to follow that policy, come what may. I say come what may, but it is really because of the close, reasoned approach to the problem, and to a realisation of the consequences of such a policy that I say so.

My friend talked about statesmanship. Well, I do not quite know how to define statesmanship. There may be many definitions. But if I may suggest a few, it is to think not only of your immediate urge, not only of the action before you, but also of the consequences of that action, to think not only of to-day, but of what to-morrow and the day after might bring. In other words, to have some perspective, some vision, some objective towards which we go and not to be driven about by the urges and the passions of the moment. Now, if you apply that test to many things that have been said here since yesterday, what do we find? Some proposals have been made in regard to East Bengal or Pakistan or Kashmir. Apply that test and see where it leads you to. It is not enough, just because you are angry with Pakistan, to say, "To Hell with Pakistan. Let us do this or that." It is not enough to say, because you are angry with something that is happening, "Let us do the same thing". You have to think of the morrow's consequences. I am leaving out anything about, shall I say, standards of morals? I am merely applying the pragmatic, opportunist test of action. Because any action you may indulge in has consequences and these consequences flow from that action as inevitably as any law of physics or chemistry. Therefore, think of those consequences and then adhere to your course of action.

Now, various proposals have been made. May I say that my hon. friend Dr. Mookerjee seemed to think that we have forgotten East Bengal or the people coming from East Bengal or who are still there. Allow me to assure him that there have been very few subjects or matters which have been of more anxious concern to us than this problem. We have not talked about it too often, for a variety of reasons. Talking would not do much good. But obviously this problem of East Bengal and any other problem like that of Kashmir or anything else, are all parts of a single

big problem, and that is Indo-Pakistan relation. You cannot separate them. And Indo-Pakistan relations have their roots in all manner of things in the past, not the last four years, but the past twenty or thirty years. When you talk about solving one problem, you may deal with it for the moment, you may better it or improve it but you cannot solve it until you solve the final problem.

5 P.M.

A year and a half ago there was an agreement between the Prime Minister of Pakistan and myself on the 8th April in regard to the situation in Bengal and Assam. That matter was discussed in the House and there was a good deal of criticism of it then and later. I am often asked today by newspapers and elsewhere, what about your agreement: what has happened to it? Now that question surprises me, because I think that that agreement is among the things in the course of the last few years that can be called one of the greatest successes that we have achieved, not because it solved the problem of East Bengal, of course it did not; nobody expected it to solve the problem of East Bengal. It was meant to solve the immediate difficulty and ease the situation, to bring relief to millions of people and open out the way for further improvement. Other things come in the way. If the Indo-Pakistan relationship deteriorates somewhere else or something else happens, naturally that affects East Bengal too. So far as that agreement is concerned I could say with great confidence to this House that the results it achieved were remarkable in the sense of the human misery it had stopped, how millions were given relief by it for a considerable time in a variety of ways, whether they came here or remained there.

Having said that, it is perfectly true that it did not solve the problem of East Bengal and the problem of East Bengal cannot be solved till the major problem of Indo-Pakistan relations is not solved or is not nearer solution. That is a big thing.

Hon. Members asked me—though they did not put the exact question,—why have you not solved the Kashmir problem or why have you not solved this or that? I can name a few dozen major problems of the world which go on and on without solution. They go on and on in spite of the United Nations—the great nations whether in the West or in the Far East. Any number of them, hon. Members know, go on and on, in spite of the best efforts of people.

I doubt if there are more than a handful of persons in the wide world who want war in any country. Nevertheless, the fact remains, as I pointed out, that the whole world or a large part of it is becoming more and more military-minded and preparing hard. Why is that so? Everybody knows that if there is a big world war, it would be terrible, it would destroy the proud structure of European civilisation, apart from the enormous and widespread misery that ensues. Everybody knows that, everybody wants to avoid war and yet they go on preparing for war as if driven by some elemental and uncontrollable urge. So these problems cannot be dealt with in this way.

