

plex, or if we want to sell our country to any foreign country, undoubtedly that will be reprehensible and India will not accept or tolerate such a position. But if foreign aid is offered unconditionally and in order to develop our own national resources and build our own economy, especially to remedy the economic poverty that faces the people of India, we should not refuse it. But let us maintain our independent status and behave as such. That is the reason why I would suggest to the Prime Minister that the time has now come for him to consider this matter dispassionately, and quietly—without much declaration—quietly come out of the Commonwealth, whether it is called British or un-British matters little. And we shall remain friendly to those countries which are our friends. That is the test which I put. One hon. friend said yesterday that our great policy is that we are friends of everybody. If you try to be friendly to everyone you will soon find yourselves in enormous trouble. The test as you will have to be friendly to those who are your friends, and you will have to measure your strength when occasion arises.

12 Noon

I will conclude by saying this that the test of the success of our foreign policy will depend how far we have been able to strengthen the national base within the country. We have no army worth the name. We have no defence industries worth the name. We have to depend in the ultimate analysis on the great moral strength of the people of India. And so far as the foreign policy is concerned it should not be a closed book. I do not know whether the Standing Committees will be selected or not. But there should be the closest contact between the Government and all parties in Parliament in the discussion of the foreign policy of the country. We do not want that occasions should arise when the country's foreign policy should be discussed in an unfriendly way, which will strengthen the hands of our enemies abroad. Take us into your confidence. Appreciate the point of view that we may have. It is not our individual point of view but the point of view of a section of the people over whom you are ruling as their representative for the time being. Proceed on that basis and pay the greatest possible attention to our home requirements. Consolidate the home front, turn your attention to the grave economic problems that face India today, and particularly take in hand in the next year the solution of these problems which are affecting the daily lives and existence of millions of Indians who today by an accidental chance have been

thrown out of the Indian soil. Take up their cause; forget for the time being the rest of the world. And, do not talk so much. I do not know of any Foreign Minister in the world who makes so many speeches as our worthy Prime Minister does. If he kindly speaks a little less than what he does on foreign matters, it will create less confusion and misunderstanding.

One last word about Tibet. None has spoken about Tibet. There was peaceful penetration of Tibet by China. I have great admiration for the Chinese people; I have great admiration for the way in which China is being developed now. But here also our Prime Minister practically acquiesced in the slavery of Tibet. Tibet has suddenly become a province of China. There has been slow penetration into Tibet, and the new maps which are prepared by China include even Bhutan as part of China. These are ominous signs which it will be for us to tackle. Look at the huge boundary, the impregnable boundary of India, the Himalayas. That has disappeared now, and today you have to guard your frontier across the Himalayas. These are new symptoms. Let us forget for the time being what is happening in the rest of the world. We will take intelligent interest when matters come up—Tunisia, Korea and other places—and undoubtedly we will make our contribution. But let us think of our home first, shaping our foreign policy in such a way that our home front can be properly strengthened, and if a crisis comes we will be able to rise to a man and stand up to it for defending the national honour and integrity of our motherland.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Since yesterday we have been discussing what is called Foreign Policy, and many aspects of it have been mentioned. We have discussed the Foreign Service, the failings or the virtues of our diplomatic personnel, the money we spend or the waste we indulge in or do not indulge in. We have also discussed other matters. I listened with respect and attention to the speeches that were being made and, if I may say so, the level of the debate since yesterday has been high.

As I listened today, the background of this tormented world came before me; because after all, when we talk about foreign policy, we talk about the world or bits of the world, or we talk of this world which for years has hung on the edge of a catastrophe. People talk of the success of our foreign policy. How they measure success and how they wish to achieve success in Ceylon or Goa, I would like to know. People have talked about the policy that our

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Government has pursued as not yielding success or being driven into this camp or that camp, and that problems remain unsolved, whether it is in Kashmir or elsewhere. Some hon. Members have criticised our policy; but I have waited these two days for one concrete suggestion, a positive suggestion of what one can do, apart from what is being done.

