

very desirable. I leave it to hon. Members to make the choice of relinquishing their control.

The last point I would like to make is that big sums of money are at present being spent in order to make this a dignified organisation worthy not only of India, but to be counted among the biggest in the world. We are spending nearly Rs. 4 crores in this Five Year Plan for the development of broadcasting and a much greater sum is going to be spent in the next Five Year Plan. When Government is spending such a large amount of public money, do you think it advisable at this stage that the meticulous financial control of Parliament and the various committees and the Finance Ministry should be lifted from the organisation and it should be handed over to a corporation?

**Some Hon. Members:** No; no.

**Dr. Keskar:** You yourself are always complaining about the working of the various corporations; still you are asking for a corporation.

I am sorry that for want of time I am not able to say certain things which I would have liked to say in reply to certain charges made by hon. Members regarding the All India Radio. I shall take the opportunity of the Budget discussion to answer those charges. But I must say that I am not able to accept either the resolution or the amendments that have been proposed by my hon. friends.

**Mr. Speaker:** I may inform the hon. Minister that if he wishes to continue he need not conclude. We shall stop this debate. He may continue on the next day.

**Dr. Keskar:** I do not mind that.

**Some Hon. Members:** That would be better.

**Dr. Keskar:** The debate can be closed. The discussion on the All

India Radio will come again during the Budget debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** So he concludes.

The mover of the resolution Thakur Jugal Kishore wants to reply; so it has to be postponed to the next day.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—concl'd.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Sir, for the last two days we have been discussing in this House the President's Address. Much has been said in praise and commendation of Government's policy and a little has been said in criticism thereof. Naturally, I am grateful for the bouquets that have been thrown at us, but I am equally grateful for the criticisms made, even though I do not agree with most of them.

I am a little afraid that this House in its enthusiasm might not perhaps imagine that we are doing more than we are doing. I am particularly referring to the international sphere, because some hon. Members in their speeches seemed to make out that India was playing a very important role, almost a dominating role, in regard to some world problems. Well, let us have a more correct perspective.

I believe that we have helped, occasionally, in regard to the solution of some problems, or the relaxation or lessening of tension and I think we should take due credit for that. But let us not go beyond that. After all a country's capacity to influence events is limited by various factors. As a matter of fact, if you look at the various factors you will find that India is lacking in most of those factors, and if we have been able to influence at all any events abroad, it has been due, not obviously, to any kind of military strength or financial

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

power, but—if I may say so in all modesty—because we took a correct view of events and we understood them more correctly than others, because we were more in tune with the spirit of the age and therefore could understand those things, not because we had greater strength or power. We could not threaten anybody; nor did we want to. Therefore, I would beg the House to look at this in that perspective. I feel, after all, in so far as international policy is concerned, right or wrong, I hope, counts somewhere. But it is not the rightness of a proposition that is listened to but rather the person or the country who says so and the strength behind that country. Any international policy depends ultimately on the domestic state of affairs in that country; indeed international affairs and domestic policies have more or less to be in line; they cannot be isolated from one another and in the ultimate analysis it is the internal state of affairs of a country that enables it to speak with some strength, force and authority in the international sphere. I do not wish to indulge in invidious comparisons. But hon. Members can themselves look at India as our country is today and a number of other countries and decide for themselves how far India has not progressed in the last six or seven years more than most other countries. It is indeed due to this feeling that India is marching forward, India is a country which is firmly established and is dynamic—it is due to this idea that people in the rest of the world see India with a measure of respect.

Many hon. Members have complained that the President has not referred to this matter or that. I have often ventured to point out that the President's Address is not a long list of everything we have done and everything that we want to do. It is not a review of all our departments and ministries. The President's Address by convention deals briefly with

India's relations with other countries and with international affairs—that is, some important points in that respect—and deals briefly with the broad internal picture.