Two or three suggestions were repeated on this occasion as it was done previously also. One was about asking Pakistan to offer territory in proportion to the number of migrants who come over. The other reference was to some kind of exchange of populations and that also presumably involves an exchange of territory. Let us be perfectly clear that such a demand means war. I hope nobody here would say that by sending a registered communication this can be effected. It means war and if it means war, let us not think of exchange of territory or population but of war. Let us not get confused. It is too easy to say these things and try to escape the consequences of what we say. Therefore let us be clear about it. All this business of exchange of population or exchange of territory or any other ways suggested have absolutely no meaning at all and the only thing that it means is that by a process of war you want to do whatever you desire.

I have dealt with the question of war and tried to put before the House that if one thing is certain it is this that by war you will not get what you want, apart from victory or defeat. You will only get a generation of terrible misery, a generation of putting an end to every single thing that you have in mind and the burden of terrible poverty all over. It does not matter how effectively you win the war.

So let us consider these problems a little more realistically and not just jump to the conclusion that by some kind of strong action we can achieve our objective. Because of this we decided that no effective result can be achieved through a big scale warfare.

I would like to add something else to that. So far as the problem of

East and West Bengal and Assam is concerned it is impossible for me to conceive that this process of squeezing out of large numbers of people could continue as it has to some extent continued during the last 2½ months. I might say it is slightly less now than it was but that has no particular meaning. During the last year, for a year I would say, there was a reverse tendency. Only in the last two or three months it has again turned this way. It is not wholly inconceivable that for the moment it may lessen but there is no doubt in my mind that the general conditions in East Bengal are such that there is some kind of a continuous pressure there on the minority population. They may put up with that pressure and if it becomes a little too much they come out. But there is no doubt that it is there and it is an abnormal situation which continually keeps tension going, not only there but all over the Indo-Pakistan relationship. It is a thing which never will allow us to settle down unless the problem is settled. I cannot find a magic remedy for it. It is one of those difficult problems which can only be settled by some kind of a basic improvement in the situation. We may provisionally deal with it in the best way possible locally. But ultimately it is the big question of Indo-Pakistan relationship. Personally I rule out war for the settlement of that, because I do not think that a war will settle or solve it. But I cannot rule out war independently or unilaterally, if the other party brings it in and as the other party talks so much about it and shouts so much I have to be perfectly ready for it.

Now I shall say a few words about Kashmir. May I say that the House had the great advantage of hearing to-day the authentic voice of Kashmir speaking in this House? I am exceedingly glad that we had that exposition of Kashmir's position from one who is perhaps more entitled than almost any other person in Kashmir to give it because the hon. Member who spoke is the General Secretary of the Kashmir National Conference.

Again, in considering the question of Kashmir we should not confine ourselves to the present. We should go back certainly four years, when this trouble arose there, but we should go back really eighteen or nineteen years to understand it, when this movement in Kashmir began the movement against autocratic rule there, and gradually built itself up and challenged the Maharaja's rule. In the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

course of these eighteen or nineteen years there were many ups and downs, people were imprisoned and shot down; the kind of things that we had known in India happened in Kashmir. It is interesting to try to remember what exactly was the part that the leaders of Pakistan were playing in those days when the people of Kashmir were struggling for their freedom; not the people of Kashmir only but the people of all the States of India. Because the House will remember that the Muslim League supported every autocratic rule in India in every State—they did not interfere, and privately they helped it. So also in Kashmir. It may have been a Hindu Maharaja, but the odd thing is that the Muslim League was in some ways in alliance with or being helped by the Hindu Maharaja's Government in Kashmir against the national movement there. Not that there was much love lost between them, but because the major movement was this great national movement for freedom; every odd group that could be brought to oppose this major movement was helped, as is the custom of all governments. So in the past this great movement was built up which challenged the autocratic rule there and there was no rival to it there; there were small groups and parties no doubt, but nothing very effective. May I tell you how in the course of those years and till recently—I say, just before this invasion of Kashmir took place—time and again efforts were made by the leaders of the Muslim League to woo Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah to win him over to their side? All kinds of ways—by going to Kashmir, by inviting him even till the eve of partition and even, I think, just after partition—and all kinds of efforts were tried to woo him. Well, they did not succeed because they were two diametrically opposed viewpoints. You heard today the approach to these questions which the hon. Member from Kashmir gave you, an approach which was as diametrically opposed to a communal approach as anything could be, an approach which I wish some of us could equal in clarity because we talk a great deal about a secular state, and my friend, Mr. Alva stretched himself to his full length of five feet seven and talked about a secular state. I wish we were much more of a secular state than we are at present, I wish we would approach the ideal we have put down in our Constitution, because we do not and let us be clear about it, because there are too many people attacking that ideal, too many

