

14193

14194

LOK SABHA

Saturday, 17th September, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(No Questions: Part I not published).

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION ✓

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and policy of Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration." ✓

Nearly six months ago, I spoke in this House on foreign affairs. That was, I think, in connection with the Demands for Grants. At that time I drew attention to the state of international affairs, and I pointed out that the prospect was a very gloomy one. The situation had hardened and there was danger of catastrophe of world war or something leading to it and a general pall of fear. The guns were all loaded and fingers were on the triggers. I am happy to say that the situation now has improved greatly during these six months. The guns are still loaded, but the fingers are not on the triggers. I do not wish to paint too rosy a picture of the world which is today, because there are numerous dark spots and danger zones. Nevertheless, I think it is correct to say that there has been an improvement in the atmosphere all

round; and for the first time people all over the world have a sense of relief, the sense that war is not inevitable or is not coming, in fact, that it can well be avoided. I think that the biggest thing that has gradually evolved in people's minds all over the world has been, if I may use the word, futility of war, that war does not—modern war at least does not—solve any major problem and that therefore all problems, however difficult and intricate they might be, should be approached peacefully and an attempt should be made to solve them by negotiated settlement. Now, that may seem a simple thing to say and yet I think it is of high significance that more and more people have thought and spoken in these terms. I am not referring to the people of India, because we have always said something like that; but countries, great and powerful countries, which have placed their reliance considerably on their military might, today speak in different terms. That I think is a fact of a very great importance, because it may well be that this heralds an entirely new approach all over the world. Again I repeat that I do not wish to appear to be too optimistic, because there are danger spots all over and there are still many people who believe, perhaps they have said so, in warlike methods to solve them. But, an evergrowing number of people in all countries look towards peaceful methods and have turned away from those people who think in terms of war.

Soon after I spoke last time in this House six months ago, there took place the Bandung Conference. That was, as everyone knows, a very significant event not only in the history of Asia, but in world affairs, and I think it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

led to many other developments. In the Bandung Conference the 30 nations assembled there produced a document signed and accepted by all of them in favour of peaceful methods, and of course, against colonialism and racialism. That was, I submit, a remarkable achievement, considering that the nations represented at the Bandung Conference differed in their outlooks greatly, in their policies greatly. Yet, they found a common ground in regard to these basic approaches. It was a significant example of people trying to find common ground. In spite of differences, of peaceful co-existence.

Thereafter, many things happened. I am not going to detail them. But, round about that time, before and after, there was the Austrian Peace Treaty which removed one troublesome question from the long list of problems which Europe normally nourishes. The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia ended a rather long-standing dispute. There was a new approach to disarmament. There was the invitation then, which has taken effect now, by the Soviet Union to Chancellor Adenauer, and a number of other factors. Above all, there was the Four Power Conference in Geneva: the four Great Powers. That Conference did not produce any blueprint, did not produce any resolutions, etc. Nevertheless, without doing anything definite, it made a tremendous difference to the whole aspect of things in the world. All the four eminent representatives there, no doubt deserve credit but I would like to mention more specially in this connection the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. The world looked with some surprise and great gratification at the melting away to some extent of the high walls and barriers that had existed between these countries.

Subsequently, quite recently, two or three events have taken place. One was the conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Geneva,

which turned the world's mind towards these peaceful uses, because, the average person has only thought of the atomic energy as something destructive and catastrophic. Now, it appears that it could be used for the advancement of humanity and the choice before the world thus became clearer still as to whether they are going the way of war and infinite destruction or the way of peace and almost, if not infinite, tremendous advancement of humanity.

Then, there has been the recent visit of Chancellor Adenauer to Moscow resulting in some kind of Agreement. The Agreement does not go far. We must not expect suddenly all problems to be resolved. The problem of Germany is very far from solution. I would not like to say when it would be solved satisfactorily to all parties.

But, the fact to remember is that that problem is removed from the arena of possible conflict to the conference table. That itself is a tremendous gain. Therefore, this agreement between the Soviet Union and Chancellor Adenauer, although it does not go far, is nevertheless a gain for the lessening of tension and for the peaceful solution of problems.