The hon. Member opposite said, at great length I believe, that the President should have spoken more about the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. Why should the President speak at great length about the Army, the Navy and the Air Force? I do not understand it. It is not that the Army, the Navy and the Air Force are not important. Let us discuss them at the right time and at the right moment. Why should the President indulge in discussing the state of affairs in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force or for the matter of that, the Indian Administrative Service or any other service? I therefore, want this House to look at things in some perspective. We are always likely to lose ourselves in the trees forgetting the big forest that we are in. Perhaps many of the difficulties of the present day in regard to international affairs are due to the fact,—if I may say so with modesty—that people have lost perspective: or, in the alternative, they have not been aware of the big changes that have come about and are coming about all over the world. We live at the present time if I may say so, in an extraordinarily revolutionary age—revolutionary in the true sense of the word that everything is in a transition and is changing rapidly. Why so, is a different matter.

You may say: it is the culmination of the industrial revolution, the crisis of the industrial revolution, of which the present symbol might be considered to be the atomic bomb or hydrogen bomb because it is all the product of the industrial revolution, development of science and technology: all the other things that have happened in the world are the resultants of the industrial revolution that had begun 200 years or a little

less, ago. We have arrived at this stage and the symbol of the age today is hydrogen bomb. We see it in terms of terrific destruction but it is something more than that; it is a symbol of enormous power that the world has got since the advent of the industrial revolution. We are having another revolution of even greater magnitude where power is being released. Whether that power will make humanity perish or survive is another matter. But there is this enormous power that has come into being. Unless one has some clear conception of this, one cannot judge the other problems because they are related to this.

Take another aspect of the world situation today: what is happening in Asia particularly and to a much lesser extent in Africa. In Africa there is a ferment. In Asia there is something much more than a ferment. Things have happened; revolutions have taken place. The whole face of things has changed and is changing. One of the dominant features of our age is the rise of Asia and it is totally immaterial whether people like it or dislike it: it is a fact. Unfortunately, people do not accept facts. Here is a fact as big and solid fact as any that you can imagine—the fact of the existence of the People's Government of China. But some countries do not recognise it. The United Nations calls the island of Formosa, China. It is an extraordinary state of affairs; geography means nothing to the United Nations nor to other countries. How can any policy which is based on deliberate avoidance of such a fact be a correct policy? Apart from that, what I was trying to point out was this: here is this Asia in the process of a tremendous revolutionary change and transition. That change and transition may take different shapes and forms in different parts. But the major point is that it has got out of its ruts. And yet you will find great countries knowing very well that political changes are taking place but not being emotionally aware of these great

changes and imagining that the old practices could be followed in the affairs and problems relating to Asia. I do not want to say or imply that Asia should, if I may say so, put herself against any other continent.

What I am trying to point out is that the first thing necessary in order to solve the problem is to understand the nature of the problem. If you do not understand the nature of the problem and if you do not know what the question is, how can you find an answer to that question? I do submit that enough attempt is not being made to understand that question. To understand, perhaps intellectually, it may be possible but not so to understand emotionally and psychologically and to have a feeling of what is happening in Asia and in Africa. It may not seem very dangerous from the point of view of foreign representatives. At present, what is happening in Africa is of the greatest interest and moment. Leave out ourselves—of course, we are there. It is of the greatest interest to any student of history and to any person who wants to see history in some perspective. And yet I am astonished at the way Africa is treated and is being treated still. What I want to say is: because, may be, of past habits, past practice or present interest—whatever it is—people are unable to view the situation as it is. We have to understand these vast new forces that have been let loose, geographical, if you like, because geography counts also; of course, political, economic, social and many other. These are functioning in the world, and in a sense you might for the moment consider the nuclear forces as the symbols of the age.

There are many consequences from this trying to understand the problem in this new context. One is, and I say so with all respect, that all our previous thinking may become out of date in the new context. All our thinking—and I say so to all our colleagues sitting here in this House,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

whether on my side or the opposite side—all our thinking may have become out of date in this nuclear age and in this age where politics and economics and everything has been affected. All the slogans that we have used in the past—there may have been some truth in them, and there may be still—but they do not exemplify the present age. We have to understand, therefore, the present situation afresh, whether in the international sphere or in our domestic sphere.

