

Acc. No. 25108
25.11.2014

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

443

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 18th February, 1953

The House met at Two of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3 P.M.

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT
SUDDEN CLOSURE OF MANGANESE MINES
IN MYSORE**

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion regarding the grave situation arising out of the sudden closure of manganese mines in Mysore and consequent loss of employment for ten thousand labourers caused by inadequate supply of wagons by the Railways.

This inadequate supply of wagons has been there for some time. Therefore, there is nothing new that has arisen today. Also, the Railway Budget will be under discussion as also the steps that are being taken to meet the deficiency. In these circumstances, I do not propose to give my consent to defer the normal work before the House.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy
(Mysore) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing more with respect to that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to inform the hon. Members that I have received the following letter from Shri A. K. Gopalan:

"In November I had an operation and I am now in hospital. I will not be able....."

476 P.S.D

444

Some Hon. Members: Where?

Some Hon. Members: He is in Moscow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is in Moscow.

"I will not be able to fly to India immediately so that I may be able to be present when Parliament begins on 11th February. Hence I request that I may be granted leave till I am able to attend Parliament after recouping my health."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri A. K. Gopalan for remaining absent from all the meetings of the House during this session?

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): Was he given passport to go to Moscow?

Some Hon. Members: Ask the Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes; he has been there for a long time. All that is not relevant. He is not here. He has asked for leave.

Leave was granted.

**MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT—concl.**

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): For four days, this House has been debating this motion and we have covered many subjects, big and small. We have ranged all over the world and considered problems of India. But, I find a little difficulty in this maze of subjects that have been raised, to deal with many of them in the course of my reply. The House will permit me therefore, if I may say so to pick and choose and deal with

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

what I think are the more important things that have been raised in this debate. I would have preferred, if I may say so with all respect, that attention was directed to the important aspects, national or international, rather than diverted to a maze of minor subjects, which, important in themselves no doubt, nevertheless, if looked at from a proper perspective, are unimportant in the scheme of things today.

Before I proceed further, I should like to say that I have endeavoured with a large measure of success, but sometimes with lack of success, to consider these matters as dispassionately as possible, as objectively as possible, and tried to profit by the comments and criticisms which hon. Members have made. One thing, if I may say so, I would repudiate, if that is not too strong a word to use: the accusation that my colleagues and I are complacent or smug. Well, I am no judge of whether I am smug or not. But, I cannot imagine any person charged with responsibility being complacent today in this world. Even if he were so inclined, he cannot be so. Certainly I have no sensation of complacency when I view the problems of this country or the world. I have sometimes a feeling, if you like to call it, of excitement at this tremendous drama that is taking place in the world, or a sense of high adventure at what we are endeavouring to do in this country, and also a sense of the tremendous difficulties that confront us all the time. Nobody can afford to be complacent. If hon. Members ever take the trouble to read what I sometimes say outside this House, they will find that I am always warning my colleagues outside, people outside against complacency. So, we are not complacent. We do not think in the slightest that we have all the wisdom, that we know everything about everything in the world today. Any person who is dogmatic, if I may say so, is complacent. Complacency comes from some kind of a closed mind accepting a dogmatic phase, whatever it may be. It is a narrowness of outlook in a changing world. None of us is complacent. Therefore, I have listened to the criticisms and comments in this House as in the other, with a view to understand, with a view to learn how we can better what we are doing, or change what we are doing.

I can also assure the House that in this matter there is no question of pride or prestige involved. We are all in this House, not the Government

only, charged with a heavy and great responsibility and we would be small men indeed if we stick in small matters on prestige or consider matters from any narrow point of view of party or group. So, I have endeavoured to consider these matters dispassionately. I would like, Sir, to express to you and to the House and to the hon. Member opposite, Dr. Mookerjee, my regret that I was not quite so dispassionate for a moment yesterday and that I felt myself provoked into intemperance.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): I reciprocate the Prime Minister's sentiments wholeheartedly.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Before I proceed further, I should just like to deal with a point which was raised by another hon. Member opposite, which, at that time, also provoked me into an interruption of amazement. The hon. Member, Prof. Mukerjee, referred to the landing of thousands of American military aircraft at Dum Dum. I was surprised and I enquired into this matter. I shall read out what the hon. Member said. He referred to a US Super Fortress landing at the IAF station, Agra early in December, 1952. He went on to say:

"Why is it that we hear.....
—I want to be corrected later by the Prime Minister, if I am wrong—that in October 1952." (Mind you, in October, 1952) "there were as many as 3250 military landings at Dum Dum Airport, out of which the contribution of the Indian Air Force was only 25 while that of the United States Air Force came to the tune of 1200."

Now, if the facts were as stated above one would imagine that a big scale invasion of India was taking place. The facts as ascertained are as follows: No Super Fortress visited Agra in December or any other date. But, an old military type of aircraft, converted to civilian use is kept by the American Embassy and is based at Palam. This aircraft visited Agra aerodrome on the 9th December and returned to Delhi the same day. Then, with regard to Dum Dum aerodrome near Calcutta, this aerodrome as the House knows, is on the international route and is visited by a very large number of aircraft daily belonging to different international lines flying from east to west and west to east. All these flights are regulated by the rules of each country as well as by international rules and usage. Sometimes, though rarely,

permission is given to fly over India without landing anywhere in the country. Normally, foreign aircraft have to land at some airport in India for examination and checks of various kinds. Military aircraft belonging to foreign States can fly to and across India only with the prior approval of the Government of India, and in accordance with an agreement entered into by that State with the Government of India. Permission is given in each case after information of various kinds is supplied. In the whole of the year—not in October only—in the whole of the year 1952, 459 military aircraft, both foreign and Indian landed at Dum Dum. Of these, 118 belonged to the U.S. Air Force. None of these American aircraft carried arms or ammunition or personnel in uniform. The Indian Air Force has its headquarters at Palam, and, therefore, relatively few landings take place at Dum Dum.

Now we are faced with two major problems, or two major categories of problems. There is the international situation, and there is the domestic situation. Practically everything falls within those two categories. And although we may consider them separately, they are to some extent connected together and have their reactions on each other. So far as we are concerned, our natural interest is in the domestic situation because we have to face those problems, because it is our desire to raise the level of our country in the sense of improving the lot of our people here, their standard of living etc., to put an end to the course of poverty, to go as far as we can in the ideal of the welfare State that we have put forward, and to which the President made reference. I do not suppose anybody in this House will differ in that ideal. The question, therefore, is how to attain it. And certainly, there might be differences of opinion in regard to that. There is no reason why there should not be or, if you like, placing greater emphasis on one aspect or the other. Anyhow, here is this tremendous adventure of building up a new India, a new welfare State in this great country whereby we raise the level of hundreds of millions of people. Can there be anything more exciting than this adventure? And yet, we all know the great difficulties that we have to face—difficulties, partly because we faced a situation after a fairly long period of suppressed growth, when the country did not grow naturally as it might have done. And so when we face this question, we have to face a number of problems, all together. We have to face, if you

take the whole of India, a number of centuries all jostled up together suddenly hurled into the middle of the 20th century. It is not an easy matter for an academic debate to decide. There are vast regions in India, different stages of economic growth, industrial condition, agricultural condition, and we are trying to raise all of them up and if we do not bring about some change by magic to all these people, well, we can hardly be blamed. Therefore, while we are engaged in this tremendous adventure full of difficulties, we have little time to spare, and little energy to give, to international affairs. But there is little choice left to us because international affairs hit us in the face all the time, because they might very well affect our individual lives intimately, because it is the inevitability of destiny that India should take her part in these affairs like other countries. Therefore, whether we wish it or not, we have to take part in them. We are part of the international community, and no country much less a great, big country like India, can be isolated from that, or keep herself away from it. So we play a part in these international affairs which grow more and more complicated from day to day.