Brave words! yes; forensic eloquence, yes; melodrama, yes; but what do you want us to do? I ask hon. Members to ponder over this question. There are many problems in the world today, whether you go to Korea, whether you go to Iran or Egypt or Tunisia or America or Germany, almost anywhere you go, there are problems, and every problem is an unsolved problem, because every problem is connected with the whole world situation in all its complexity and this whole world situation may sometimes take a turn for the better and sometimes for the worse, but as a whole, it presents a very tragic aspect. So, do you expect the solution of these problems? If I may say so with all respect, it means a total lack of comprehension of what the problem of the world is. Success may come, but I do not claim success. Our policy may have led to failure here and there. It is not that. But I do wish this House to consider the issue not from the point of view of debate or of eloquence but from the point of view of considering some of the most tremendous problems of the age; for it is a tremendous responsibility for anyone, whether it is an individual or a Government or this Parliament to have to face and consider these problems and to decide what we are to do about them. We cannot decide these problems. That is, shall I say, sheer arrogance for any of us to think that even this great country of India is going to decide the fate of the world. Of course, not. It may be, however, that we may make a difference, that we may help towards a decision, that we may make that final difference which may come between war and peace, and that will be a great service if we can do that to the world.

Therefore, I approach these problems in all humility. Hon. Members have talked about my whims and caprices which fashion our foreign policy. It is a small matter, how they refer to me; but it is not a small matter when they refer to the policy of this great nation as the whim and caprice of an individual, whoever he might be. It is not a fitting thing for us to say and it is not a fact. Our policy, as I have said repeatedly, has grown out of our past way of thinking and our declara-

tions and I do say that we have stuck to those declarations and to those past ways of thinking. In so far as we can stick to them in the changed circumstances, we have stuck to them and those hon. Members who think otherwise are mistaken entirely and completely. I cannot and nobody can judge himself. It is for others to see, but so far as I can understand whatever we have stood for and whatever I personally stood for in the realm of international affairs, I have stuck to them to the uttermost limit without the slightest wavering or deviation to the right or left.

Personally, I am quite clear about that. Of course, I may be wrong; others may be better judges. Whether it is relation to the type of partnership or about our remaining in the Commonwealth, I wish to stick to every word I have uttered and those who make this charge do not understand what they are talking about or what I said then or what I say now. It is amazing how some hon. Members opposite with all their eloquence, with all their fine qualities have somehow lost all knowledge to understand the changed position. They are like the religious fundamentalists who will not see to the right or left but who will only go in one direction. The world may change but their mental habits and thoughts will not change. It does not matter to them whether it is morning, noon or night. Theirs is not to reason why or say anything. They will keep repeating the same slogan, the same everything, although the world may go on changing.

Take this business of peace. We all want peace, of course but unfortunately the great powers and the great blocs of nations today, they all talk peace and yet in some great countries peace is considered a dangerous word. If you talk of peace one almost suspects your loyalty. In other countries peace is talked about so much in such tones that they deafen and they almost sound like war. After all peace is not PEACE; it is a quality; it is a way of approach it is a way of doing things; it is the objective which you want to reach. If in talking of peace, you are preparing for war, then surely, there is something wrong in the peace you talk about. Are you going to get peace by meetings and by conferences? We have plenty of peace conferences now-a-days. Perhaps some hon. Members may have seen an advertisement in England: "Join the British Navy and see the world." You might very well say: "Join the peace movement and have free trips over the world". There are conferences all the time and people are rushing backwards and forwards

free of charge. I do not know who pays. All for the sake of peace they travel, suffer extreme discomforts and go to the uttermost ends of the earth. I do not understand this and I do not think it is dignified for people to rush about like this, Indians or anybody, at the cost of other people and other countries. But is this the way you are going to have peace? Are you going to have peace by merely shouting by the roadside and the market square "Peace, Peace", and banging other peoples' heads and saying "a person who does this will be punished"?

Surely, let us function as a mature people and as a mature nation. We are not children; we are not in a debating society to match each other's forensic skill, regardless of facts and regardless of what the effect of our words is. It is very easy to talk of anti-imperialism and that kind of thing. Imperialism does exist today, but I do venture to say that Imperialism, as it exists today, is something surely and absolutely different from what it was and about which some of the hon. Members talked. Let them understand what it is. Let them also understand that there are other Imperialisms growing. Take the British Imperialism. Does any man in this House think that British Imperialism is the same thing as it was in the past?

An Hon. Member: What about Malaya?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know about Malaya and I say British imperialism flourishes in Malaya, in Africa and elsewhere but British Imperialism today is an exhausted thing. England is a country for which, I hope, this House has respect for the way it has fought its problems since the war was over, and for the courage with which it has faced them. It certainly and undoubtedly in many places does things with which this House or I do not agree. That is not the point. Let us see things in the historical perspective. To talk about the British power as it was before the last war, as if it was the same today, is either complete misunderstanding and ignorance of what is happening or trying to delude others. It is not so. Today, there are other powers, great powers, for good or ill. I repeat that for England, since those war years, I have nurtured considerable respect, because I like brave people fighting against odds and the British people have fought against great odds. That does not mean that I agree with England in this or in that. That is not the point. But to talk about British Imperialism today in the same context as of old is to talk about something which does not exist.