Again, for some weeks past in Geneva the Ambassadors of the United States of America and the People's Government of China have been meeting and discussing a relatively small matter, that is, the return of their civilians to their respective countries, and it was announced some-time ago, a few days ago, that an agreement had been reached in regard to this matter. As I said, it does not go very far. The major questions affecting China and the United States remain. The whole far-eastern problem remains. The future of Korea is still among the undecided questions. Formosa or Taiwan, or even those little islands, Quemoy and Matsu, about which there has for long been a general concensus of opi-

nion that they should, whatever other matters might be decided, go to the mainland—even that problem remains. And yet the House should remember that there has been some kind of a sea change over it all. We have not heard for a long time now of a major conflict in the China seas. Whether there has been any official agreement or not—and there has been none—the fact is that people move away from this idea of settling things by military measures, and have greater hopes of a peaceful settlement.

Now, all these changes have taken place which point to this one direction—the growth in people's minds of an aversion to war, or, if you like the fear of war, and a desire to settle problems peacefully. Now, it is true, I suppose, that this change in people's mind is partly at least due to the fact that they realise the tremendous potentialities for destruction of the new nuclear weapons, the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb and all its progeny. That is a major fact. And yet, I think, it is not that fact alone, but rather, well, if I may say so with all respect, a return to wisdom and goodwill, a reaction from these long years of war and cold war and the people getting tired of them because they led nowhere at all they realised,—it has solved no problem, it only kept them at a high pitch of effort, excitement, anger and hatred—a turning away from that in the direction of "Well, let us try to settle these problems in some other way, even though they might take some time".

Where does India come into this picture? It would be an exaggeration to say that India has made a major difference to world policy. We must not exaggerate our role, but it is a fact that India has on significant occasions made a difference and that difference has led to certain consequences.

During the last several years India has been called upon to undertake international duties in Korea, in Indo-China and elsewhere. And now, as the House knows, there is a proposal that India should undertake some

responsibilities in regard to the Chinese civilians or notional in the United States of America. India has, I think it may be said without undue exaggeration, played a significant role in times of difficulty. It was not often enough a public role—and we did not, and we do not, desire to publicise it—but a gentle role of friendly approach to the parties concerned, which has sometimes helped in bringing the others nearer to one another. We have never sought to be, and we have never acted as, mediators. Let us be quite clear about it. And we have no desire to act as such. The word 'mediator' is often branded about. Therefore, I wish to make it perfectly clear. There is no question of mediation between great countries. All we have suggested and sought to bring about is that those countries should face each other, talk to each other and decide their problems themselves. It is not for us or for others to come in and advise them what to do. But we can sometimes remove obstacles which have arisen during the last few years.

Now, India's contribution to this new situation may perhaps be put in one word or two, *Panch Shila*, or rather the ideas underlying it. And the House will notice that ever since these ideas of peaceful co-existence—there is nothing new about those ideas, but nevertheless it was a new application of an old idea, an application to a particular context—were initially mentioned and promulgated, they have not only spread in the world and influenced more and more countries, but they have acquired progressively a greater depth, and a greater meaning too. That is, from being perhaps a word used rather loosely, it has begun to acquire a specific meaning and significance in world affairs.

I think we may take some credit for helping this process of spreading this conception of a peaceful settlement, and above all, of non-interference, of the recognition of each country to carve out its own destiny with-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

out interfering with others. That is an important conception. Again, there is nothing new about it. No great truths may be new, but the fact remains that that required emphasis, because there has been in the past a tendency for great countries to interfere with others, to bring pressure to bear upon them, to want them to line up with them; and I suppose, that is a natural result of bigness and smallness; and it has taken place not recently but throughout history.

Now, this stress being laid on non-interference of any kind—and it has been defined, the House will remember, as political, economic, ideological etc.—is an important factor in considering the situation today. The fact that it will not be wholly acted upon here and there is really of little relevance. You make a law, and it is no good people saying that somebody made us obey that law, and commit a crime. The law is the law which gradually influences the whole structure of living in that country, even though some people may not obey it.

I need not say that those who do not believe in it gradually come within its scope.