I should like to say just a few words in this context which is very important. I should like to say a few words about certain international aspects of problems we have to face and some casual remarks about our domestic policies. As the House knows, the most important question today internationally speaking, and the most dangerous one, is the situation that is being created in regard to Formosa and the offshore islands of China. The President has referred to it and he has stated that we recognise the People's Government of China, we recognise no other China, and that Chinese claims are justified according to our thinking. Some hon. Members have criticised the statement. I should like them to consider some aspects of this question.

First of all, it is patent that we cannot recognise two Chinas. We can recognise only one. In fact it is nobody's case that there are two Chinas—at any rate no country's case. And we have deliberately recognised one China because that was the real China. Obviously, Formosa is not China.

The question arises as to why we should say, or the President should say, that Chinese claims appear to be justified—Chinese, whoever has China. I will not go into ancient history, because for hundreds and hundreds of years Formosa has been part of the Chinese State, except for

a little less than half a century when the Japanese occupied it, and China always looked upon it as its own and claimed it; it was totally immaterial what government existed. This was the nationalist claim of China.

But apart from this, in Cairo, in Potsdam this was clearly stated that Formosa should go to China. It is true that China then was not governed by a Government which is predominantly Communist. Subsequently, under the Japanese surrender terms also this was stated. And—I speak from memory—in the San Francisco Treaty also some kind of reference was made to it. So that, at no time has there been any doubt cast on the fact that Formosa is part of the Chinese State. Now, what has happened in the last year or two or, if you like, three years to change that position? I am not aware of anything, unless one says one does not like the present Chinese State. That, logically or legally is no particular argument.

Therefore it follows logically—I can understand even a logical proposition being upset by war or by other settlements, they are not ruled out—but for a country which recognises the present Government of China it logically and inevitably follows that Formosa is part of that State. At the present moment it is in possession of Marshal Chiang Kai Shek supported by a Great Power. That is the fact as it exists today. What is to be done about it?

I do not propose to argue about that matter except to lay stress on this that whatever is done, one should try to negotiate a settlement peacefully. It may take a little time. Time spent is better than war which might extend and bring ruin to a large part of the world.

There is a curious division of opinion about these matters among some countries of the West. There is hardly any country which does

not recognise that the offshore islands, notably Quemoy and Matsu, are obviously and definitely parts of China. They are a few miles, five miles or ten miles, beyond the shore. And no country can tolerate an enemy sitting ten miles from their shore, bombarding them all the time. It is an intolerable situation. Therefore it is almost generally recognised that those islands should immediately be evacuated and taken possession of by the government of the mainland. But that has not been done. I do not know if that will be done. I should have thought that was an additional step that should be taken in any event. Because, it has absolutely no justification of any kind. After that, so far as Formosa and the Pescadores are concerned that matter can be taken up.

The difficulty—it is not in regard to Formosa alone but in regard to many world problems—is, I do believe, a certain hiatus between facts as they are today and the thinking.

I shall put to this House another aspect. One hears frequently about pacts and military alliances in Europe, in the Middle East, in South East Asia, elsewhere. There are in the world today two mighty Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. There are some other Great Powers today, the United Kingdom and may be one or two others; they are great in degrees. I can understand, although I would not approve of it, military alliances between Great Powers: There is some meaning. I do not understand military pacts and alliances between a huge giant of a Power and a little pigmy of a country. It has no meaning in a military sense to me. It has absolutely no sense. In this nuclear age the only countries that count, from the nuclear war point of view are those great countries which are, unfortunately, in a position to use these bombs. But to attach small countries to themselves in alliance really