I will go a step further and take other countries. There are still some imperial powers, colonial powers. Undoubtedly, all these colonies should be put an end to, whether they are British or French or Dutch or Belgian or any other. I quite agree. But the position today nevertheless remains that all these colonial powers have no strength behind them. They have the strength of tradition; they have the strength of being helped by other people, and all manner of things. But, they have inherently no strength. Let us certainly by all means help in putting an end to the remaining elements of colonialism in Asia, in Africa, wherever it is. Let us understand what the real conflict is about today. Let us understand this marshalling of forces. Let us understand that if the conflict once takes place, then the whole world will be mightily changed, and whatever the change may be, the change will not be for the good because of the uttermost destruction and the rest of it. Therefore, that does not do much good. Let us analyse each problem by itself. It does not help in the slightest to repeat the slogans of yesterday, thinking that they take the place of thought and action. It is a complicated, difficult, tormented world today. All we can do is to approach these problems with great humility, not with a certitude of success—I have none—and try to help where we can, try to be good, try to put in a good word, and try to avoid evil at any rate, and try to go ahead faster where you have the chance to do so.

It is all very well to talk bravely even about small matters. It does not become people to be brave, to be melodramatic and to repeat this hon. House as if it was a meeting in the Ram Lila Grounds in Delhi. We are the Parliament of India talking about great problems; we should not put on melodramatic poses and forensic attitudes, repeating the slogans of the market place here. A high responsibility rests on us. So I beg this House to consider the foreign policy, not in terms of petty success, not in terms of failure; because the success or failure of foreign policy today of every country is involved in the success or failure of this world of ours. No man can say whether this world will survive peacefully for the next few years or will not. No man can say what will happen if disaster comes to it. It just does not matter what your policy or my policy is. When disaster comes, it comes to the world. It is true that even so, our policy should be, firstly to prevent that disaster, secondly to avoid it, and thirdly, even if it comes, to retain a position in which we are able to stop it even after it has started.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I want to be perfectly frank with this House. I should like an ever-widening area in this world, an ever-widening area of countries in Asia which decide that they will not enter the war whatever happens. I should like the countries in Asia, and other countries also.—I speak about our neighbours—I should like the countries in Asia to make it clear to those warring factions, those great countries who are so much exercised by passion against each other, that they will remain cool and, whatever happens, they will not enter the arena of warfare and that they will try at least to restrict the war to other regions and save their regions and try to save the rest. I should like also, in so far as we can, to declare ourselves and get other countries to declare against the use of these horrible modern weapons. You have heard of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb which has not exactly come into existence but which is said to be far worse. Hon. Members talked about bacteriological warfare and have expected Government, if I may say so, to function as if it was an organisation which rushes in and expresses its opinions like hon. Members do, without taking the trouble to find out exactly what to say, when to say it, and what weight to attach to anything. Governments do not function in that way. Governments weigh their words; Governments weigh the evidence. Governments do not go about condemning people or nations until they are absolutely convinced. Even when Governments feel that there is adequate evidence, they cannot do so till the proper moment comes or till they are quite satisfied about it. We should undoubtedly, and I think nations should raise their voice against any application of germ or bacteriological warfare in any country. Take something which has been used in the recent past; some kind of grenade or something like that, the Napalam bomb, a horrible thing. All these things are there.

But how are you going to put a stop to this drift towards catastrophe and disaster? It is not an easy matter. When the world is worked up by passion and prejudice, one thing I am dead certain is that you do not put an end to it by yourself joining that crowd of passionate and excited people shouting at the top of their voice. That does not help. It merely increases the din and increases the passion. It does not matter if the word you shout is peace. Even then, it increases the din and shouting. You have to be a little quiet and go about speaking to smaller voices so that it could be heard by more people. You have to try some-

how to make the people less excited. You may be convinced that you are right. But, if it is your object, not merely to show off that you are right and that you are very strong about being right, but to gain results in the world, to calm down others, to prevent them from fighting, you have to set about winning them over. You have to see about winning them over even though they are in the wrong, not by going and telling them that they are bad, very bad and that they should be punished and crushed. That is not the way of calming them and winning anybody over. I do not mean to say that we should not condemn the wrong. We should. But, I have not been taught that it is civilized behaviour among individuals, much less among nations, to go about condemning people. It is far better to talk about our own weaknesses than point out others' weaknesses and others' failings.