people trying to undermine it; if they do not attack it, too many people acting a way which ultimately undermines it—too many communally-minded people in this country today. Let us be clear about it, let us therefore not lose ourselves in words and phrases but look at things as they are happening. But in Kashmir it was a straight fight between communalism and this ideal that we hold, and it is a straight fight there today and all the time. It is quite absurd to talk of India and Pakistan fighting for possession of Kashmir as if it was some booty to be seized hold of by the stronger person. In Kashmir the struggle has been for a basic ideal and the Kashmiri people have fought their struggle even more than your armies. Do you remember that before our armies went there, there were three days when there was no proper government, no proper police in the Valley of Kashmir because, I regret to say those who were in authority ran away taking their bag and baggage along with them. So there was nobody in authority there and there was the enemy raiding and pillaging, almost at the Valley's doorstep.

Now, what happened then in the Valley of Kashmir? Surely, if there had been any real sympathy for the invader the whole Valley would have been offered on a silver platter to the invader. Even apart from sympathy, if there had not been a strong feeling of national unity and national consciousness the whole place would have gone to pieces, just disrupted, because the governmental apparatus had gone, the police had gone, there was the enemy at the gate, the people would have run away and there would have been panic and all that. Instead of that during those three days with constant and instant danger threatening them, it was the people of the Valley who kept the peace; their volunteers without arms, volunteers of this National Conference and the leaders of the National Conference, it was they, without arms, without anything, just because of their personal influence and their appeals and their day and night watches, who kept the peace and to the last day there was not a single shop that closed in Srinagar even though the enemy was six miles away.

Now when people talk about a plebiscite and people talk of India imposing itself on Kashmir, they should keep this picture before them. I have not a shadow of doubt in my mind as Maulana Masoodi said, that the result of a plebiscite in Kashmir can only be one result and that is in

favour of the present Government there.

You know the subsequent story about the invasion and what happened and all that. It is a very remarkable thing that after all that has happened somehow or other some of our friends in foreign countries write and speak and behave in the manner they do. I can understand that their knowledge of events is limited, nevertheless, the assurance with which they try to lay down the law, sometimes the affrontery with which they try to advise us, amazes me. When I think of the story of Pakistan and Kashmir, when I think of Pakistan's case and the way they put it forward repeatedly, I am reminded of a story—the story of a young man who murdered his father and mother—and when he was tried for this, he pleaded for mercy and clemency on the ground that he was an orphan. It is really extraordinary how everything has been twisted out of recognition in the way Pakistan puts forward its case. I have often thought wherein perhaps we have erred in the last three or four years in regard to Kashmir. We may have committed many small errors here and there, but I just cannot find out in my mind any major step that we have taken which can be called a wrong step. It may be a slightly mistaken step. The House will remember that a year and a half ago or more, there was a cease fire and after that or just about that time the U.N. Commission passed a resolution. There was one before that and we accepted that. Thus we accepted both of them. The first resolution that we accepted some time in 1948 was not accepted by Pakistan. Later, another resolution came which we accepted after long parley with the Commission and after an exchange of letters because we wanted to be quite clear about it and we wanted no misunderstanding to be there. So we cleared it up and those two or three matters were cleared up in letters exchanged between us and the members of the Commission. May I say regarding the letters that we exchanged that before we sent our letters to each other we jointly drafted them. Before I sent my letter to the Commission and after they approved of it, then I signed and sent it to them, so that it was a mutually arranged matter to clarify any difficulty. This related to the disbandment and disarmament of the so-called Azad Kashmir Forces and to certain Northern Areas. I mention these two matters because these two

very important matters came in the way of any progress later, because Pakistan refused and said that it did not have anything to do with them. We insisted—naturally. We said, "We stick to them. We have accepted that resolution, and this is part of that resolution, so far as we are concerned and so far as the Commission is concerned and we are not going to give it up."