So that it is this basic conception which counts. And what does that conception mean, again? It means that there may be different ways of progress, possibly somewhat different outlooks on the objectives aimed at; but, broadly, they may be the same. If I may use another type of analogy, truth is not confined to one country or one people; it has far too many aspects for anyone to presume that he knows it all, and each country and each people, if they are true to themselves, have to find out their path themselves, through trial and error, through suffering and experience. Only then do they grow. If they merely copy others or attempt to copy, the result is likely to be that they do not grow, and even though the copy may be completely good, perfectly good, it is something imposed upon them or something undertaken by them without that normal

growth of the mind which really makes it an organic part of themselves.

We have had in the past thirty years or so the development of this country under a great leader, Mahatma Gandhi. Now, quite apart from what he did or did not do, it was an organic development of this country, something which fitted in with the spirit and thinking of India, and yet which was not isolated from the modern world, which fitted in or tried to fit in with the modern world too. No doubt, this process of adaptation will go on. But it is something which grows out of the mind and spirit of India, effected by learning many things from outside, as it must be; because, if we are isolated, as we were for hundreds of years, we fall back. If we are submerged by others, then we have no roots left. So that this idea of *Panch Shila*, apart from the various aspects of it, lays down this very important truth, that each people must ultimately fend for themselves. I am not thinking in terms of military fending, but in terms of striving intellectually, morally, spiritually, opening out all their windows to ideas from others, learning from the experience of others, but, nevertheless, doing it themselves; and those other countries should look upon this process of each other with sympathy and friendly understanding without any interference or imposition.

So India has played this some little role, and during these past few years the general policy laid down on behalf of India, and which we have sought to follow to the best of our ability, has been progressively recognised in other countries. It may not have been accepted by all, certainly not; some have disagreed with some parts of it or the whole even. But progressively, there has been a belief in the integrity of the policy of India, that is, it was a sincere policy based on a definite outlook and there was no ill-will in it for any other country. It was based essentially on goodwill and fellowship with other countries.

That, I think, has been progressively recognised.

The House knows that only a short while ago I undertook a somewhat extended tour of some countries, notably the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and also Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Rome, England and Egypt. Rather incidentally, on my way back, I even saw for a brief while a small corner of Western Germany, Dusseldorf. Wherever I went I had the most extraordinarily cordial welcome or welcomes which, naturally, moved me greatly. But I realised then, as no doubt the House realises, that that welcome had little personal significance; it was a demonstration of appreciation of India's basic policy and a demonstration in favour of peace. It is extraordinary how the people of every country that I visited were not only intellectually inclined towards this but emotionally inclined towards this idea of peace. And those countries, the House will remember, were not of one type. They were of various types and kinds and backgrounds. Nevertheless, this was a common factor. So I took that welcome to be a tribute paid to our country and the policy that we have pursued.

Soon we are going to have, in the course of these next few months, a number of eminent statesmen and leaders from other countries. Only the other day we had with us the Deputy Prime Minister of Egypt whom we welcomed cordially, because we have the most friendly relations with Egypt. In two or three days' time we are going to have the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Laos visiting Delhi. And in the course of the next few months we shall have the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union; and, I hope, accompanying him will be some of his chief colleagues also. Apart from that, among our distinguished guests during this winter season are going to be the Emperor of Ethiopia, the King of Saudi Arabia, the Shah of Iran, the Vice President of Indonesia, the Foreign Ministers of Canada, Italy and Australia and the Vice-

Chancellor of Germany. We shall welcome all these eminent dignitaries representing different view-points with equal warmth and show. I hope, that India has a large heart and a friendly approach for everyone.

Now, I just referred to a new responsibility which we are likely to undertake, that is in regard to the recent agreement arrived at in Geneva between the Ambassadors of the United States and the People's Republic of China. The matter has not been completely finalised yet but, I hope that in the course of a few days it would be finalised. In this matter, it was the Peoples' Government of China that proposed India's name to represent them or to undertake this duty on their behalf in the United States of America, just as the United States, I believe, suggested the name of the United Kingdom to undertake that responsibility for their nationals in China. The proposal of the Chinese Government naming India was accepted by the United States of America and thus we were approached to undertake this work by both parties. In the circumstances, we had to agree to this and we have expressed to the Peoples' Government of China and to the United States that if this responsibility has to be undertaken we shall endeavour to discharge it. We are not quite sure about the details of it yet as the matter, as I said, has not been finalised yet.