simply means—and I say so with all respect to those countries—that they are becoming very much dependent on the other countries. They do not add to the defence, from the military value; it is little or nil. May be, it may be supposed to have some value from a psychological point of view. I wish to refrain from saying anything which might militate against anybody. But it applies to both groups, not to one group. First of all, in this nuclear age, to think of war itself is, I think, insanity. Because, any person who has thought about it, not every, but many, many generals whether in England or France or U.S.A. or the Soviet Union, have all said that war today is unthinkable, simply because a war is fought to achieve certain results, not to bring ruin on yourself. War, today, will bring ruin to every country involved, not only one. In this nuclear age, war is unthinkable. All the great countries appear to be clear about it and are absolutely certain that there is no country in the world which wants war. To talk about war mongers and the rest is completely wrong. There is nobody—individuals may be—no country that wants war. If that is so, what is the value of this policy of military alliances and armaments. I do not understand it. It does not logically follow from the first. I am not criticising the past for the moment. I am trying to think in terms of today, after the development of thermo-nuclear bomb, the hydrogen bomb, because, it has changed the whole picture of fighting today. What might have been good a few years ago is no longer good today.

Remember this, the fact that one country has far more bombs and the other country has less is of no great relevance. It has some relevance, of course. I believe, in phrases like one country has more and the other less, the question is that the country that has less has reached the saturation point. That means that a

{Shri Jawaharlal Nehru}

situation is reached that the country that has less, although it has less, has enough to cause infinite damage to the other country. There is no defence against these things. You merely damage or ruin the other country. When you have arrived at the stage of saturation point, you have arrived at the stage of mutual extermination. Then the only way out is to prevent, to avoid war. There is no other way. This talk about reduction of armaments etc., good as it is, does not help much. That is point No. 1.

Secondly, in this age of nuclear warfare, what does this business of having alliances and pacts mean? how does it help in a military sense; psychologically, it may. Whatever military strength a country has, I suppose it possesses. I am not asking them to disband their armies or their air forces or whatever it is. They are there. The only effect of these pacts and alliances, appears to me, to be to try to frighten, to hold a kind of threat. These threats are being thrown about on both sides of these powerful blocs: if this happens, we shall do this and destroy you; if this happens, we are ready; all this. Again, if I may say so, this business of threatening through military pacts has become rather obsolete in this nuclear age. If you threaten a power, a big one which has nuclear weapons, it is not likely to be frightened. If you threaten small countries, of course, small countries might possibly come under the threat—it is a possibility—and function through fear.

As things are today, we have reached a certain, if you like, balance—it is a very unstable balance, but a certain balance—when any kind of major aggression is likely to lead to a world war. If you like, that itself is a factor that checks. Whether aggression takes place in a small country or big,—even if it is a small

country—because it tends to upset that unstable balance, a war is likely to result. It is because of this that in the Geneva Conference, the House will remember, there was much argument about some of the Indo-China States or all of them. Either major party was afraid that if these States or some of them link up or are coerced into joining one group or the other, it will be to the disadvantage of the other. For instance, suppose countries like Laos and Cambodia were overwhelmed or drawn into the sphere of China, that frightened the other countries, big and small on the other side. On the other hand, if Laos and Cambodia became hostile to China and could be used as bases for attack on China, naturally China objected to it very strongly. What was the way out of the difficulty? Either you have war to decide who is the stronger one or you make Laos and Cambodia or all the Indo-China States more or less outside the sphere of influence, outside the alignments, outside the military pacts and alliances of the two groups, so that both could feel, at least to some extent, secure in the knowledge that these Indo-China States are not going to be used against them. There is no other way out. Because, if any party went more forward, there the other party had to check it and there came conflict, there came war. So, wisely, at Geneva, they decided more or less, though not in clear language, but more or less, that these Indo-China States should keep out of military pacts or alliances on either side; in other words, remain more or less neutralised: not quite, but more or less.

If you extend that argument, you will see that the only way to avoid conflicts is, first of all, to accept things more or less as they are; I do not say completely, because many things require change. But, broadly speaking, you must not think of changing them by war, because, war does not do what you want to do but

it does something much worse, something quite different. Secondly, by enlarging the area of peace, of countries which are not aligned to this group or that, which are friendly to both, and which do not intend joining in any war, you reduce the chances of war.