The United Nations came into existence seven, eight years ago, and it represented the old, old urge of humanity to seek for peace and co-operation in this world. It tried to profit by the failures of the old League of Nations. The old League of Nations, even at its commencement, was not what might be called a universal organization, an international organization with a universal background. Great countries kept out of it and were kept out of it. The United Nations started at least with the assumption of universality; and countries differing from each other entirely in their structure of Government, economic or political policy, all came together under that common umbrella of the United Nations. So, one attribute of the United Nations—supposed attribute—was universality. The other, of course,—the main objective—was the maintenance of peace, and the growth of co-operative effort among the nations, and the solution of disputes by peaceful means as far as possible. The United Nations, the House will remember, laid down a rule about the veto of certain so-called great powers. Now, it is very easy to criticise that rule as illogical, undemocratic and all that, but, as a matter of fact, it represented the reality of the moment. It meant ultimately that the United Nations could not adopt sanctions against one of the great powers, because that power could veto

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

it, because having sanctions against one of those great powers itself meant a world war. Now, that may not be logical, but it was a fact that it meant a world war. If the United Nations was to avoid a world war, it had to bring in some such clause. It may appear illogical. Now, let us see how this has developed.

First of all, we find that that principle of universality with which the United Nations started has been departed from. Well, the most patent departure is the fact that a great country like China is not there, and is not recognized by some great countries. This is not a question of any one of us liking or disliking the present Government in China or approving or disapproving of China's revolution, but it is a question of one of the biggest countries in the world not being represented there, not being recognized there. Therefore, it comes in the way of that basic principle of universality, and, in fact, the United Nations, to that extent, goes back to something which made the League of Nations fail. Now, that, I think, is one of the grave difficulties that face us, and much has flown from that, many new fresh problems have come from that. And it is not a question of my saying or any country saying "Let us agree that China should be there", or some saying "Let it not be there". It is not a question of expressing an academic opinion, but realizing that one of the basic facts of the world situation is this,—that the United Nations which presumes to be a universal organization in this world has ceased to be that because of this first major fact that a great country which is obviously a running country, obviously a stable and strong country is not represented there. Then again, a difficulty has arisen. For the moment, I am not blaming anybody. But this great organisation built up for peace is itself today engaged in war-sponsoring,—however small it may be does not matter—and to the extent that it is a sponsor of war and it is connected with it, naturally its functions of peace-making become less. It is difficult to exercise that function adequately, if you yourself are a party to war. Now that is a great difficulty; the difficulty may have arisen because of nobody's fault or somebody's fault. That does not matter. We are trying to analyse the situation as objectively as possible, without casting blame on anybody. And the problem arises whether we have grown up, whether the world has grown up adequately enough to have an international organisation of the type aimed at. I do not know Peo-

ple talk about one world, about world federalism and the like, and many wise and intelligent and ardent people agree with that ideal. I think most Members in this House will agree. But it is one thing to agree with that, and quite another thing to give effect to it, and we see, far from this kind of world government, even the United Nations, as it was started, continually coming into difficulties because of various factors, because of a sovereign State still thinking of a sovereign State, and because of other factors and conflicts. The question arises: Is it a fact, is it a possibility that countries entirely different from each other in their political, economic and other policies, can co-operate in a new organisation, or must they remain apart? In the old days, centuries ago, it did not much matter, because they kept apart, they did not come in contact; but today that has become impossible, because they are continuously in contact. If there is continuous contact, that contact may be friendly contact; if not, a hostile contact, and the question arises: Can an international organisation exist which can contain within its core countries aiming entirely differently? Well, I suppose, one could answer it. There is no reason why it should not function with all those countries in it. That was the ideal. After all, when the United Nations was started, countries like the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. entirely different in outlook and ways did co-operate and come together, and did function for a period, till they gradually drifted apart. For my part, I do not see why they should not function in an organisation, provided, of course, that each one of them did not, if I may say so, interfere with the others, and so long as each could carry on any policy it chose for itself. But difficulties come in, where there are attempts at interfering with others. Then, of course, there is conflict, and one party or both interfere, or one begins interfering and the other starts also interfering. Then again, as the House knows, it is very difficult to know, in such a matter, who started. Charges and counter-charges are made. I am merely placing all these problems before the House so that it might be able to look at this international picture in broad historical perspective.

There is another matter, of course, which is most important in our understanding things today, and that is the pace of technological development, which is tremendous, which we who live in this technological world do not wholly realise, but which is making all the difference to this world, most

particularly in regard to the development of communications, in the development of the art of warfare and all that, which throw us into each other's laps all the time, and which has resulted in creating a situation when any real major conflict or a world war would be of such tremendous significance and destruction that no objective for which that war is fought can ever be realised through it. Now that is the basic fact too. You may have the best of objectives, but war has become such that you will not realise that objective, and you will get something which, well, you do not like, in spite of so-called victory.

Now, here are certain broad aspects which I should like the House to keep in mind. Therefore, what can a country like India do? We cannot influence other countries by force of arms or pressure of money; we can negatively do something, we can positively do also a little occasionally, but to imagine that we are going to shake the world or control international affairs according to our thinking, as sometimes hon. Members seem to hint, that we should issue something in the nature of an ultimatum to this country or that country, or demand from this country or that country, or express our views in strong language to the world at large, has little meaning, unless you can do something afterwards. Hon. Members opposite have repeatedly said in their comments that the President has used weak language, circumspect language, and why not come out strongly in favour of this or that. I would beg of them to remember that in the modern world strength does not reside in strong language at all. In the problems of modern world and international affairs, strength does not reside in strong language at all. Strength resides somewhere else. Nor does it reside in slogans. We must have strength somewhere before we take to any step. Otherwise we make ourselves ridiculous. And apart from strength a nation—and I hope India is a mature nation, with all our failings, and we have a few thousand years of growth in restraint and all that—a mature nation does not and should not shout too much. Strength does not come from shouting. It is not a sign of maturity. I regret that there is far too much shouting and cursing in the world today. It may or may not be justified. But it is not good all the same, you have come up against all these problems, of, apart from the other countries, two giant countries disliking each other, trying to undermine each other, and yet terribly afraid of each other. It is a most extraordinary situation, and we

live in this psychosis of fear, of fear and hatred, and there can be no worse companions for a country than fear and hatred.