Now, I mentioned many cheering developments in the world situation. But, there continue to be many dark spots. In the North of Africa, Morocco and Algeria, recent developments, in some ways, have been terrible; and, I have no doubt that all who have heard of them in India have naturally been greatly moved by them. I do not wish to say much about that because efforts are being made to find some solution and I earnestly hope that those efforts will succeed. But, I will say this, that what is happening in these countries in North Africa has not only deeply moved people in the whole of Asia and Africa--and I

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

hope elsewhere too—because it is not merely a matter of some law and constitution but what happens to millions of human beings struggling for freedom. Well, what has happened, unfortunately of tragedy, has happened and all we can hope is that this is the end of this tragedy and that some way out to freedom for these countries will soon be found.

At the other end of the continent of Africa, there is the Union of South Africa which stands out today in the world as the unabashed champion of everything that I would submit not only the United Nations Charter but civilised humanity everywhere should abhor. They consider that they are the champions today—and there is no secrecy about it, no veil, no suttuffe—of racialism and the master race, something which the Charter of the United Nations expressly forbids, something against which the last Great War was fought. But, here is this extraordinary instance of a Government continuing a policy which, I believe, every thinking and every civilised person in the world must deplore.

In the heart of Africa there is much trouble, much movement, much ferment because one of the outstanding features of the modern age is this awakening of Africa. With that, all of us in this country have the deepest sympathy. Africa has had a history of greater tragedy and suffering than any country or any continent, not today, I mean, but for hundreds of years ever since the slave trade had carried so many of them to the West. I earnestly hope that the peoples of Africa will find freedom.

✓ One of the bright spots in Africa is the Gold Coast and Nigeria and I hope that before very long we shall welcome these countries to full freedom.

✓ In Indo-China there have been the three International Commissions functioning and all three have Indians as Chairmen. We have been

✓ faced with problems from day to day—difficult problems—and we continue to be faced by them. But I must congratulate the Commissions and, more particularly, the Chairmen of these Commissions for the great tact and ability with which they have handled these problems.

- Now may I come nearer home to problems which perhaps occupy our minds more than these world problems? But it is right, I think, that even in regard to our internal problems, we should see them in proper perspective, I mean, in the larger picture of the world; otherwise, we shall see it out of perspective and not form a right judgment of them. Therefore, it is important that we should always keep this larger picture of world affairs before us. It is often said that external policy is a projection of internal policy, or sometimes to some extent external policy affects internal policy. They both affect each other. And the proper policy is one in which both are related and both help each other. In the same way, any policy that we pursue in the wide world has to fit in with our internal policy, broadly speaking. I do not mean to say that in every detail it has to fit in, but there are certain domains. But there must be the same broad mental approach; otherwise, both the policies fail. In the same way, any internal policy that we pursue must also be in keeping with these broad policies. But it is not so much a question of internal or external policy but the basic approach, basic, mental, intellectual moral approach to life and its problems, national or international.

✓ Among the problems which affect us especially in India at present are the Goa problem, Pakistan and Ceylon. I do not wish to say much about Pakistan except that, however difficult the problems may be, we have always sought in the past and we shall continue to seek in the future a peaceful solution of them. In regard ✓ to Ceylon I have stated in this House

that the situation there is not a happy one; indeed it is very unsatisfactory. But we still hope that we shall be able to find some way out which will be honourable to India, to Ceylon and most of all to the people concerned—the nine hundred thousand or so people of Indian descent.

Now I come to Goa. There is apparently a feeling, and even newspapers in India and abroad have given expression to it,—that there has been some marked or sudden change in our Government's policy in regard to Goa. Further, it has been thought by some people, more particularly I think by some foreign observers that we have made this change because of foreign opinion or foreign reactions. Now, naturally we follow and we are interested in foreign reactions not only about this matter but about every other matter. We want to be wide awake and know what the world is doing and what the world is thinking. We are not isolated. We do not wish to wall ourselves in.

But I should like to make it clear that whatever decisions we have arrived at have been completely internal decisions in our attempt to follow the policy which we consider right. Nothing that has happened or is being said in foreign countries has in the slightest affected or brought about the decisions we have made.

Secondly, I would venture to point out to this House that there has been no reversal of the policy and that we have consistently followed the same policy throughout and more especially in the course of the last little more than a year ever since certain developments took place. It is true that there has been sometimes a varying emphasis; it is true that at some periods there was a certain laxity in enforcing that policy. . . . (Laughter.) Laughter is pleasant to hear but when it has no meaning, I do not understand.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Just as this policy has no meaning.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not competent enough to bandy words

with Shri Kamath; nobody is competent enough for that.