As the House knows, India has adopted a certain policy in this respect. We have followed this policy consistently during the last few years. I believe that that policy has been appreciated by many countries. Some countries of Asia, not because of us, but because of their own reasons, have followed a similar policy. Even other countries which have not followed it have begun to appreciate our policy. I should like to say this in regard to our policy. We are following it because we are convinced that it is the right policy and we would follow it even if there was no other country in the world that followed it, because, it is not a question, as some hon. Members seem to imagine, of balancing the things, joining this group or that or sitting on the hedge, but because it is a positive policy, it is the only policy which we think we should follow, and we hope others would follow. We follow that policy with conviction and faith. There is no doubt about that because there is conviction and faith in our mind. Also, because people have their conviction or their reasons for it, or because of the benefits of it not only in the present but in the possible future, they have begun to appreciate it more and more.

The House knows of some countries, some good friends in Asia like Burma, Indonesia, who have more or less been following the same policy in international affairs. Recently, the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia came here and he and I issued a statement in which reference was made to the Panch Shil five principles. That indicated how the idea is spreading. I can assure this House that even though many Governments may not publicly approve of it, people in many coun-

tries have been attracted to it and are constantly being more and more attracted to it.

In this world today there are many schools of thought and action. I cannot enumerate all of them, but I can mention a few. There is the school of strong action, as it calls itself. That, I suppose is a relic of the old days; when some small country misbehaved, a war ship or a cruiser was sent down to frighten it into submission. Strong action is all right when a very big country shows a mailed fist to a very small country, but strong action does not go very far when the other country has also got a big fist. However, there is a school of strong action. Then there is a school which talks about negotiation through strength—a good thing. Of course, if you are weak, nobody will listen to you. But, as one develops one's strength to negotiate, unfortunately the other party also goes on developing its strength. So, more or less the balance remains where it was. In fact, sometimes it becomes worse, so that, that does not help very much.

Then there is the school of—what shall I call it—learned confusion which talks very learnedly about international affairs, discusses them, delivers speeches, writes articles, but never gets out of a confused state of mind. There is a fourth school, equally prominent, of ignorant confusion. So that, between all these various schools it is a little difficult to get to know where we are, what we are, more especially when the problem relates to Asia, because most of the currents of thought today in international affairs comes from Europe and America. They are great countries there, to be respected, but the greatness of a country does not necessarily endow it with greater understanding of some other country; and the fact that Asia has changed and is changing has not wholly been grasped by many people in other continents. Therefore, in thinking of Asia more especially, there is great confusion.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Now, probably—certainly in America and in some parts of Western Europe—the world seems to be divided into two mighty camps, the Communists and the anti-Communists, and they see these two great forces in conflict with each other, and they cannot understand—either party cannot understand—how any one can be foolish enough not to line up with them. Now, that itself shows how little understanding they have of the mind of Asia. Well, I will not presume to talk of Asia, although what I say applies to many countries in Asia, but Asia is a big continent with many ways of thinking and functioning.

To take India now, we have fairly clear ideas about our political structure, about our economic structure. We function here in this Parliament and in this country under a Constitution which may be described as that of a parliamentary democracy. We have accepted it. It has not been imposed upon us. We propose to continue it. We do not intend changing it. We intend to function on the economic plane, too, in our own way. I hope to say a few words about that aspect slightly later. We, with all respect to some hon. Members opposite, have no intention to turn Communists. But, at the same time, we have no intention of being dragooned in any other direction. So that, simply we mean no ill to anybody. Every country has a right to choose its own path and go along it. We have chosen our path and we propose to go along it, and to vary it as and when we choose, not at somebody's dictates or pressure; and we are not afraid of any other country imposing its will upon us by military methods or any other methods. Anyhow, the only way is for us to build up our own strength, internal strength and other strength, which we intend doing. Meanwhile we want to be friendly with other countries. So that, our thinking and our