So, I submit that this is my approach to foreign policy. You may call it neutral or you may call it whatever you like. I do not see where neutrality comes in in this picture at all. It is not neutrality. The word neutrality is completely wrong except in times of war. There is no neutrality except when there is a war. If you think there is a war on today, we are neutral. If you think there is a cold war today, certainly we are neutral. We are not going to indulge in cold war which, if I may say so, is in some ways worse than shooting war. A shooting war is infinitely disastrous; but this is worse in the sense that it is more degraded. It lowers the standards all the time. We do not propose to join that war. It does not matter who is right and who is wrong. We will not join in this exhibition of mutual abuse.

Now, there are so many subjects which have been referred to in the course of this debate. I do not wish to get, if I may say so, rather lost in this maze of subjects, but there are one or two major aspects which I should like to put to this House. There has been repeated reference to our inclining more and more towards what is called the Anglo-American bloc. Now, it is perfectly true that our economic and some other bonds have been in the last few years far more with the United Kingdom, with the United States of America and other countries of the West. That is something that we have inherited, and unless we put an end to this and develop some other bonds, somewhere else, we have to continue them. Obviously we had to continue them. We could not live in isolation. We wanted certain things. We could not get them from elsewhere. So, in normal practice, any country would

continue those. We had to continue them; we propose to continue them. I see no reason at all except the passion and prejudice of somebody who does not like it. I see no reason at all why we should break any bond which is of advantage to us.

Now, it is true that where a country begins to depend upon another country, there is always a danger and risk. Dependence is always bad, whatever form that dependence might take, and one should be guarded about it. And yet a country, placed as India is today, and many other countries, inevitably depends on other countries for certain essential things. We are not industrialised enough. We do not produce important things. We talk about our Army, Navy and Air Force, and yet we have to depend upon other countries for the major things that an Army or an Air Force or a Navy requires. We are dependent. Hon. Members talk about a big army. It does not matter in the least how big an army you have, if you do not have the equipment for the Army. It does not matter, in the ultimate analysis, how many people you train up unless you have got the entire background for that army in the country. Well, we try to build that up as far as we can. Till we build it up, what are we to do? We have got to get the essential things from abroad from one country or other, from everywhere. It is not good to rely on any one country; and to begin with, we have got to do things which are necessary to build up basic industries in this country. Now, we have tried to get them from certain countries because it was easier to get them from there, because of our economic contacts there, because our trade and commerce are in those channels. It is all very well to suggest other channels. It is very difficult for us to build new channels overnight. We are perfectly prepared to have new channels with other countries; we are perfectly prepared to deal with the Soviet Union or other countries which can supply us with the particular goods we need and supply them with our goods. But the fact remains that it is simpler for us, easier for us, to get things from America or England or France or other countries at the moment.

Take our defence services. We have inherited them. They have been built up after a certain model. Now, we may change that model later on or not. It is a good model so far as it goes, i.e., our defence services are efficient, our army is a good one. Inevitably it has been built up in the British way, because the British started it and built it up for a large number of years. Now, do you expect us to break it up

and start building up afresh? I can understand the argument that the army should be made more and more popular. That I can understand. Let us consider it by all means, let us explore it. But, you want us to break up this magnificent fighting unit that we have got today built up on a certain model just to show off our dissatisfaction with the fact that the British built it up or that it rather approximates to the British model of an Army. That would be childish. We have to keep it going as it is. And because we have got to keep it going—we can gradually change it or make it after our own way, whatever it is,—we have to get the equipment for it. Inevitably it is easier for us to get the equipment from certain sources which can supply that equipment than it is to get entirely new types of equipment, entirely new types of arms which do not fit in even with the arms we are producing in this country. That will create all kinds of difficulties.

Some hon. Member said: Why do you get British advisers? Why not get a German or Japanese or somebody else? Well, certainly; but things are not done in that way. It is not a question of getting odd people to come and advise us in an odd manner. Here is a machine working in a particular way, and you have to work it apart from everything else. You cannot mix up people or advisers thinking on different lines, different equipment, different types of munitions, coming here and quarrelling with each other while they advise us. We must follow a single system till we change it.