What are the basic elements of our policy in regard to Goa? First, there must be peaceful methods—let us be clear about that. It obviously is essential unless we give up the whole roots of all our policies and our behaviour. Now, therefore, any person who thinks that the methods employed in regard to Goa must be other than peaceful—it is open to him to have that opinion but there is nothing that I can debate with him or argue with him because we rule out non-peaceful methods completely.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): What about Patna?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. lady Member opposite says: what about Patna? I entirely agree with her; I think peaceful methods were not adopted by a large number of people in Patna including the students, and including of course the police. I think it is about time that the people of this country and all parties decided that it is not desirable or in the interest of our country to indulge in non-peaceful and indisciplined methods of action.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What about the police?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the police is wrong, the police must be punished. Nobody defends the wrong actions of the police. There is no defence of the wrong action of the police or anybody or any official. But if I may say so—I was going to say so a little later—one of the elements in our thinking has been not only what happened in Goa but what happened subsequently in the city of Bombay and elsewhere; the indiscipline, the methods other than peaceful that come into evidence because—I am not blaming anybody—they exhibited a certain atmosphere in the country which was the very reverse and the opposite of the peaceful atmosphere which is so necessary for any peaceful movement of satyagraha etc. One cannot have it both ways. If one thinks that methods

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

like military methods, or police action as they are called—are necessary or desirable, well, one has them. If on the other hand one feels that peaceful methods are essential then one tries to have them. But to mix them up is to fall between two policies, two chairs, and to be nowhere.

There are, perhaps, some in this House—not too many, but certainly some—whose experience may go back during the last 35 years or so in India's history. When the national movement in India was pursuing, under a great leadership, peaceful methods, whenever we slipped—and we slipped sometimes—the movement was stopped utterly and absolutely, because it was felt by our leader that we must be true to our principle and to our policy and that nothing is going to be achieved by indiscipline and by people diverting themselves from that basic policy either through excitement or anger, or, even if you like, some justified resentment. Whatever it was, one cannot carry on a movement at any time, big or small, unless one is clear about one's policy and unless that policy is followed and some other policy is not included in that policy.

The word "satyagraha" has been used in this connection. I am not the originator of satyagraha nor do I presume to be an authorised commentator as to what it is. But, some of us at any rate have functioned at least for 35 years in a way and in a domain where satyagraha has been ever present. So, we have learnt through trial and error some experience about it. Anyhow, so far satyagraha is concerned it is no business of the Government. A government does not start satyagraha. The most that a government can do is not to come in the way of satyagraha, not to prohibit satyagraha because it is not against their law or their general policy. That is the most a government can do. It is for other people, people other than government to do it if it is not contrary to the law of the country or to the general policy

pursued. Therefore, as a government, of course, we do not discuss satyagraha. In some other capacity we might or some people might, consider it.

Now, I would like the House to remember what the basic policy was in the course of the last year and a quarter; that is to say, ever since satyagraha or some kind of satyagraha was talked about. Repeated emphasis was laid, of course, always on peaceful methods. Secondly, emphasis was laid that there should be no mass entry into Goa, or, no mass satyagraha in the form of mass entry. Thirdly, that it should be predominantly the business of Goans. It was about an year ago that was said, and repeatedly said. Later, gradually, what happened was that a number, to begin with relatively a small number, of Indians, non-Goan Indians, participated in the small groups that went in there. The groups were small and the Indians were relatively few. It is true we may be criticised for allowing this thing to continue. There was no vital principle involved. It may be asked "Why didn't you deny the right of Indians to do it"? It is not that I say that Indians have no right to do it. I am not for the moment talking about satyagraha—Indians have every right to work for the freedom of Goa or, for the matter of that, for the freedom of the North Pole if they want to. Why should I put a ban? But it can come in the way of my policy and therefore I can stop it, but mentally, I do not wish to deny the right, but if it comes in the way of policy or if it is likely to create consequences which are undesirable, then I come in the way or the Government comes in the way; because we thought that the participation of Indians in the so-called satyagraha in any large numbers would produce wrong results, we expressed an opinion against it. When one or two Indians go in, it is not a matter of great significance—it may be, of course—but it was doubtful and so we had to make that point perfectly clear later. Gradually, early in August, or earlier still—on the 18th July,—