Therefore, one of the approaches at least in which we can help is to try to lessen this atmosphere of fear and hatred. But how far? We cannot do very much about it. But at least we can, negatively; first of all, we may not do anything or say anything which increases that. That is within our power certainly. At least we should not indulge in that shouting and cursing and slandering match which seems to have taken the place of old-time diplomacy. That is something though it does not or may not achieve much result. At least, we have not added to the illness of the world. Positively, where we can help also, we should help, although in taking any positive step, there are always certain risks involved that it may fail. We had been very cautious about our positive steps. Negatively we have endeavoured, I think, with a great deal of success, not to take part in these controversies, by merely running other nations down. We do not agree with a great deal of what some other countries say or do. But when the time comes we try to point that out in as friendly a language as possible, because we are quite certain that by using stronger language we do not help anybody, not the cause of peace certainly. So the positive steps we have taken, we have also taken as cautiously as possible. We have tried not to, and no step of ours has been taken just to put this party in the right or the other party in the wrong. We may have failed—that is a different matter—in the step we took. But we have tried always to do something in the hope of success and tried to find out as far as we could the opinions of the other parties concerned.

There was this Korean Resolution. Now, I do not wish to take the time of the House on this occasion as I have spoken about this in the past. We tried our utmost in that matter to find out what the other countries concerned were prepared to accept or to do. It is impossible to find out everything. One may make a mistake, but we did proceed on a sound enough basis of finding out a good deal, and about 90 or 95 per cent. of what we put forward in that Resolution was, if I may say so, taken down sentence by sentence from what had been said to us by the parties concerned, not in a joint form, but separately; we had to put it together. My point is this. I am not justifying anything except to say that the earnest attempt we have always made was to try to compose

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

things and put one party's viewpoint before the other without compromising anything. Well, we failed; we must suffer for that failure. But I do submit to the House that it is grossly unfair for any person to accuse us of partiality and the like in this matter.

Some hon. Members on the other side are constantly repeating like some 'mantram' which they have learnt without understanding what it means, that we are stooges of the Americans, that we are a part of the Anglo-American bloc, etc. Of course, that kind of statement normally, in the case of persons who are less restrained than I am, might lead to a retort in kind. But I do not wish to say that. But I should like them and others to try to keep out of the habit of learning some slogans and phrases and repeating them again and again. It becomes rather stale work. It is not interesting or exciting to hear the same phrase repeated again and again, whether it has any relevance or meaning or not.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): What happened to the amendments that you accepted at the instance of America?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My point is that if we or any country seeks for peace, peace requires peaceful methods. The House will remember a thing which Gandhiji laid stress on always, of means and ends. I am not entering into a metaphysical argument, but surely if you demand peace, you must work for it peacefully. It is quite absurd to work for peace in a warlike manner. (*Interruption*). I am not referring to any particular group, but unfortunately some people seem to think I am talking about them. Because the fact is that today --and I say so with respect--quite a large number of countries, big and small, talk about peace in the most aggressive and warlike manner. This does not apply to one group or another; it applies to everybody almost. In fact, one might almost say that peace is now spelt W A R.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): Not a very clever statement. Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are becoming enveloped, all of us, not so much in this country --I am talking about other countries--by a mentality which might be called the military mentality. That is, statesmanship is taking a second place and is governed more by military factors than the normal factors which statesmen consider. Now, that is a dangerous thing.

Now, a soldier is a very excellent person in his own domain, but as somebody, I think a French statesman,

once said, war,—even war is too serious a thing to be handed over to a soldier to control, much less peace. Now, this intrusion of the military mentality in the Chancellories of the world is a dangerous development of today. And how are we to meet it? Frankly, I confess that we in India cannot make too much of a difference. I do not wish this House to imagine that we can take this on our shoulders and remodel it to our heart's desire; we just cannot do it. But we can do something; we can co-operate with others, we can help in creating a climate of peace and thereby, possibly, help in going some way towards our objective. We try; if we fail, well, the world itself fails. There the matter ends.

Now another factor is that we talk about peace and war, and there are many causes, no doubt, of this war, some often discussed, others rather hidden. But surely one should realise that owing to a number of factors in this world, chiefly technological developments, political developments and the like, nationalist movements and the like, people all over the world, vast masses of people, have ceased to be quiescent. Now, it is a good thing. They are not prepared to suffer, to put up with their condition; people in colonial countries are not prepared to put up with what had been done in the past. Therefore, they look at anything that appears to them as a liberating force; they are attracted by it. It is a patent thing. May be that liberating force may not liberate; may be it might be worse—that is immaterial. But the point is that the whole world is in a fluid condition and men's minds have been moved and perturbed and they seek something to support them and to guide them ahead.

Now, in this state of affairs one would have thought that one of the earliest steps to be taken is to remove certain patent grievances and certain patent structures of government which put down masses of people. In other words, the problem of colonialism in the world which has been certainly tackled to a considerable extent in the past few years since the war ended, should be tackled still further, and thus at least one cause of making large numbers of people utterly dissatisfied should be removed. Well, it has not been removed. And there is another thing also which is slightly allied to it, though not the same, and that is, a way of looking at the countries of Asia as if they were an outer fringe, a distant outer fringe, which should

fall in line with the others. Well, one of the most important developments of the age has been what has taken place in Asia and what is likely to take place in Asia. There is no doubt about it whether for good or ill. The whole of Asia is very wide awake, re-surgent, active and somewhat rebellious. Now, how are you going to deal with it? All these problems are problems ultimately not of military might but of men's minds. They cannot be dealt with by guns; sometimes guns may be necessary. I do not know. But certainly they are problems of psychological approach to vast numbers of human beings, whether it is in Asia, whether it is in Africa. The approach that is being made in Africa, in large parts of Africa, whatever its virtue in the minds of those who are doing it may be for the present, one thing is dead certain that it is bound to fail ultimately, tomorrow or the day after. There is no shadow of doubt about it. It does not require a prophet to say that this approach will lead to the most dangerous consequences in racial conflicts. Take the question of the steps that are being taken in South Africa. These are basic facts which may not be related to the circumstances in the Far East or in Central Europe and Germany but they are basic facts which may do much to shape the world of tomorrow. Now, therefore, what policy can India pursue in this matter? As I said, whatever policy it pursues it should talk in a quiet voice, it should not shout. It should talk in terms of peace, not of threats or cursing or war. I would like others to do so, too. Anyhow we should try to do so. We should not merely show our temper to other nations even though we may feel strongly. Let us convert our feeling into strength, not into temper, and that applies in the world at large. That applies to our relations with Pakistan. We have endeavoured to do that with more or less success. It does not matter what temper the other party shows. Obviously, we have to protect our interests, we must protect them and we must protect them. But even in trying to protect them it does not help to show temper. There are two ways of approaching this question. One is the conviction that war must come. We try to avoid it but it is bound to come. Therefore we should prepare for it. And, well, when it comes, join it this way or that way. The other way is trying our utmost to avoid it, feeling that it can be avoided. Now, there is a great difference in those two approaches. If mentally you are convinced that it is bound to come, well, you accustom yourself to

that idea and you work to that end even though you may not like it. You are not working for peace but you are convinced absolutely that war is coming; it is inevitable and therefore let us work for war. On the other hand, in trying to work for avoidance of war you must believe in it. A phrase here and there is not enough because otherwise you are always working to the other end. People work for it. Naturally no country can forget the possibility of being entangled in war,—that is a different matter—and taking such precautions as it ought to. There is, I think, a great deal of difference in these two approaches. I have a sensation that many great countries today apparently have come to the conclusion that war is inevitable—not that they want it. I do not think people anywhere want it. I hardly think that many statesmen want it but still somehow they have come to that conclusion. Well, so far as we are concerned, we believe that war is not inevitable, it is a dangerous possibility—sometimes it becomes a probability—but it is not inevitable and therefore to the utmost and to the end one should work for its avoidance. One can work for avoidance apart from the political or diplomatic field, essentially in the human, psychological field, in so far as we can. Naturally, we cannot do much but we try to do what we can in this matter.