I shall not take the House into the intermediate stages. The Commission ultimately left it at that, that is to say, they could not reconcile our interpretation of those resolutions based on our correspondence and Pakistan's being different, they could not reconcile the two and they went away. Later, other things happened. Sir Owen Dixon came, and others. But in the last resolution passed by the Security Council a strange sea-change came, that is to say, in this resolution they ignored largely what had been agreed to previously between us and the Commission. Naturally, we objected to this. We pointed this out to them. After all, we can only be asked to do what we had agreed to do, but those two or three major points that we had raised with the Commission and to which the Commission had agreed in writing are there for anybody to see. They were completely ignored in the last resolution of the Security Council and further, the Security Council went on to say that in certain eventualities arbitration would take place about differences. We ventured to point out to the Security Council that this was something entirely different from what had been agreed to previously and said that we were just not going to give up the previous agreement in the face of any such new order of the Security Council and we were not prepared in matters of this kind where the fate of millions of people were involved to submit them to an arbitrator. That is why we voted against and rejected that resolution in the Security Council, and I greatly regret that when this resolution came up before the Security Council two great countries, friends of ours, took up a line there which was exceedingly unfriendly to us, which seemed to me extremely illogical also, which seemed to flow from a great deal of ignorance of the problem and what had been done before and which seemed to me to be based on some entirely extraneous considerations which had nothing to do with this problem. However, it was a matter of great regret to me. Now, Pakistan goes on saying that we have spurned the United Nations and the Security Council. I deny that.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

All that we have told the Security Council is that we stand by our previous agreements and it is they who have forgotten their agreements, and we are not prepared to accept anything which either forgets the basic fact of the previous assurances or which challenges our self-respect or independence or honour. That is the basic difficulty; and now Pakistan lays the greatest stress—of course taking advantage of this fact—that they agreed to the last resolution in the Security Council and we did not. They have agreed to many things later on because it so happened that whatever was put forward by some others happened to be to their advantage and they quickly agreed to it. That is the position in regard to Kashmir.

A great deal of fuss was made in the Security Council and elsewhere because the Constituent Assembly was called to meet in Kashmir. Why was this so, someone asked. What business is it of anybody to interfere with some internal arrangement which we had in Kashmir or anywhere else in India? We have told them and given them the assurance that this does not come in the way of the Security Council. How does the Security Council function in such matters? We went to the Security Council with a complaint, a simple complaint, of Pakistan's aggression. It is odd that we have not had any decision of the Security Council on that yet, although three years after that Sir Owen Dixon did say that Pakistan's action was a breach of international law or some such thing. The House knows all these facts and I am sorry to take up the time of the House in detailing these facts in this way, but I do wish hon. Members to remember some things that are not the facts in the books, if I may say so.

In Kashmir there is a basic conflict between two ideals. And the real conflict is being fought not by Indian troops or other troops, but by the people of Kashmir themselves. It is further a conflict between progress and uttermost reaction and bigotry. I invite hon. Members to go to Kashmir and see for themselves the progress that has been made in spite of all difficulties,—governmental progress, progress in economy of Kashmir, all kinds of public works, supplies, transport, in every sense, and particularly the very great land reform that they have brought about quickly. The whole face of the country is changed.

Go to the other side, as Maulana Saeed said, the Azad Kashmir—of course you cannot go there. But there the conditions are amazingly different. The fact of the matter is that from the psychological, from the real basic point of view, the battle of Kashmir has been won and this terrible shouting that is going on in Pakistan is the result of uttermost frustration, because they know they have lost it. They have lost it not because of our army or anybody's army, but because the contrast is so tremendous, because the ideal for which the National Conference and Shaikh Abdullah fought for these twenty years, for which they stand today and for which we stand here, that is the ideal of communal unity, of working together, not of the two nation theory and one community trying to rule over another. That has been instilled in the mind of every Kashmiri and the results seem to have convinced him of the rightness of Shaikh Abdullah's approach, quite apart from his personal popularity and that of other leaders. So it is this feeling that Kashmir has slipped out of their grasp that has completely upset the rulers of Pakistan. On the other side, in the so-called Azad Kashmir area there are continuous squabbles and quarrels. The whole place is some kind of occupied area by the Pakistan Army.