the number of Indians increased somewhat. I want to be quite frank to this House that early in August, that is, let us say, a week before or a few days before the 15th August, we were in some doubt as to what, if any, action we should take, because we saw developments taking place which were not in keeping with the policy we had laid down. The policy throughout, even at the end of July, was that there should be no mass entry and predominance was on Goans and not Indians, though there was no strict, rigid barrier between individual Indians going there or not going there. We were much concerned about these developments. We know that large numbers of enthusiastic countrymen and countrywomen of ours were going there in a spirit of self-sacrifice and desiring to help in the freedom of Goa. Whatever our policy or their policy might be, even though their policies might differ, there was no question of our not appreciating the individual motives of those people who went there—or most of them—and that is why on the morning of the 15th August, when I was speaking from the ramparts of the Red Fort here, I said that my mind and heart were full of thoughts for those people on the Goa border. My mind was full of what happened and what might happen to our brave people doing an act, facing a danger. Whether I agree or disagree, my mind and heart will go out to brave men facing danger for a cause. But I was concerned about the consequences then, and we may perhaps be justifiably criticised that "Why do you allow matters to go thus far on the 15th August"? The criticism might be justifiable. I quite frankly say that my mind was not clear how, having gone that far, to suddenly ask those people who had collected or were collecting in larger numbers against our conscience in regard to the mass entry, etc., not to do so. So, what took place in Goa on August 15 happened. Later, all of us had to give a great deal of intense thought to this position, and as a result of that very careful and anxious consideration, we came to the conclu-

sion that we must lay stress on our basic policies in regard to Goa, again the old policy, but in addition, in the present context, certainly not to allow any doubt about that policy. As I said, it may be justifiably said against us that we were not quite clear, not about the basic policy but about certain developments, certain minor aspects of that policy and therefore, the people generally might have not been clear in their minds as to our policy. That charge might be brought against us perhaps and I think there will be some slight justification for it, though the basic policies have been completely clear for the last year and a quarter. Anyhow we felt that now it was not right or fair to the public or to ourselves or to anyone who was thinking in terms of going to Goa that we should leave the slightest doubt in our minds; and in the present context, we therefore came to the conclusion that no satyagraha, even individual satyagraha, should be permitted. As a matter of fact, it is obvious that—I am not speaking on grounds of principle but about the sheer practical aspect of it—after a big-scale effort was made on the 15th August, going back immediately to individual efforts, efforts of odd individuals, has no particular meaning. It is lost; the significance of it, moral or physical, is rather lost. Hon. Members may have read in the newspapers how the Portuguese have started describing some people as "violent satyagrahis". I do not know anything about them. I believe there are some small groups, or some small group in Goa itself, which have indulged in acts of sabotage like damaging a small bridge or something like that.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Is there any independent source to verify what the Portuguese said about the satyagrahis?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I just said that reports in the Press have appeared, and I have no doubt those particular reports are correct, that the Portuguese say that "violent satyagrahis have done this and that". What I was venturing to point out

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

was this. There are a number of people, not satyagrahis,—people who do not claim to be satyagrahis at any time,—belonging to some small or big group who have committed small acts of sabotage. These little attempts of odd individual satyagrahis, although completely different from that, tend to get mixed up with that other thing, or even if we cannot tell the Portuguese mix it up. I was just pointing out the practical aspects; but it is not this practical aspect that I am venturing today to lay stress in this House, but on the basic aspects of this problem. I am asked, "what is the alternative to this kind of satyagraha?" In answer to that, I can also ask my questioner, "what exactly you seek to achieve by the particular methods that you may suggest?" Obviously, problems of this kind do not yield themselves to some sudden and magic remedy. But, as the House knows, we have taken a large number of measures, economic, financial and other, which I have no doubt are effective to a considerable extent; and their effectiveness grows with other measures that we may take. These are the normal ways of approaching this problem. Remember that in our considering this, we are ruling out what is called military or police action. We have ruled it out. Then we are considering what other steps we should take. I have no doubt in my mind that the steps we take as well as the general development of the situation must necessarily and in the liberation of Goa from the Portuguese. I cannot fix a date. I do not think any person in this wide world can fix a date for the solution of any of the world's problems. Whether these problems are of Europe or of Germany or of other parts of Europe, of the Far East, of Indo-China or Africa or any other part, no date can be fixed. But, the main thing is that the policies pursued should be on right lines. I do believe that right conduct must necessarily lead to right results just as wrong conduct leads to evil results. I have no doubt in my mind about that. I do not think

that when we are acting in the international sphere, we can apply some other test.