Now, the House knows that certain recent developments have taken place. Certain statements have been made in the United States of America by the highest authorities in regard to the Far East which have caused grave concern not only to us here but in many countries all over the world. I confess that it is not clear to me even now exactly what the full consequences of those statements are. But, whatever the meaning behind them, there is no doubt of the impression they have created and the reactions produced. From the point of view of psychosis of fear and world psychology, they have had a bad effect apart from anything else. All this talk of the blockade of China or other such steps obviously is not talk that leads to peace or settlement, whatever else it might lead to. It is easy for any party to justify what it says by arguments and by what the other party said. Are we to remain silent? That may be done. But it is too serious a matter for this kind of justification of statesmen and politicians, much too serious a matter affecting the world. I do confess that we as a government and, I am sure, as a people, view these developments with the greatest concern. Now, again what can we do about them? It is no good my using strong language. That

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

will not impress anybody more than the more quiet statements that we might make. In so far as our opinion is concerned, it is conveyed quite clearly. Our test is always this. Does this help in lessening the tensions of today or does it add to those tensions? That is our major test. If it adds to these tensions we are against it. If it worsens the situation we are against it. If it somehow helps, if it goes far, that is all the better. So that is the test that we apply whether in the United Nations or elsewhere.

Now, coming to our domestic policy, I do not wish to go into details. But hon. Members opposite have talked a great deal about hunger and starvation in India and the economic condition and the like. I believe there is an amendment to the effect that the economic situation has deteriorated. Now, that is a question, to some extent, of facts and figures. It is completely easy in this great land of India to make a list of suffering and distress and poverty. That is our misfortune. It is there. Nobody can doubt it. There are these 360 million people. But may I beg the House to consider: Is that the test? The test is whether we are getting over these difficulties: how far we have gone; how far we are likely to go; and what steps we are taking. I think that, objectively considered, there is no doubt that the economic situation has improved considerably. It is a matter of judgement. (An Hon. Member: And famines also.) It is a matter of facts and figures. I think the peasantry in this country—I am not for the moment talking of the landless labourer—has improved greatly, not slightly. This country is a great, big country, and it is very difficult to make generalisations about it, because there can always be exceptions. But subject to this statement, I think it is correct to say that the peasantry of this country is a good deal better off today than it has been for generations past. (Shri Nambiar: Question.) As I said, I exclude the landless labourer from my statement. He is very important and we should do our utmost for him. In some cases, the landless labourer has also done well; in others, he has not. The industrial population certainly is not worse. It is, if anything, better—not too much better, but if anything better during the last few years. We add to our numbers largely, and in spite of the fact of a growing population, the general condition of the people is, I think, better. That does not mean very much, I admit,—because we start from a low standard. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would not hon. Members be a little silent and patient?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Members opposite,—some of them,—are greatly impressed by the strides in economic progress made by the Soviet Union. I agree. The Soviet Union has made great progress. Nevertheless, in spite of that great progress, standards of living, say, in the Soviet Union and in America, are very different. That is no condemnation of the Soviet Union at all. The fact is that the standards of living in the United States are the highest in the world.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: For the few.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No. For everybody, I say, barring a few.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: What about unemployment? What about the Negroes?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are we to be settling this matter by bandying about words across the floor of the House?

Shri Chattopadhyaya: There is no bandying about of words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Every hon. Member has got the right to say what he feels. If another hon. Member does not agree, let him not agree. But let him keep quiet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If hon. Members will listen to the end of my argument, then they will perhaps grasp more of what I say. I will put it in another way. The Russian Revolution took place in November 1917. Ten years later, let us say, in 1927..... (An Hon. Member: When these people were not born.)..... what was the state in Russia? What was the progress made? Certainly, they had civil wars and tremendous difficulties. I admire the progress that they have made, but what I am pointing out is that when you look at the progress made by the Soviet Union you should not go and compare it with America's. You should compare it from where it started at the time of the Revolution. Then it is a fair comparison. Say, in 1917 it was this: in 1927 it was that and in 1937 or 1947 it was this—that is a fair comparison to judge the pace of growth. It is no good saying that the American standards of living are higher. It has no particular meaning in this context, because America has had other reasons for growth. She has had 150 years for growth. Therefore, you have always to consider the starting point. In the same way, it is no good comparing the India of today after five years of Independence and all this business of partition..... (An Hon. Member: See China.)

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma (Kanpur Distt. South cum Etawah Distt.—East): Oh, China? Do not talk of China.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would beg hon. Members not to interrupt. If they would interrupt, I hope it will be in a more musical voice. (*Laughter*).

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Why not in a poetic language? He is a poet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, it seems to me that to compare India today with the Soviet Union would not be proper. Somebody said "See China". I am very happy about that, because I should like to be compared to China. I want to be compared to China—in every way—all along the scale. I want to lay down that comparison for the future. (*Interruption*). I do not mean to imply that we are cleverer than China, or that we go ahead faster than China. They may go ahead faster, but I say that it is a right thing for us to see what China is doing and to profit by it wherever we can. Conditions are different, and remember one thing—there is a very major difference.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): I think the Prime Minister means China minus Chiang-Ke-Shek.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member's history is rather out of date.

I am not challenging this comparison to China. I do not mean that. But I do think that it is fair for us to consider what China is doing, and to learn by it so far as we can. There is a certain basic difference. The Chinese are an amazing people—amazing in the sense of their capacity for hard work, for co-operative work. I doubt if there are any other people quite equal to them in that respect. But there is a very big difference. Remember that. History will show us to the effects of that difference. The difference is that we are trying to function in a democratic set-up. It is no good, therefore, saying that we are better or more virtuous than others. There is no question of virtue involved in this. Ultimately, it is a question of which set-up and which structure of government—political or economic—yields the highest dividends for the country or for the world, and when I say the "highest dividends", I do not mean merely material dividends, although they are important, but other cultural, spiritual—or whatever you may call them—dividends. That is to say, it is an important fact that whether an individual or a group or a country grows in an atmosphere of intellectual or other freedom or not. Anyhow, the future will show. But it

is a democratic set-up which we have deliberately chosen and which we feel in the ultimate analysis is good for our people and for our country. We do not dictate to others. It is open to them to do what they like. Nevertheless, it sometimes makes the pace of growth slow, for always—apart from other things—you have to weigh the demands of tomorrow with the needs of today, in building up a country. Now, here we are in the days of, if I may say so, phased national reconstruction or development in this country. I speak of course without accurate knowledge, but I should say that there is no comparison whatever between India and China as to the building activities of great works that we are undertaking. They are far greater than China's. They are doing other great things—that is a different matter—but in this respect there is no comparison. In fact, India today is putting up some great works which in their totality and separately can compare with anything that is being done in any part of the world.