Now, there are some other matters between Pakistan and us. There is the evacuee property matter and canal waters. In regard to both these we offered and we offer still judicial determination by properly constituted courts of Pakistan and India with provision made for final decision. We are perfectly prepared for that.

In this connection I want to make one point clear, because in foreign countries a great deal has been said in connection with Kashmir and its rivers, as if the rivers of Kashmir affect the destiny of Pakistan and if Pakistan did not control Kashmir, well the rivers can be cut off or turned off somewhere and the whole of Punjab would go dry. Now, first of all please do not mix up the so-called canal water question with the Kashmir question because the canal water question does not deal with the rivers in Kashmir; it deals with the rivers in East and West Punjab, about which, as I said, we are prepared to have proper judicial determination about our rights and their rights. So that, that issue has no relation to the Kashmir river issue.

In regard to the Kashmir rivers, as most hon. Members should know, the rivers are the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab. Now all that is necessary is for hon. members to look up the map of Kashmir and just see what one can do with those rivers. It is fantastic to mix up the Kashmir question with the canal water issue. In England and America much is made of this.

So, here we are at this stage, at this critical stage, in our relations with Pakistan. I hope the crisis will pass. I am convinced that the only thing that will ultimately settle our various problems is friendliness between India and Pakistan. I am quite convinced that that is bound to come, even though in the intervening period our relations may be bad, or may go even worse. Friendly relations between us are inevitable—in what form they will come I do not know. If so, why should we not try to get that sooner rather than later, after passing through all kinds of disasters and troubles. So far as we are concerned, in spite of all the provocation that Pakistan has given, in spite of the daily talk of *jehad* and the rest, we shall always be ready to solve every problem peacefully and to develop friendly relations with Pakistan. At the same time as things are today in Pakistan, on account of threats that are continually being raised, we have to take every precaution. I cannot detail to the House all the precautions we have taken in the military sense, except that for more than a month past when this situation developed in this way, we have given the most careful thought to it.

Now a good deal has been said about civil defence. Many hon. Members have mentioned it. The way Prof. Shah mentioned it seemed to me somewhat different from the other approaches. His idea of civil defence appeared to me something in the nature of conscription, limited or not, for all kinds of works. That is not exactly civil defence. It may be suggested on other grounds. For my part, I think it would be a very good thing in this country—quite apart from the Pakistan issue—if there were conscription in which every man rich or poor, was enlisted to do ordinary labour work. And so long as we do not make people like ourselves take a spade and dig, I do not think it will be good for our souls or for the soul of the country. We think we are very wise and clever because we sit in our office with fountain pens in our hands. This

conception that a clerical job is a better one, will ultimately degrade the whole nation.

Leave that out—conscription. What is the talk of civil defence? What exactly does it mean? I know something about it. When people talk to me about civil defence, I want them to talk to me intelligently about it, not vaguely throw the word at me. Do you mean what Pakistan is doing, or do you mean something else? Pakistan is digging trenches all over; Pakistan is having black-outs all over; Pakistan is talking about fire brigades and the like. What do you mean by it? Let us consider it item by item as to exactly what we can do. I say and I have definitely and if I may say so rather aggressively put down the idea of civil defence, and I will continue doing so. After the graves and fullest thought given to it, I have called upon all our State Government not to have it. I have done it because I know my job, not through ignorance—because I understand what I say and I understand what I have told them. I am not going to allow our people to waste their time in digging trenches and the like, in getting excited and getting other people excited. It is true that everybody has realised that morale counts. Well, I am a better builder up of morale than most people perhaps know and I am going to build up the morale of this country. And morale is not built by the stage tricks of Pakistan. There are other ways of building up morale. When I see the duplication of the trickery staged there it does not affect me powerfully at all.