12 Noon

In Goa, we have a remarkable picture of the 18th century facing the 20th century, of a decadent colonialism facing a resurgent Asia, of a free and independent India being affronted and insulted by the Portuguese authorities of in fact, Portugal functioning in a way which, apparently, to any thinking person, is so amazing in its incongruity in the modern world that one is a little taken aback. It is not the normal opposition of a normal argument or action.

We have watched, may be other Members may have watched,—with interest the reactions of foreign countries to what is happening in Goa. Goa is not only a symbol, small as it is; it was and it has become even more so a symbol of decadent colonialism trying to hold on. It is something more. It has become an acid test by which we can judge of the policies of other countries. Does any country actively support or encourage Portuguese intransigence in Goa? If so, we know, broadly speaking, where that country stands in world affairs. Or, are there any countries that, without positively and actively encouraging, passively support or acquiesce in this position? We know how those countries stand. Or, lastly do those other countries realise that Portuguese domination in Goa cannot and must not continue, not only for normal reasons and causes, but because it has become an affront to civilised humanity, more especially after the brutal behaviour, the brutal and uncivilised behaviour of the Portuguese authorities there. I submit, therefore, to this House that the policy Government have laid down in regard to Goa is not only a sound policy, but, if I say so, it is the only policy. Minor variations may take place from time to time, but the major roots of that policy must hold

good, unless we ought to uproot everything that we have done inside the country or outside and our national and international policies and seek some new path which we have no intention of doing. And I submit that this policy which fits in with this larger world policy as well as our national outlook is a policy which will yield results too. It is not merely an idealistic policy, but a practical policy. I trust, therefore, that any doubts about this matter would be removed from the minds of not only Members here but those outside and they will realise that we have consistently followed a policy through this last year. Certainly to some extent it now appears to me, we created some doubts and misunderstanding about it recently, and we allowed the situation to drift a little, and you may blame us for that, but the moment we saw what this was leading to, that it was taking us in a wrong direction, we had to pull ourselves up, and no Government which realised that could refrain, unless it lacked courage, from stopping this evil drift. I think we have shown—the country and the Government—courage in this matter to ourselves and to the world. That does not mean—and I should like this to be clearly understood by people outside India, here it is not necessary—the slightest slackening by our Government in regard to this question of Goa. All that has happened in recent months has made this question important. It may not be a terribly important question because it is inevitable—all the world knows and I am quite certain that people in Portugal know that it is quite inevitable—that Goa has to come to India, that they will have to leave India and that Goa then necessarily has to associate itself with the Indian Union. But the first thing is the liberation of Goa. If in the normal course this took a little time, it did not matter much. There are many problems which take time. As the House knows, there are bits of Portuguese dominated territory in China, in Indonesia, little bits—Macao, this and that, they continue to be as such. The

People's Government of China does not get terribly excited because Macao is Portuguese. Macao will go to them; there is no doubt about it; everybody knows. But they do not get excited. They are not weak in their military strength. It is a small matter for them if they choose to take it, but they do not choose to take it because of their larger policies. There is a bit of Portuguese territory elsewhere too. So, it would not matter normally if a matter takes a little more time or not, but the course of events has made Goa a more important and a more vital issue and to some extent over this issue the iron has entered our souls, the country, and therefore, one has to deal with this matter with all the wisdom and strength that we possess and not allow it to lapse, not allow it to become a static question, and I hope that people in other countries will realise that.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved: ✓

"That the present international situation and policy of Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration." ✓

Now, there are certain substitute ✓ motions. Hon. Members who wish to ✓ move them may do so.

Shri Raghuramiah (Tenali): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves the foreign policy pursued by the Government, which has led especially to the acceptance by many countries of the principles of Panch Shila and to the easing of the international tension, thus promoting the cause of world peace."