4 P.M.

An Hon. Member: What about the wastage?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member lives in a sea of wastage and his mind also does not see what is being done. If there is waste, stop it by all means. But the point is: do you see what is being done?

The difficulty comes in always between the needs of today and the demands of tomorrow. A poor country, poor in resources, has not got large resources for investment for building up for tomorrow. And if you want a surplus, well you have to be strict with yourself in the present generation: And democracy does not like stinting in the present—not usually. In times of great crisis it might. Democracy wants the good things of today, today, as far as it can get them. And that is a tremendous advantage, from that limited point of view, which an authoritarian Government has, which can build for tomorrow, not paying too much attention to things of today, — of course satisfying them to some extent, but not paying too much attention. You cannot do it. How many hon. Members here, or in the State Governments, dare do something for the obvious reason that if they do it, they might not get elected at the next elections.—some tax put on, some tax taken off, things which might otherwise be justified. So, there is that difficulty of democracy.

Of course, we all talk about democracy a great deal. But it is a relatively new thing in its present shape

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and form. That is to say, the old-time democracy was a limited one, with limited franchise, limited people, certain ruling classes, etc. Now we have got adult suffrage and here in India the biggest electorate in the world. And with all my admiration and love for democracy I am not prepared to accept the statement that the largest number of people are always right.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): Hear, hear. (Laughter).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member who made that interjection is himself a patent example (Laughter.) He is never right whatever happens.

So that, we know how people can be excited, their passions roused in a moment. Is this House going to submit to the passion of the moment or even of a democratic crowd, if I may say so? Five and a half years ago here in this city of Delhi, apart from Punjab and the whole of Pakistan, what was happening? Was that democracy functioning?—when people were killing each other and driving each other and doing all kinds of atrocities, in Pakistan and in this part of India, when millions went from this side to that and from that side to this? Democracy functioning! People were functioning! I do not blame those poor people. But I am saying that democracy goes mad; democracy can be excited to do the wrong things. Democracy, in fact, perhaps sometimes, is more war-like, even than the others, than individuals. Individuals after all have some training. But that very democracy of yours can be excited to do all things, their passions excited, and then it is more difficult to control a democracy in war than perhaps it was a statesman of older days.

So we have to function. Here are these mighty experiments going on, and we have to build India according to democratic methods. That we have decided, because ultimately we feel that democracy has something of the highest values, highest human values. We believe that.

Now again we talk of human values. It is true. Many hon. Members must have thought of the effect on human values of war itself. People say that democracy has human values. Of course. But then war puts an end to those very values that democracy cherishes. Democracy, in fact, is if not a casualty of war, at any rate a partial casualty of war. It does not function properly. Then all standards of human values that we cherish go down

in war. In fact, the tragedy of the situation is this: that we go to war to protect democracy, to protect human values and standards, but because we have adopted a wrong method to protect them, we achieve wrong ends. We do not achieve what we are aiming at. That has been the tragedy of the last two world wars and something infinitely worse is likely to happen if there is another war.

So, in judging the economic condition of the country, I would beg hon. Members to take this fact into consideration. I have no objection to their criticising the Government, or even condemning it. We are all engaged in this task of building up this country. And it is too serious a matter for any of us merely to take a negative line and help in creating an atmosphere of depression in the country. Atmosphere counts. The psychology of the people is more important than any decree of Government. In that connection I am glad to say this. I am giving my own impression of this country and that cannot be hundred per cent. true of the whole country. But I know something of my people. I go about and understand them and it has been my high privilege to have their affection and confidence also. I have found during the last five or six months people in their enthusiasm undertaking, often with voluntary labour, almost all the plans that we have put forward. The few hundreds of miles of road they have made, or the tanks they have dug, are important in themselves. But infinitely more important was the spirit, the crusading spirit which went into this work. Now it is that spirit which we count on and it is that spirit which will make our Five Year Plan or other Plans a success. If that is not there, admit that no kind of Government decree, or Government organisation will take us too far.

So, I would beg hon. Members in every section of the House to realise this that they can help in creating this spirit in this country or hinder it. And this constant attempt to produce an atmosphere of frustration and depression in the country, surely cannot achieve any objective which anyone in this House has at heart.

I referred just now to the Five Year Plan. Well, most hon. Members by now would have read it. Many have criticised it. Now, as I have said before, there is nothing sacrosanct about that Plan. I think the mere making of that Plan itself is a great effort. It was an inevitable and right thing, for without that foundation, without that investigation, that basis of calculation

of resources, etc., and of priorities, we could not get going. We may talk academically as in a school-boys' debate. It is essential. We have laid down some policies about land, food, etc. I think they are good policies. Convince us—we will vary them. There is no difficulty about it. It is not a law which cannot be touched. We want to go as fast as we can. But it is not good enough to tell us to do something which is beyond our resources. We want to stretch our resources: we are prepared to take risks, but intelligent risks. After all the responsibility of carrying out this Plan is a heavy responsibility. We cannot gamble with it. We cannot take undue risks. Every legitimate risk has to be taken, for we realise that the policy of being too cautious is the greatest risk of all. Therefore, look at this Five Year Plan in that spirit. I am quite sure that nobody in this House can disagree with, let us say, 80 per cent, or 90 per cent, of that Plan. They may disagree with some policy. Well, when the time comes talk about it, discuss it, improve it, do what you like but get going. Let us get going with it.

Dr. Svama Prasad Mookerjee referred yesterday briefly to the community projects. Well, I have got a list of community projects.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta—North-West) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not been able to follow the interruption.

Shri Nambiar (Mavuram): What about the Industrial Policy?

An Hon. Member: Is it question hour?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I will just say a few sentences. We believe that it is essential for India to be industrialised. We believe, secondly, that the industrial policy should be based on the development of basic industries—steel, etc., etc. But we also believe that any industrial development will have a weak foundation without a strong agricultural economy. Therefore, we cannot develop industry without considering and strengthening agriculture. The food part of it is important enough: if we have not food in the country and if we depend on other countries it would be an ill day for us. We must make our country self-sufficient in food, and make our agricultural economy good. Otherwise, any industrial structure that we build up in the present day may topple over, because of the weakness of our agricultural economy. I cannot go into this question at the moment.

But let no one here imagine that we do not attach enough importance to industrial development. We do. It may be that the hon. Member can make some bright suggestions to us which will make us go ahead in respect of both functions with speed; we shall gladly accept them.

An Hon. Member: Community Projects.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Community Projects. I was just saying this, that these projects have been in existence for the last two to three months may be a little more, in some places only a month, in some places three months. And I think they vary greatly. Some are functioning extraordinarily well, some moderately well, some not well. It is true. On the whole—I am merely informing the House of my own reactions to the reports we have received—on the whole I think we are doing very well. It is true that some projects are behind hand, little has been done. But taking the whole of India I think we are doing very well. It is a new experiment, it is difficult. But the test of it really is the type of workers who go there. On the whole, again, I think that we have got a fairly good number of workers there.