I was talking about Kashmir and the wonderful way the people of Kashmir have risen to the occasion. I deeply regret that some small sections of the community there, in Jammu specially, have in rising to the occasion played a game which can only be of advantage to Pakistan. And those are some Hindus of Jammu. It amazes me how the spirit of communal fanaticism blinds people even to their own advantage. Today take this Constituent Assembly which is going to be elected there next month. They are trying to put as many difficulties in the way as possible, creating as many difficulties in the way of the National Conference of the present Government in Kashmir, of Shaikh Addullah, and doing so in the most vulgar language. That is why I have often said that it is this kind of immature mentality which produces communalism. It is not a grown-up man's thought that can do it. It is immature, childish; or it may be that it is when a person

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

has outgrown his own wisdom. If today in India I am a little anxious about things, it is only one thing, and that is the communal spirit in India. I can deal with the communal spirit of Pakistan. I want to deal properly with the communal spirit in India, the Communal spirit of the Hindus and Sikhs, not so much of the Muslims—I can deal with them too. I want this House to realise that if anything is going to come in our way, if war comes or anything, it is this spirit that will come in our way and that will weaken us. I do not think that anybody will try deliberately to do that. But if you spread that spirit, that idea, abroad, then in times of excitement people misbehave. And if people misbehave, then your front weakens because we have to meet this front before that. That has to be remembered. We cannot fight the enemy if behind our backs mischief is done. No army can fight with its base being upset by wrong actions. Therefore it is of the utmost importance that all this wild and vague talk of communalism be put an end to at any time, more specially now. I attach the greatest importance to this. Therefore, I am stretching this, because there is a tendency always for a person to become a great patriot by cursing Pakistan, by cursing Muslims. I want this House and I want this country not to curse Pakistan. I want this House and this country to feel friendly to the people of Pakistan, because those poor people of Pakistan are not much to blame anyhow. What would you do and what would I do if day in and day out I had to read those newspapers containing stories full of falsehoods and hear the radio and all the time be enveloped in this atmosphere of fright and fury. It is not the fault of the people, naturally. I do blame those who are responsible for it. It is a heavy responsibility. It is not for me to say much about it. Anyhow, let us not create a feeling of ill-will for the common people there or for the country as a whole, because these feelings of hatred and violence somehow carry on and weaken us.

In the last fortnight or so hon. Members must have seen many leading Muslims in this country, many important Muslim organisations in this country, coming out criticising Pakistan's action in this matter in Kashmir or in these other matters and offering their full support to our Government and to us. And I am quite sure—I do not always attach value to these things, and some people may do it just to gain favour—but I

am quite sure that many of these things that have come to us represent the true feelings of those who have sent them. That kind of thing represents more strength to us than an army corps or many army corps. It represents strength in many ways, because it means that our nation is cohesive before a common danger. It means strength to us because thereby we strike at the very root of what Pakistan stands for, that is, this two nation theory and all that. Therefore, that strengthens us and we should welcome it. We should work for it and we should make it quite clear to all our minorities and all the others who may be at all afraid of anything happening that it is our proud privilege to give the fullest protection and opportunity to the minorities in this country. I dislike this word 'protection' and I dislike 'minority' too. But for the moment I use them. I want these words to cease to be.

Therefore it is the very worst approach for the minds and hearts of the people if you think in terms of civil defence. We can dig in trenches in twentyfour hours, take it from me. But you will not require them. Trenches are dug for people, if I may say so, who expect invasion. We are not going to be invaded, whatever happens. Do you think if even war comes we wait to be invaded? Is that your test of India's strength? We are not going to be invaded. And because of that we are not going to dig in trenches and have any black-outs. But whether you have any outside black-outs or not I should like our people to put an end to the black-outs inside them and not to lose themselves in passion and fury and anger and hatred but to think coolly and collectedly of the situation, not complacently—nothing could be more foolish than to be complacent—to be ready for every eventuality and to carry on our work normally.

Shri Sidhva (Madhya Pradesh): I have to make a personal explanation with your permission.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Sidhva: I have a right to make a personal explanation. Yesterday I was referring while addressing this House to the question of the food problem (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that the hon. Member wants to explain is this. He showed it to me in my Chamber. It appears yesterday he stated that the statistics that he has been giving all along, whenever the food debate arose in the House, were not accepted by