The House will remember that we attained independence in a co-operative way, ultimately in a friendly way, with the British power, and I think history will record that to our credit, and to England's credit—I am not ashamed to say to England's credit also. Having done that we went step by step. The House will remember that for the first two years while we were formulating our Constitution, we were a Dominion. But from the very first day our Constituent Assembly met, we declared that our objective was a Republic. That was in December 1946. And as soon as our Constitution was completed and given effect to, we became the Republic of India. Later, the question arose about our being in the Commonwealth or not. Now, is it not a very different thing for the Republic of India which has nothing to do with England constitutionally, legally or in any other way except such normal bonds as two countries may have in the economic sphere or in the cultural sphere, whatever it may be, to decide to remain associated

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

with England or with a group of countries without the least inhibition, without the least binding factor in it? I should like hon. Members to point out to me—the hon. Member Dr. Mookerjee who was himself in the Cabinet when these questions were considered said that the time had come for us to do this or that or to leave the Commonwealth—In what way, at any time, at any moment, during the last three or four years, the fact of our being associated with the Commonwealth has affected our policy, has varied it this way or that in the slightest degree, I should like to know that. I say, therefore, it becomes purely a question, if I may say so, of acting in a sentimental huff. I must say nations do not act either on sentiment or in a huff. They act with dignity and strength, and considering what is the right course, they adopt it and go by it. Now, it is open to our country as it is to any other to be associated in an alliance with any other country. We have avoided alliances which entangle us. Dr. Lanka Sundaram referred to a number of Treaties of Friendship which we have entered into and pointed out some minor differences in phraseology. I hope hon. Members will excuse me if I do not go into these rather trivial points, because they have no importance whatsoever. So far as we are concerned, we are prepared to enter into a treaty of friendship for ever with every country in the world. It is open to us to enter into any alliance with any country. In an alliance, invariably you give something and you take something. Each country binds itself down to a certain extent. If you put it this way, it gives up the freedom of action to the extent to which it is committed by an alliance or an agreement. That is not coming in the way of the independence of that country.

Our association with the Commonwealth is rather remarkable. It does not bind ourselves down in the slightest degree in any way whatever, and it has not had that effect during these last two or three years either. It has given us certain advantages, and it has not meant any disadvantages in the slightest degree. I should like hon. Members to point out to me now or later how and in what way it has been disadvantageous, except in the way that they just do not like the look of it. I cannot help their likes and dislikes. We are concerned with the advantages to our country. And if I am told "See what is happening in Ceylon or in South Africa, they are in the Commonwealth and yet you put up with this kind of thing," then I venture to say that that is the very reason I remain there. May I explain it? I

do not want this Commonwealth to be an interfering Commonwealth. I shall say what the Commonwealth means to me. It means an occasional meeting together once a year or twice a year. It means occasional consultation and reference to each other. It means certain advantages which I get by being able to influence larger policies, apart from the normal method of doing so. Otherwise it does not come in my way at all.

Now, if I admitted the right of the Commonwealth to interfere with any country in the Commonwealth, then I cease to be in the Commonwealth at all. I am not prepared for their saying anything to me, I am not prepared to accept anything from them at all. It is very important and clear that the Commonwealth, or whatever it is, is some kind of an unsubstantial thing, unknown in any other constitution. But what we have to consider is: in the balance, is it advantageous for us or disadvantageous? I am perfectly clear in my mind that in no sense at all does it come in our way, in any policy, political, economic, peace or war. If any hon. Member seems to think that we have got some kind of common war or defence policies, allow me to assure them that they are completely mistaken. We have never discussed defence policies in the Commonwealth, either jointly or separately.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): But why did you allow the Commander-in-Chief to go to London?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Our Commander-in-Chief goes to London to take part sometimes in what are called 'military exercises'. Perhaps the hon. Member does not understand these things.

Shri Nambiar: I am prepared to be understood.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall again repeat that our system, our army's model is inevitably after the British system. It helps us as we want things from England. We have got a very big military stores department in London. We have to keep it up because the same type of things have to come to us; we have sometimes to get them through the good offices of the British War Office. Our Commander-in-Chief goes there in order to consider these matters. Our commanders do not discuss policies, ministers discuss policies. But the real thing is, if I may draw the attention of the House to this, in many matters we have inherited certain ways from the British period and we can decide either to reject them or accept them. We have

given up many; we have decided to keep many till we change them as we want to change them.