Now, may I say a few words in regard to the subject which occupied the hon. Member opposite. Dr. Mookerjee's speech, practically the whole of his speech, yesterday, that is, the Praja Parishad agitation in Jammu? The hon. Member spoke on this subject most of the time yesterday, and I have no doubt that in the context of things it is a matter of importance to be dealt with. Nevertheless, I think we should always remember the relative importance of things. When we draw up a plan, the Five Year Plan, we consider priorities. That is important. But ultimately everything is a question of priority in this world. We cannot do everything. An eminent person said long ago: it makes all the difference in the world whether you put truth in the first place or in the second place. You do not discard truth; it is there. But the point is whether it has the top place or a second place. So also in considering a problem, whether it is a political problem or an economic problem, it is most important what order of priority you give to it. It is important for this House, which has to shoulder the burden of the governance of India, to have some order of priority in its mind—all-India priority. Of course we have to think of the details too. But if once we lose sight of that, then we get lost in a maze, and in the trees we forget the wood. There is always that danger.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Now, I said that because in considering this Jammu problem and in the context that the hon. Member put it, one would imagine that of all the great national and international problems that was the dominant problem of the day. Well, I recognize its importance in its sphere. But, surely, let us see it in its proper perspective and not get unduly excited about something and forget the more important things.

Now, here is a situation, which the hon. Member himself realizes, when the world is, I will not say (because I do not think it is) on the brink of war—it is not correct, so far as I can judge of the situation, but certainly it hovers about over the brink of all kinds of precipices all the time. One does not know at what moment something may happen. Look at the international situation. Look at those mighty things that are happening in India, that we are trying to build up. In that context let us look at this Jammu problem. I think to do anything else is to upset all our priorities and all our perspective.

The hon. Member was very indignant at what he said were the abuses hurled at him or his colleagues. The main abuse that he took exception to was being called communal. First of all, let me express my pleasure at the fact that he considers communalism as something to be disliked and an abusive term, because it is a bad thing. I hope gradually he will convert his colleague on his left to this viewpoint. (Dr. N. B. Khare: Never, never.) because I seem to remember that he takes pride for being communal.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Of the right type, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I improve that phrase? Of the rightest type; (Dr. N. B. Khare: Righteous type.) as right as possible, in fact so right that it has terrible reaction.

Now, the hon. Member suggested: What is this business of communalism? Who is communal? Let us sit round a table and thrash it out. Well, let us by all means sit round a table, whenever we can, and thrash things out. But I was taken aback by the statement, because many of us have lived through the last thirty years of India's history—if not thirty, twenty—and seen and participated in the ups and downs of the national movement. We have seen how organisations which have been called communal have functioned, whether they have been Muslim, Hindu or

Sikh. We have all got that past history before us. We have got before us also something to which I referred a little while ago, the occurrences in August, September, October, 1947. And finally we remember the 30th January also when the greatest of us was shot down by a foolish youth. Now I do not quite know what interpretation of India's 30 years' history and all those events that took place my hon. friend gives but the normal analysis has been that there are in India all kinds of forces—to use the terms of Europe, some Rightists, some Leftists, some central, whatever it is—and among them, the normal Rightist groups gradually finding that they cannot well have much influence purely in the social plane, have taken advantage of the cloak of religion to cover up their other reactionary policies and have exploited the name of religion in politics and have excited people's passions in that name. That was done, as we all know, with a tremendous degree by the Muslim League.

Dr. N. B. Khare: This is only his usual mantram and nothing else.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That was done by other organisations of Hindus and Sikhs. I am not concerned with it. It is no good for me to be told that this evil is the reaction of any other evil. I am concerned with my own evil, not other's evil. And apart from this, there is a basic—I say so with all respect—weakness in us as a community, the national community I am referring to. We have had many virtues which have kept us going through the ages but we have had failings too which have made us stumble and fall through many times and among the failings is our living in compartments, our caste system, our provincialism, our regionalism, all these things. We are going out of them. I am glad to say. Nevertheless, they are here. People can exploit them and they have exploited them in the name of religion or caste, etc., because many of our folk, whether he is a peasant or a worker, can be excited in the name of religion. Certainly they get excited wrongly and repent afterwards. All this is communalism which is something utterly bad. I have no doubt that if there had been no communalism, there would have been no partition of India. I have no doubt that many other things would not have happened. Take the Punjab or take any other place in India. It is this narrow outlook always trying to gain a favour for this group or that community forgetting the larger good that has weakened us in the past. It was only

in the measure that we got over it—and we got over it in the past on account of our national movement—that we gained our freedom but we did not get over it adequately and sufficiently to prevent the partition, to affect certain groups in India which were affected by the Muslim League. So, we suffered in the partition and it is not a question, as hon. Members might say of my agreeing to it. Agreeing to it is a minor matter. You have to deal with strong forces, with imponderables, people's minds and wishes. In the modern world today, you cannot, in any part of India or in Kashmir or in Jammu, deal with people by force. You cannot hold them by the bayonet. You hold their minds, hold their hearts. They may be excited at any moment. In the long run, unless you win their goodwill, it is no good to you. They are a burden to you. So, how can I go into this question of communalism? It surprises me. It is not a question. It is an approach. Some people who are franker than others talk about it but apart from talking, it is a mental approach, a narrow approach which considers that India is the property of this group or that group. That group may be in 70 per cent. or 80 per cent. majority. I say even if it is 99.9 per cent. in the country, that .1 per cent. has as much right as the 99.9 per cent. One should be made to feel, if he has a sense of feeling that he is not getting a square deal, that he is not on a level with others, that he will not be discriminated against and so on and so forth. You have to win his mind. That is the problem. We have in India 40 million Muslims, as big a number as any other Muslim country has excepting Pakistan and Indonesia and Pakistan is split up into two: neither Pakistan has as many Muslims as India has. Any propaganda, any mental approach which makes those people feel that they are not completely at home here, they are not completely safe, they have not got the same opportunities for development and progress, etc., is an anti-national thing and a communal thing. Now I do submit that there is such a propaganda going on often enough, there are organisations in the country whose almost sole purpose is to do that.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: Do I understand that everything pro-Muslim is national?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Here, in the city of Delhi which is gradually becoming a kind of microcosm of India in regard to various forces, etc.—you can see it in the bazar, you need not go far—you can hear cries of certain

organisations of praise for Godse who killed Gandhiji. What is that?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Where did it happen? You are making a very serious allegation. We have never heard of it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not accusing any hon. Member here I say that here in Delhi, I can give you two or three specific instances of these cries being raised. I am not making any hon. Member here responsible for it. I say an atmosphere is created where people's passions are roused and they say these things.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Please do not trust all your informers. That is my humble request.

Shri A. Ghosh (Burdwan): There was a procession in Calcutta at the time of the Hindu Mahasabha conference when posters saying "Long live Godse" were carried.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): In Banaras also.