approach does not fit in with this great crusade of Communism or anti-crusade of Communism or anti-Communism. And many people in those countries do not understand this, the cause of this. And yet many countries of Asia have inevitably to follow this policy, unless we are much too weak to stand on our own feet. Then it is a different matter. If a country is too weak to stand on its own feet, then it seeks shelter, then it seeks help because it cannot rely upon itself. But that is an unfortunate state of affairs. But there is this for us to consider that if we seek help, there is the help which countries take in friendship which we are willing to take of course, but there is the help which countries take because they are too weak to stand on their own feet. Well, that help does not help at all, it weakens. And hence, we have been careful in this matter to make it clear always that our policies cannot be affected and there must be no strings attached to any kind of help that we get, that we would rather struggle through ourselves without any help than to have our policies affected in any way by outside pressure.

I was mentioning just now the change in Asia which is taking many forms. Presently, in the course of about seven weeks there is going to be a conference at Bandung in Indonesia—an Asian-African conference it is called—to which a number of countries, independent countries of Asia and Africa, have been invited. So far as I know, every country that has been invited is likely to attend. I am not quite sure, all the answers have not come, but I think they will all attend. Now, what this conference is going to do exactly I cannot say. I cannot, it is not up to me or even to the sponsoring countries to draw up their agenda. It is the conference that will decide. But, I was a little surprised to learn that hon. Member, Mr. Asoka Mehta, said something about this conference drawing up a vast programme for the



liberation of suppressed countries. Now, we are all for the liberation of suppressed countries. There is no doubt about that. But the idea of associating this conference with a programme of this type seems to me to misunderstand completely the purpose of this conference. Are we going to set up an agitation there? The House will remember this is an official-level conference, Governments are represented. In fact, Prime Ministers are represented. And in the conference there are completely different ideologies and political and economic structures so to say, completely different. There are countries in this Conference, which are aligned to this great Power Bloc or the other Power Bloc, and there are countries like India and Burma and Indonesia and others, which are not aligned with any. So, here we meet this curious assortment of countries of Asia and Africa, with certainly much in common, and also much not in common. It is going to be an extraordinary meeting. And yet, the mere fact of our meeting is of the highest significance. It is the first time that such a meeting is taking place. It does represent rather unconsciously, subconsciously, Asia and Africa coming to the forefront. I do not know whether this idea was present in the mind of the original sponsor of this Conference wholly, but because the proposal was made at the right time, it fitted in to the spirit of the times, and this Conference has thus got an importance of very high significance.

Obviously, a Conference of this type is hardly likely to discuss highly controversial issues as between the countries represented there. Also, if I may express my own opinion, I hope it does not function as if it was setting up a rival group to others. It is essentially an experiment, if I may use the word, in co-existence, essentially an experiment in countries of Asia and Africa,—some of which are inclined this way, and

some the other way in regard to the Power Blocs—meeting together, meeting in a friendly way, and trying to find what common ground there is to co-operate in the economic field, the cultural field or even the political field. Therefore, this is a development, which is, from the point of view not only of Asia but of the world, of great importance.

The hon. Member Shrimati Renu Chakravartty gave me the honour of quoting at some length one of my own books about democracy. I have looked up the passage, and I could tell her that by and large I agree with what I wrote 22 years ago, although I hope I have developed much since then. What I said—if I might repeat that—was that democracy, if it is confined to political democracy, and does not extend and does not become economic democracy at all, is not full democracy. And many people want to hide themselves under this cloak of political democracy, and prevent other kinds of progress. Broadly speaking, I said this. That is perfectly true. Now, something has happened in recent years, which is quite new and novel. Even in regard to political democracy, it is quite a recent event that adult suffrage has come to various countries of the West even; it is quite new. And therefore, the argument that a small restricted democracy was in favour of vested interests, while quite true, does not apply when there is adult suffrage in a country; it may apply to some extent, but not certainly to that extent.