Now one of the things we have inherited, to the use of which hon. Members opposite have not objected to, and it is a sign, if I may say so, of mental subservience about which we are repeatedly told, is the English language. I have not heard any word of protest from the Opposition benches to the use of the English language. I have not heard being told that we are subservient to the Anglo-American bloc because we are using their language all the time here. I have no doubt at all that English language is the greatest thing which ties us to the Anglo-American bloc. The English language inevitably brings nearer to us their thoughts, their activities, their books, newspapers, cultural standards; while the rest of the world with which we are not acquainted linguistically is cut off from us. It is a sad thing. I should like our country, apart from developing our own language, of course, to know other languages of the world, so that we may develop and come into contact with them. And here it is a strange fact that some hon. Members opposite object to every thing, to even those things that are advantageous to us, because they happen to emanate from America or England or some country in the West, but they swallow wholesale the English language which is the real and ultimate bond which has tied us to them mentally and otherwise. I have no objection to the use of the English language, of course. I do not mean anything against it. But my argument was that we have inherited certain things, and it is not a good thing to break a good thing, to upset something that is good. We change it because we have decided, for instance, to change it gradually in our country during the next few years and to use our own language ultimately and fully. I hope English will remain even after that, not as a language we use in our official way, but because it is a great language. I hope other world languages will come in too here. That is all right. But this general approach of suspecting everything that comes from England or America is not helpful at all. I submit that it will be found that whatever step we have taken in foreign policy and many other subjects may have been wrong in a small way, but whatever step we have taken has always been measured by this rod, whether it helps India's interests and whether it helps the course of world's peace.

We have often expressed ourselves in a way that displeased the great nations and filled them with anger, but we have preferred that to going

70 P.S. D.

any other way. Hon. Members are acquainted with recent history, how great nations have changed their allegiance rather suddenly; how they have had alliances and how enemies have come together and become allies and then enemies again. Even in the course of the last great war, the Soviet Union was allied to Nazi Germany; a little later it was attacked by Nazi Germany and it fought with enormous endurance and courage against Hitler's armies. Now, I am not condemning any country; I am merely pointing out that at that time the rulers of the Soviet Union thought it right and desirable to have a close alliance with a country which previously they had condemned and which they were to fight a little later and fight to the death also. Now, I have not heard all the predecessors of the hon. Members opposite in their organisation ever criticising that as they might well have done.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: That was the Fatherland. How could they?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is one difficulty that I have to face and that is that I am liable to error. Very much so. All I can do is to try to avoid it. I think any of us is liable to error. When I am approached from the point of view of infallibility of an organisation, an idea, a country, then I rebel against that. I think any such idea may yield results for the time being, but ultimately it is fatal to the growth of a nation; it curbs the spirit and the mind and stunts the community. So judge the present day difficulties of the world not from the point of view of inevitably some country being right or wrong. Judge of each point separately: and secondly, do not indulge in vilification of any country. It does not help. Let us certainly point out, when the situation demands our pointing out, that a policy is wrong or something else should be done; but merely to go about slanging other countries does not create the atmosphere for the peace that we desire.

So I submit that so far as our policy is concerned, in spite of the fact that we deal largely with the United Kingdom or the USA—we buy our things from them and we have accepted help from them—we have not swerved at all from our policy of not aligning with any group. And, if I may say so, it is because we stuck to that policy and, in doing so, were denied help and still we stuck to that policy, that people realised and countries realised that we could not be bought by money or made to change our policy. It was then—not because we went begging for it, we have not done so at any time—that help came to us and we gladly accepted it; and we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

shall accept it all the time provided there are no strings, provided our policy is perfectly clear and above board and is not affected by it. I realise—I frankly admit—that there are always certain risks involved; not risks on paper but risks in the sense that certain obligations might be felt which might affect our policy without our knowing it. These risks are there. All I can say is that we should be wide awake and try to avoid our committing any mistake because of these risks. If the Government at all makes a mistake, this House, I am sure, will pull it up.

We have no big armies and we are no great power. The next generation will no doubt, I hope, be stronger than us, but even in the present generation which I represent, we may make many mistakes. But we have not known to bow down to threats. We have spent our lives in resistance. A word from us would have brought us many of the good things of life. We refused to give that; we preferred not to give it, not we, a few individuals, but millions in this country. So if any country imagines that we are going to change our policies and sell ourselves for a mess of pottage from any other country, it is, I submit, completely mistaken. I am quite sure in my mind that if at any time any help from abroad depends upon the slightest variation of our policy, we shall give up that help, the whole of it, and prefer starvation and everything to it. So it is in this way that we accept help and, I think, the world knows it well enough.

Now there is one other aspect to which I should like to refer to. Dr. Lanka Sundaram asked whether a Standing Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs was going to be constituted. Well, Standing Committees were constituted in the old British days in a peculiar way for a special purpose. As they were constituted, they serve no useful purpose now. I do not know if it will be appointed—that is a matter for the House to decide—but I should like to assure this House and specially the Opposition that as Minister for Foreign Affairs I should gladly welcome frequent consultations with them and talks with them about any matter appertaining to foreign affairs. We can think about it and evolve some method, not only discuss the general international position, but discuss specific problems as they arise.