Pandit C. N. Malviya (Raisen): I come from Bhopal. There was a procession led by Dr. Khare, Shri N. C. Chatterjee and Shri Deshpande. This slogan was raised:

बमूतसर से आई आवाज,
हीर गाइसे जिन्दाबाद ।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): It is an absolutely unfounded charge. It is a fabricated statement.

Pandit C. N. Malviya: It is quite right, Sir. I say it with full responsibility.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I say it is an unfounded statement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I continue? I was not relying, if the hon. Member thought so, on any, what might be called, police or intelligence reports. In this matter, I was relying on what hon. colleagues here in Parliament have told me.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: We are also hon. Members. We say that is not true.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): Why do these hon. Members defend. I wonder. (Interruption).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, the mind of the House is diverted. I was talking about a certain atmosphere of hatred and dislike that has produced all this communal approach and outlook. That I think is a dangerous atmosphere, a bad one.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

The hon. Member opposite talked a great deal about the full integration of the Jammu and Kashmir State to India. I think that is the major task for us in India and I give that the highest priority, and I would give, compared to this, the second priority to the Five Year Plan or anything else. The major task in India is the proper integration of India.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Including Kashmir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I explain the proper integration of India, meaning, not just the constitutional and the legal—the map shows integrated India—but the integration of the people of India in their minds and hearts. It is not enough merely to talk it out. We have inherited a strong tendency, I am glad to say, of unity, largely built on two contradictory factors, opposed factors: (i) subjection to British rule and the British imposed unity of India and (ii) the unity of the national movement contending against the British rule.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: And the Hindu culture, the third.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is mistaken. What he is saying is important in another context, not in this, because that did not lead to political unity, but led to cultural unity, which is a different thing. We are talking about political unity now. Now, we have inherited because of this national movement, etc., a political tendency to unity. Naturally, it is there. But, we have also inherited strong tendencies to disunity and disruptiveness, which come into play often enough in many shapes and forms, whether it is communalism, provincialism, or casteism, or parochialism and regional feelings and the like. They are tremendous. Of course, ours is a big country. It is a question whether the unifying influence is stronger than the disruptive influence. I think the unifying influence is strong. But, the danger is that the people who do not give full thought, feel secure that they are united. That is all right. They pursue the disruptive tendencies till they go far and then they cannot check them. Therefore, the great problem is the real integration of the minds and hearts of the people of India. That is not a matter of law or constitution. The law and the constitution come in their place, of course, to register the decrees of the mind and the heart when they are properly done. It is from that point of view that this question of Jammu and Kashmir has to be approached also, and no other.

I should like just to remind the House of a little past history. When the Jammu and Kashmir State acceded to India, they acceded in an identical manner like any other State in India had acceded. There was no difference, in the quantum of accession—it was full—or in the manner of accession. The Governor General here then Lord Mountbatten signed the paper and the Maharaja on the other side signed the paper. It was just like any other State. Immediately, there was war in Kashmir and naturally it became a special case, because of that and other reasons. A little later, it was referred to the United Nations. Now, our policy had been, even before all this happened and before this accession took place, declared formally by the Government, by Sardar Patel and by me, that in any State which wants to accede, naturally, the formal way is for the Ruler of the State to accede, but where there is any doubt or challenge, the people of the State can decide. That was the policy stated, regardless of Kashmir. We did not even think of Kashmir. It was an independent policy. Naturally when the question of Kashmir came, we had to apply the policy which we had stated. It was patent there were other circumstances too. So, I stated on behalf of our Government, when I announced the accession of Kashmir to India, that the accession is complete and whole. There is no lacuna in it. But, in accordance with our own policy, it is for the people of Kashmir to decide otherwise if they so chose. Even in accepting the accession, although it was good enough for the Maharaja to agree, and for us to accept his signature, we took care to have the approval of the largest popular organisation, the National Organisation there, and then we accepted it. This was the background.

A year later or more, the question of the other States was considered as to how far we should go and what further steps should be taken in regard to their integration. May I beg the House to remember the difference between accession and integration? Accession is complete. Accession makes the territory completely a part of the territory of India. From accession, therefore, Indian citizenship, etc., whatever flows from being Indian territory, follow. Integration is the degree of relationship or autonomy enjoyed by that State. You may say that a Part A State is integrated in a particular degree, a Part B State in another degree and a Part C State in another degree. A Part C State is integrated even more than a Part A State. It is a bit of the Government of India stretched out. There are degrees

of integration and degrees of autonomy in each State. It was an open question for a long time, what shall be the position of a Part B State, and what position they should occupy in our Constitution, and what shall be the degree of their autonomy. It was a doubtful question whether they should all enjoy the same uniform measure or in varying degrees. Because the situation was not alike. It differed from place to place. But, fortunately for us, these matters came up when we were rather fresh. I mean to say things were going on with a certain momentum, a certain rush, and much could be done which cannot be done now easily, and Sardar Patel, therefore, brought this about with his great energy and ability—this closer integration of the other States, and a certain uniformity in the other States in somewhat of a rush. Now, I put it to hon. Members if we have to face this problem of the other big States today, it would not be such an easy matter. I do not mean to say that they are against any basic principle of ours—not that—but it would be a much more difficult matter. It is all very well for a sub-committee to be appointed to consider financial matters and economic matters, and then have the whole thing put down quickly in the first year or so, but now if we did it, it would take a much longer time, and much longer argument with each State. In fact, my colleague, the Finance Minister, has to face argument now in spite of all that, because fresh things come to light. So that, if this argument applies to all the other States which have no basic question involved as Kashmir has, we should remember that to talk of deciding of additional subjects and financial matters and financial integration and all that—is no simple matter; it is a very complicated matter, apart from any differences of opinion, even if you start with the same opinion.

The hon. Member said repeatedly that I had refused to meet the Praja Parishad people and that I treated them as political untouchables. Now, what are the facts? About a year ago—may be a little more—as a matter of fact, I did meet the President of the Praja Parishad, Pandit Premnath Dogra. I did meet him here in Delhi and had a long talk with him. Of course, this present agitation was not there. We talked about other basic matters affecting Jammu and Kashmir, because there was some kind of agitation then. And after my talk, he, I felt, accepted my viewpoint and agreed to what I said. And what I told him was that the method he was pursuing was bad not only for the Jammu and Kashmir State, but for

Jammu specially and for the very objective that he was seeking to achieve. I thought he had appreciated my argument. He said "yes". Two days later, I saw a statement in the press issued by him which to my amazement said the opposite. It, in fact, said that practically I had accepted his argument, which was a most amazing thing—not exactly that, I mean, but it created that impression. Well, needless to say, it rather upset me. Letters were sent to him that it was very wrong of him to do that. That did make me feel that he was not a safe person to see often, because every meeting would be exploited, and then I have to go about explaining what has happened. Once soon after—by "soon after" I mean about two months after that—again nothing to do with this present agitation—he did ask to see me and I sent word to him that our last interview was not a great success, and, in fact, it created difficulties—and also I was very busy with Parliament—"I am sorry, I can't see you now." These are the two occasions. There has been no third occasion when the question has even arisen.