The problem that we really have to face is whether the change we want to make, changes in the economic domain, can be brought about by the democratic method peacefully or not. Normally speaking, if democracy is not functioning in the political plane properly, then there is no way out to bring about a change, except by some kind of pressure-tactics or violence or revolution or violent revolution. But where there is this peaceful method available, and where

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

there is adult suffrage, there the question of trying to change anything by violence is not only absurd, but wholly wrong, according to my thinking, because that means that a small number of people are trying to impose their will by means of violence on a much larger number, having failed to change their opinions by the normal method of reasoning or argument. That, certainly, is not democracy, political or economic or any. Therefore, the problem before us is to have democracy—we have it politically—and to extend it in the economic field.

I think it was the hon. Member Shri Asoka Mehta possibly, who asked the question about what I have meant when I was talking about socialist pattern of society; and another respected colleague of his, Acharya Narendra Dev has also asked this question in public. I think he is completely entitled to ask that question, though I do not know if he expects from me a kind of formal and specific and detailed answer. Frankly, I am not in a position to give that detailed answer. But if you want me to say what we aim at, that is a different thing. We have called it a welfare state; certainly; I go a step further and say we aim at an egalitarian society.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy** (Mysore): What is that?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Well, I cannot go into explaining words—it means a society where economic opportunity and the rest are equal among the people.

**Shri Nambiar** (Mayuram): How to get it?

**Shri Algu Rai Shastri** (Azamgrah Dist.—East cum Ballia Dist.—West): Wait, and you will get it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** These are broad generalisations. Anybody can say them, but I say them because one has to keep some picture in view, and there is a grave danger of—as hon. Members opposite are some-

times inclined to do—imagining they have done brave deeds because they have shouted a slogan, or that they have changed society by reciting a few phrases, usually out of date phrases.

**Shri S. S. More:** What are your steps?

**Mr. Speaker:** Let him proceed.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Steps there can be; the first step is to think correctly, and not be tied down to slogans. That is important.

**Shri S. S. More:** Next step?

**The Minister of Defence Organisation** (Shri Tyagi): Try the first.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** This is a serious matter. Even the system of production, distribution, everything has changed because of the tremendous development of technology. That does not put an end to any economic doctrine or any other doctrine, but it does point out new avenues of approach. I say, all our economic thinking has to be refashioned in the nuclear age—I come back to the hydrogen bomb—in terms of nuclear power. It is not that I wish to show any lack of respect to the great thinkers of the past; they were very great thinkers, and we must profit by what they have said already. But I do submit that to apply them wholesale in the present age is complete lack of thinking and lack of judgment. Now, what we have to do, and what we aim at is this—leave out the final picture, except that the final picture is important of course, for we must know where we are going to; but in the present, the most important thing becomes one of rapid production of wealth and increasing unemployment...

**Shri K. K. Basu:** Truth has come out.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am sorry, lessening unemployment. Honourable friends opposite are satisfied by very little thinks.....(Interruptions). They have not got much to hand on to

now.....(Interruptions).

5 P.M.

It is obvious that by whatever process, whatever method you may adopt, you have to have increased production in the country and greater employment till you reach full employment. Let us forget various 'isms' and catch-phrases, good as they may be. Let us, therefore, think out how we can do it, scientifically. Before you start thinking, you have to have the data, the statistics, for it. We talk about planning. I think it is good, of course. I think we may take credit for this, that in the course of the last three or four or five years, our country has become completely planning—conscious—which is a good thing. Now, planning itself cannot be done in the air, just wishful thinking; it has to be based on data, on statistics. When you plan, you make a picture of five years hence or ten years hence. Now, you have to find out what your production will be then, what your consumption per capita will be, this, that and the other—how much food people will eat, how much your standards go up, how much more cloth people will consume or more food or more sugar or more shoes or more anything. All that has to be calculated; all that has to be provided for. So that if somebody asks 'define your socialism', well, I may give a picture, a distant picture, I have in view where there is a happy society with everybody having opportunities and nobody domineering over another and so on and so forth. That is easy enough; but it does not help, except to have a picture of what you are aiming at. The point is that in the present circumstances, we have got to increase our wealth in this country. We have got to see that distribution is just and that unevenness in this country is removed, and that ultimately we have a society where equality prevails. I am afraid that type of society is not going to come in my lifetime; let us be frank about it.