Now in the larger world today we have associated ourselves with the United Nations. Our association with the United Nations does not take away

from our independence. But to a certain extent it does, if I may say so, as it does of every member country, because once you limit your field of action by joining an organisation like that, to that extent your independence is limited just as other alliances limit it. It is just a mutual limitation. It is a far greater limitation than our being vaguely associated with the Commonwealth of Nations—with England and others. There is nothing in that at all. In fact, it is almost an airy association because it is not written down on paper or Constitution or anywhere; so long as we wish to be there, we are there.

To come back to the United Nations, we associated ourselves with the United Nations because we felt that some such world organisation was essential. The League of Nations had failed. Here was another attempt under wider and perhaps better auspices and we joined it. And I think that the Charter of the United Nations is still a very fine and noble document. An hon. Member used the words "go and scrap the Charter". I do not understand that. I think the Charter is a very fine thing. But it is true and I feel it more and more that the Charter is not being lived upto; that the United Nations somehow swerved away from the basic provisions of that Charter in theory as well as in practice. And I think that is a very serious matter for us and for other countries to consider.

There was the Atlantic Pact of certain Western Atlantic countries. It is not my concern as to what certain countries do for their defence. We cannot as a Government come into the picture or object to anything that they do. But there is one aspect of that Atlantic Pact which has been coming into evidence more and more. Whether it is the formal aspect of it or just an informal one, I do not know. But it began—this community of Atlantic nations—as a defence against aggression. Well, no one can object to that. It has extended itself apparently as a defence of the colonial possessions of those nations and that is a very serious matter so far as we are concerned. It means various countries giving assurances, whether formal or informal, for the protection and maintenance of colonial rule wherever it exists. Now, to colonial rule wherever it might exist, we are, as you know, unalterably opposed.

So I wish to point that out to hon. Members of this House that we have taken a serious view of this as we took a very serious view of the denial of a discussion in the Security Council on the Tunisian question. Apart from

the merits of the Tunisian question, it is an amazing thing that nearly every country of Asia and many countries of Africa are wanting a discussion—a consideration—of the Tunisian issue, apart from the determination of it, and this is being denied and denied by two countries voting against it. Now, that is a very extraordinary state of affairs. If the whole of Asia and Africa combined cannot get a subject discussed in the Security Council because two or three great Powers object to it, well then, a time may well come when those countries of Asia and Africa might feel that they are happier in their own countries and not in the United Nations. That would be a tragic decision; because I do feel that in spite of these faults, the United Nations serve an essential purpose and if we did not have it today, undoubtedly countries will have to come together to build up something like it again. I do not want that to happen. I do attach the greatest importance to the United Nations, but I repeat the way the United Nations have swerved from its original moorings and become gradually a protector of colonialism in this indirect way is a dangerous deviation and also how slowly instead of being a great organisation for peace, some of the members have begun to think of it more and more as an organisation for waging war. Now that was not the conception behind the United Nations and though the old Charter remains, somehow facts begin to belie it more and more. We have ventured to point this out to the member countries of the United Nations and I think that our words have created some effect in their minds. I mention this to this House because inevitably the action we take from time to time, whether in regard to a particular issue, whatever it may be and whatever country might be involved, or whether it is the larger issue of world peace, is not shouted from the market place. We are a responsible Government dealing with other Governments and if we shout in public, the whole effect of our approach goes. That is not the way modern diplomacy is carried on. Because we do not shout, the hon. Members opposite might perhaps think that we remain supine; apparently their idea of diplomacy is the holding of public meetings and the passing of big resolutions—big banners and big flags of a particular type.

Yes, I mentioned just now a flag and my mind goes back to the incident that took place a few days ago. Hon. Members have referred to the putting up of the Union Jack some days ago over this Parliament building. Some two or three years ago the matter came before us and we decided that as

a matter of courtesy, on a certain day in the year, we would allow the Union Jack to be put up on one of our essential buildings like the Secretariat. It was no request to us from anybody else. It was a matter of courtesy. We gave instructions. There was no question at that time of putting up the flag on the Parliament House as the Parliament was not sitting and I must confess that when I saw the flag on the Parliament House, I was myself a little surprised because I had expected it to be on the Secretariat building and not on Parliament House. But the instructions given two years ago were not properly understood by the person in charge and the flag was put up on the Parliament House. I do feel that while it is perfectly right for us to show courtesy and to put up the Union Jack, I do believe that over Parliament House no flag but the Indian flag should be put up (*Hear, hear*) and instructions have been issued to that effect.