Now, so far as seeing people goes, the hon. Member should know that, subject to time, I see everybody who wants to see me—all kinds of persons. Naturally, time is limited, and I would gladly see anyone. But, reverting to this Praja Parishad agitation, if the House will permit me, I should like to read the report of a speech delivered in the other House—a few lines of it—not by a Member of our party, but by a very eminent Member of the Opposition, a great leader of the party which the hon. lady leads with such grace in this House—Acharya Narendra Dev. That, surely, is an objective analysis by a person who has no desire merely to support the Government.

This is what he said:

"The other question, Sir, is the delicate question of Kashmir. I am not competent to pronounce any authoritative opinion on this matter, but I will say with a full sense of responsibility that it is a communal agitation; that the Parishad is the old R.S.S. It opposed the land reform movement. It supported the Maharaja in the days of old, and when the R.S.S. was put down, it overnight assumed a new name and is masquerading under the name of the Praja Parishad. I say that this agitation is ill-timed, ill-conceived, and is calculated to render the greatest injury to our larger interests."

Dr. N. B. Khare: That is a chip of the same block: his master's voice. Nothing else.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say that I do not wish to be unfair to the House? Subsequently, Acharya Narendra Dev. having said this, also said that nevertheless, this movement has assumed a certain mass character, and, in order to be fair to the House, I shall read out some more passages:

"It has assumed a mass character in that area, and we have to find out the actual reasons which have led these masses to be thrown into the net of these communalists. I am anxious and I want that the communalist leaders should be isolated from the masses. And we should, therefore, try to understand with sympathy the reasons, however wrong they may be, which have led a large number of people to join the communal forces in the country."

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: And then later on the suggestion he makes for a settlement? Please proceed to the end. "Repression will not do" etc.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Oh yes, Of course. Naturally, I can assure the hon. Member that repression never solves a problem. I naturally accept that. There is no doubt about that.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Hearty congratulations.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: One correction. The hon. Member in this connection referred to the Militia being used, and said that there were largely Muslims. As a matter of fact, the total number of the Militia in the State is 5,720. The numbers are: Muslims—1,859; Hindus—2,763; Buddhists—645; Sikhs—618; Miscellaneous—I do not quite know what "Miscellaneous" means—24. And what is more,—this is the total State figures—the Militia in Jammu is very, very largely Hindu. The fact of the matter is—the hon. Member is aware of that,—that in the past no Kashmiri, Hindu or Muslim, was allowed to enter the Army. The Kashmiris felt it greatly that they were not allowed to enter the Army or any semi-armed formations like the Armed Constabulary and the rest. And the old Kashmir army was full of people from Jammu, from Hindus and Muslims both alike; so that, it is not easy to get a Kashmiri into the Militia for he is not used to it, and a great difficulty has thus grown up in the Kashmir Valley. In Jammu it is largely, almost entirely, a Hindu force.

I do not wish to go into this Praja Parishad movement. First of all, I entirely recognise that repression does not do; secondly, the grievances of the people concerned—I am talking about the larger number of people, the masses, and when I say grievances, I am referring to economic and like grievances at the moment—should be met, and to use the words of Acharya Narendra Dev, they should be separated from the wrong leadership that has misled them.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Leave it to them to decide.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot decide it.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Who is right and who is wrong?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot decide it. They will decide, of course. The decision has to come from them, not from me. That is true.

Now, there are two parts of this problem, the economic etc., dealing with land reforms and the rest, and the other which is purely political and constitutional. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that the agitation of a group in Jammu—a large group, if you like wants to affect the Constitution of India, wants to affect all kinds of problems, not only as between the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and India, but affecting our relations with Pakistan or our relations with the United Nations and everything else. It is an extraordinary thing that we should be called upon, or that a demand should be made upon us to do something, or if not to do something, to give assurances that we will do something, which has all these powerful and far-reaching consequences. It is a matter which five or six months back was carefully considered here, between the Government of India and the representatives of the Government of Kashmir; certain agreements were arrived at, which we thought, in the circumstances, good and adequate. Many of us wanted something more. That is a different matter. But in the balance, having discussed everything, we found that that was adequate, and that it increased much more the old quantum of integration than previously. In fact there is no doubt about it, that whatever financial or other integration might be necessary will have to take place. There is no lessening of the bond between Kashmir and India. In every way they are tied up to us.

But then again, we are asked about the United Nations and the rest. I am placed in a difficulty here. I do not want to go into the question of the rightness or wrongness of some actions

taken some four or five years ago. But here we are at the present moment. I want the Government of India to keep its face. I do not want to undo anything or withdraw anything that I have said at any time. We have a reputation, and a high reputation, and I do not think it does any good to a country to behave in a way which might discredit that reputation in the slightest. We gave our pledge in regard to Kashmir, to the United Nations. Well, it is true, if I may say so, that we have not had what I consider a very fair deal from them, and some great countries particularly have seemed to take a particular delight in putting forward propositions to which we cannot agree, because the basis of their thought is different. But there it is. My hon. friend asked me to send for the Praja Parishad leaders to discuss these matters of international and national concern. How can I discuss these matters with any person? What we are going to do is an intricate matter.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Not even to discuss and to explain to them, so as to dispel their fears?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As I have said, I am perfectly prepared to do it. I have done that once, as I said.

Dr. N. B. Khare: If you do it again, you will succeed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am perfectly prepared to explain things, to any person and to dispel fears, in so far as I can.

Then again, may I point out that every State in India has a large measure of autonomy? If Uttar Pradesh or West Bengal or any other State had trouble, we will advise them. But we do not jump and interfere. It will be amazing if we send for the opposition of Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy's Government in Bengal, to Delhi, to deal with it here. It is fantastic. How can any Government in any State carry on, when the Central Government starts dealing with the Opposition in that State, an Opposition not even in the Assembly there, but an Opposition outside? These are difficult things. It is not a question of prestige at all. Let me assure the House. There is no prestige involved, and if any, it must be pretty fickle, and pretty fragile. So, to talk on these matters, it is not a question of prestige at all. But it is certainly a matter of doing it efficiently and in the right way, not by bypassing the Government there. We cannot deal with that in that manner.

476 P.S.D.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: No one has suggested that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have taken an enormous amount of time, and I am very grateful to this House for the indulgence with which it has listened to me.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. There has been a long debate. There is no necessity for any more questions. I shall now put the amendments to the vote of the House; if any hon. Member wants his or her amendment to be put separately I shall do so, but the rest I shall put together. I suppose the main groups are agreed upon this.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): I want my amendment which reads as follows, to be put separately:

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

"but regret that there is no adequate appreciation in the Address of the deteriorating economic condition and growing unemployment in the country nor any indication of any effective measures to tackle it."

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I want my following amendment to be put separately:

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

"but regret that the Address fails to recognise the continuing deterioration in the conditions of the Scheduled Castes and other backward communities and to indicate positive steps to be taken to improve them."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the first of these amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

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

"but regret that there is no adequate appreciation in the Address of the deteriorating economic condition and growing unemployment in the country nor any indication of any effective measures to tackle it."

The House divided: Ayes, 64: Noes, 284.