668 L.S.D.

Obviously, you cannot by magic change 360 million people in this country suddenly. In every country, in any country, it takes a long time to do it. But we can go fast and we can remove, at any rate, many of the ills and differences that exist today. The faster you go now, the more you go now, the faster you can go later.

So that the approach to these problems, having had a clear picture of what I consider the socialist pattern, should be by devising means for greater production and greater employment. Now, obviously if we think in terms of socialism, we must have ever more social control of the major means of production. There again, we are not thinking—I am speaking frankly—of land becoming the public sector. Land remains a private sector. We are thinking in terms of co-operation, a co-operative effort. But land remains there. That itself rules it out. I do not know what percentage of the country's land will remain in the private sector, though strategic controls will be there for the public good.

Then again, in regard to many other forms of activities, the private sector will have full play, but undoubtedly, the public sector—socially owned, of course—will grow more and more important—it is very important today—and it will have a dominating position and it will, by and large, control the economy of the country. That process will continue. Now, I think there is no example in history where this experiment of this type has been made in any other country. We have seen in other countries that what has happened is this. Many countries in Western Europe, the industrialised countries, developed industrially, economically. They made good progress before political democracy advanced very much. We have got instances, on the other hand, of certain countries, say, the Soviet Union, where by various revolutionary processes they industrialised their country more

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

or less rapidly in the course of thirty years or so; remember, not in five or seven years; but in the course of thirty years or so. Now, we have not got that process. Here the process through which the countries of Western Europe went is reversed. We have got political democracy of the highest order to begin with and now we have to build up our economy under that. Remember the process was the very reverse of what it was in Western Europe for 100 or 150 years. Therefore, we are facing this problem in a novel way and we want to gain economic progress and all that through these democratic, peaceful processes. I think we can do it; in fact, I am sure we can do it. I am sure not because of any theoretical argument, because there is no question of theory, but simply because I am sure of the Indian people; I am proud of them. Therefore, I think we can do it. Anyhow, it is a tremendous thing, and the only way for us is to approach this question pragmatically, keeping that picture in view, the approach, I mean, of going as fast as we can, always basing our thinking and our action on facts, statistics and science.

**Mr. Speaker:** I understand amendments Nos. 1 and 27 are to be put together.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** On a point of order, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order order. The Members will resume their seats. What is the point of order which Mr. Deshpande wants to raise?

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** The point of order is that amendments Nos. 1 and 27 are the same and amendment No. 27 includes also amendment No. 1. It includes also the prices of agricultural commodities. Therefore, amendment No. 1 should be declared out of order and both of them need not be put.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want any more explanation. The hon. Member knows that the amendments have undergone some changes and both amendments have been combined and it is one amendment. The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address fails to take note of the plight of the peasantry due to the calamitous fall in the prices of agricultural produce and the high prices of manufactured goods; and

also regret that the Address makes no reference to measures that are immediately and urgently called for, in order to check evictions and tackle the disastrous fall in the prices of agricultural commodities."

*The Lok Sabha divided : Ayes 28 ;  
Noes 192.*

## Division No. 1

## AYES

[5-10 P.M.]

Achalu, Shri  
Basu, Shri K. K.  
Biren Dutt, Shri  
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu  
Chatterjee, Shri Tushar  
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.  
Das, Shri B. C.  
Das, Shri Sarangadhar  
Deshpande, Shri V. G.  
Gupta, Shri Sadhan

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.  
Hukam Singh, Sardar  
Kelappan, Shri  
Mehta, Shri Asoka  
Mishra, Pandit S. C.  
Misra, Shri V.  
More, Shri S. S.  
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.  
Nambiar, Shri

Nayar, Shri V. P.  
Ramnarayan Singh, Babu  
Randaman Singh, Shri  
Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal  
Saha, Shri Meghnad  
Swami, Shri Sivamurthi  
Trivedi, Shri U. M.  
Veeraswamy, Shri  
Waghmare, Shri