May I also say one word about the situation in Korea? I am not at the moment referring to the truce negotiations which have gone on for such a long time, although they are exceedingly important and one might say that the future of not only the Far East but of the world depends on what turn those negotiations take; and it seems an amazing tragedy that we should get stuck up there month after month and year after year. So far as we are concerned we have not been completely out of the picture in the sense that we have tried to keep in touch with the major parties concerned. We had special opportunities of doing so and we had played some part in this in the hope that perhaps some way of bringing about peace might be found. But I should like to say that I have been deeply concerned at certain internal developments in South Korea. We have nothing to do with South Korea. We have never recognised the Government of South Korea. So it is not our concern. Nevertheless, indirectly, because we are members of the United Nations and the United Nations is functioning in South Korea, it is a matter of concern to us what happens there. And the recent developments connected with the activities of President Syngman Rhee are not only very remarkable, but, I think, should make the United Nations and every country connected with it think of the undesirability of any association with a person like President Rhee who functions in that way. Any support of the regime of President Rhee means the support of the very things which the United Nations is supposed to stand against.

Shri Nambiar: Withdraw the medical mission.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Medical mission has not gone to President Rhee.

I am sorry that I cannot deal with the large number of matters referred to, but I hope, either in this House or elsewhere, to deal with the other matters which hon. Members have mentioned here. I am grateful for the indulgence of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order. order. The House is not rising immediately. There are these cut motions. Hon. Members ought not to rise when I am on my legs. I am really surprised that in spite of my repeated warnings and the warnings of the hon. the Speaker, hon. Members do not observe this decorum. What is the great hurry? The business of the House is not over immediately. It is not as if scorpions

were menacing them. Hon. Members must remain here. When they take interest in such important and serious matters as these, they must have the patience to remain in the House.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Some hon. Members went away because they apparently do not want to vote.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let them show greater courage.

Now, I shall put Cut Motion No. 420 by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri to the House. The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The House divided: Ayes, 72; Noes, 296.

Division No. 4]

AYES

[1.9 p.m.]

Achalu, Shri
Ajit Singh, Shri
Bahadur Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri
Basu, Shri K. K.
Boovaraghasamy, Shri
Buchhikotalah, Shri
Chakravarty, Shrimati Benu
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
Chattopadhyaya, Shri
Chaudhuri, Shri T. K.
Chowdary, Shri C. B.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
Damodaran, Shri N. P.
Das, Shri B. C.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Deo, Shri B. N.
Dehpande, Shri V. G.
Doraswamy, Shri
Gam Malludora, Shri
Girdhari Bhal, Shri
Gurupadaswamy, Shri
Hukam Singh, Shri

Jayaraman, Shri
Kachroyar, Shri
Kandassamy, Shri
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Mahata, Shri B.
Majhi, Shri Chaitan
Mangalagiri, Shri
Menon, Shri Damodara
Mishra, Pandit S. C.
Misir, Shri V.
Mookerjee, Dr. S. P.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
More, Shri S. S.
Muniswamy, Shri
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Mushar, Shri
Naidu, Shri N. R.
Nambiar, Shri
Narasimham, Shri S. V. L.
Nathani, Shri H. R.
Pandey, Dr. Natabar
Pannose, Shri
Raghabachari, Shri
Raghavalah, Shri

Ramnarayan Singh, Babu
Randaman Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri Gopala
Rao, Shri K. S.
Rao, Shri P. Subba
Rao, Shri Vittal
Reddi, Shri Madhao
Reddi, Shri Ramachandra
Reddy, Shri Eswara
Rishang Kolshing, Shri
Saha, Shri Meghnad
Shakuntala, Shrimati
Sharma, Shri Nand Lal
Shastri, Shri B. D.
Singh, Shri R. N.
Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Swamy, Shri N. B. M.
Tirvodi, Shri U. M.
Vallatharas, Shri
Veeraswami, Shri
Velayudhan, Shri
Verma, Shri Benuji
Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Abdus Satter, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achint Ram, Lala
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Prof.
Agarwal, Shri H.L.
Agrawal, Shri M.L.
Ajit Singhji, General
Akarpuri, Sardar
Alagesan, Shri
Atekar, Shri

Alva, Shri Joachim
Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari
Asthana, Shri
Badan Singh, Ch.
Balkrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Bansal, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri
Basappa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakta Darshan, Shri

Bhandari, Shri
Bhartiya, Shri S. R.
Bhargava, Pandit M. B.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C. S.
Bhawani Singh, Shri
Bhawaniji, Shri
Bheekha Bhal, Shri
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri