

[Dr. D. S. Raju]

introduce a Bill to make certain provisions relating to the employment of members of the Armed Forces of the Union in the working and management of railways.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to make certain provisions relating to the employment of members of the Armed Forces of the Union in the working and management of railways."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. D. S. Raju: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

11.23½ hrs.

COAL MINES LABOUR WELFARE FUND BILL*

The Minister of Labour (Shri D. Sanjivayya): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the financing of measures for promoting the welfare of labour employed in the coal-mining industry.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the financing of measures for promoting the welfare of labour employed in the coal-mining industry."

The motion was adopted.

Shri D. Sanjivayya: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

11.24 hrs.

DISCUSSION ON U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION RE: CEASE-FIRE BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN AND RESOLUTION RE: INDIA QUITTING THE COMMONWEALTH

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the discussion under Rule 193.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Sir, I submit that the Resolution I have tabled has got a specific purpose. It was said yesterday that both this discussion and my resolution would be taken up together. I submit for your consideration, Sir, that 2½ hours may be kept separately and it may be taken over to the next session.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): Sir, I also made the suggestion yesterday, but it was curtly suppressed. I wish to submit again for your consideration and for the consideration of the Government that this discussion should be separately treated and not mixed up with all those matters which have sprung up today, because when the resolution was tabled it was a different situation and the Government accepted the second part of it after the statement of the Prime Minister was made. I, therefore, submit for your consideration that these two should be separated and time should be allotted separately for the two.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, this matter was raised yesterday and it was ultimately decided that when we discuss the cease-fire all those things also could be covered in that. Therefore, in the bulletin it was put down that the non-official business will not be taken up today.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Nothing prevents this House from re-considering the matter.

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 2, dated 24-9-1965.

Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I would only request, though it has been put down in the bulletin, that this resolution be at least moved so that we can have it first in the next session.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Manasamund): I heartily support the demand made by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad and Shri K. D. Malaviya because the importance of this Private Member's Resolution would be completely lost if it is merged with the general discussion. In view of the situation in the country and the feelings here it is but appropriate that it should be discussed separately. You may not be able to give full two and a half hours for want of time but whatever time you may be able to offer it is necessary that it should be given separately for this Resolution.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Yesterday I thought the Prime Minister also gave us to understand that there need be no special resolution in regard to that particular question because that question as well as other questions pertaining to the present situation can be discussed together.... (Interruptions).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I have to differ from my hon. friend, Professor Ranga. When a private Member gives notice of a Resolution by virtue of balloting it comes up and there is a right to discuss that matter. But the idea that we had yesterday was that only in view of the rush of time we perhaps would not be able to take it up. But you could easily find out a *via media* so that at least that Resolution could be moved today so that it can go over to the next session.

श्री मधु सिन्घे (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप कोई ऐसा रास्ता निकालिये जिससे श्री मागवत झा आजाद का जो राष्ट्र कुटम्ब सम्बन्धी प्रस्ताव है उसको भंगने से बचने में ले लिया जाये ।

Mr. Speaker: There is not much to be discussed.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): The point is that we have got limited time.

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members allow me to speak for a couple of minutes perhaps the problem will be solved. My suggestion is that we might allow Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad also to move his Resolution. Those who want to refer to it might do so. It would be considered as part of the discussion and it would be taken up next time also. Government need not reply to that part today. Government can have their time to reply to those points subsequently. So, they might not refer to it at all today; only other points would be referred to.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: But what happens to other Resolutions? It is only the third one? There are two Resolutions preceding that.

Mr. Speaker: That would create another difficulty. Unless those Members who have got priority as first and second agree to it, how can I do it? That would be my difficulty. Whose Resolutions are these? I find the first one is by Shri B. K. Das and the other by Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar. Would they agree?

Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar (Fatehpur): I may be allowed to move my Resolution.

Mr. Speaker: That would not be possible. Does Shri Das agree to the third resolution being taken up? He agrees to it. Shri Kakkar might also agree as that is the wish of the Members. So, now this Resolution would be allowed to be moved. Now Shri Alvares.

श्री बसुपाल सिंह (कैराना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो प्रधान मंत्री की राय है कि बही सब कांग्रेसी मेम्बरान की राय है । इस लिये इस प्रस्ताव

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

पर कांग्रेसी मेम्बरान को टाइटम न दिया जाये, सिर्फ मुस्लिम पार्टी के मेम्बरान को दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या उन मेम्बर साहबान का एलेक्शन भी प्रधान मंत्री अपने नाम से करवा लेंगे। उन को अपनी कांस्टिट्यून्सी में भी तो जाना है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : प्रधान मंत्री की राय में श्री कांग्रेसी मेम्बरान की राय में कोई डिफरेंस नहीं है।

Shri Alvares (Panjim): I beg to raise a discussion on the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 22nd September, 1965 on the resolution passed by the U.N. Security Council on the 20th September, 1965, calling for a cease-fire between India and Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker: He has to make his speech also. But before that, I want to fix the time limit. Hon. Members would appreciate that a large number of Members want to participate in this discussion. I would allow Shri Alvares 25 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Half an hour.

Mr. Speaker: All right, half an hour. Other members should not take more than 20 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is the House sitting beyond 4 O'Clock?

Mr. Speaker: If the House so desires. I cannot say anything now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We should sit up to 6 O'Clock.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): Sir, I have an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: When it is placed before the House, I will allow him.

Shri Alvares: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if ever there was a conflict between two countries that was doomed to failure beforehand, it was this war that Pakistan unleashed upon India for the infamous purpose of disintegrating our nation and of upsetting the secular basis of our policy. Now that the cease-fire has become a matter of fact, it is proper for us to join the deserved tribute to our armed forces who, with their signal courage, ferocious gallantry and unprecedented valour, have torn apart the foreign armour of the Pakistan armed forces—an armour that was loaned to them for an ideological war against Communism but one that ill-fitted the religious fanatics who leashed a religious war against India.

If there is one lesson that arises from this war that has now happily ended, it is that the will and the courage of the Indian people, the initiative of our armed forces, the valour shown by our jawans and generalship have outwitted infinitely superior mechanical armour and, I hope, in the years to come this lesson will be taken to heart by our people to meet any contingency that may arise in the future.

As the cease-fire has now taken place the emphasis will shift from military moves to the chessboard of political manoeuvre. The cease-fire is only a preliminary step to ensure that the retaliation of a defensive measure that this country undertook in meeting the aggression by Pakistan will have served its purpose. If we lose sight of this cardinal fact, the many sacrifices that have been made by the people and the armed forces will have been in vain. If we do not keep in mind the lessons of past years, this war will have been fought in vain.

We undertook this war, in the words of the Prime Minister, as a war of attrition to weaken the defence potential of Pakistan so that the harassment

that she has been subjecting us to during the past 18 years shall never occur again. If we have to do this, we have to ensure that in all the manners that Pakistan has committed aggression against this country, either in the garb of infiltrators, by harassment, by other methods or by open armed aggression subsequently, will be made impossible. How this possibility has to be ensured is a matter that we have to work out. But, I am sure that none of us will rely upon mere verbal guarantees for the future. For the last many years we have been accustomed to platitudes paid to India's secular democracy. Nobody has ever thought it necessary in order to guarantee us against this war of hate. Therefore if the cease-fire is to be consolidated into an enduring peace, it is necessary that countervailing measures must be undertaken to the satisfaction of our military experts.

As I said, verbal guarantees are of no use. It must be physically impossible in military terms for Pakistan ever to harass us in the manner she has done during the past 18 years and particularly since last month. Therefore after the cease-fire, when a disengagement will be taking place sooner or later, no such disengagement must take place or shall take place until militarily we are assured against this aggression from Pakistan.

Infiltrators have been sent and, though Pakistan did not admit its responsibility for them, nevertheless, the Secretary-General's report made it quite clear that these were armed Pakistani forces sent in a guise in order that they should gather in this country and in a concerted attempt, at a subsequent opportunity, try to separate Kashmir from India for the purpose of physically annexing it. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, and as far as this House should be concerned, there shall be no withdrawal to the ceasefire line of the 5th August. Militarily, it should be put beyond all doubt whatsoever that Pakistan cannot use either her influence or her war potential in order to commit aggres-

sion on India, in order to annex Kashmir, once again.

In order to discuss the cease-fire agreement, it would be necessary to understand whether Pakistan really puts faith in cease-fire. The hurried telephone conversation between President Ayub Khan and the President Johnson during the past two days has confirmed that there are some serious move underground, on some assurance to Pakistan, if the disengagement between the two forces is to take place. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has already stated that if the political solution of this problem is not found by the United Nations, Pakistan will leave the United Nations Organisation. If this happens—I am not much concerned—the United Nations will lose one physical member and perhaps China will gain another. It is possible that Pakistan may join the new anti-Indian axis of Pakistan, China and Indonesia and may also set up a parallel United Nations organisation of the new emerging forces that Indonesia has been propagating for so long. But whatever it is, it is obvious that Pakistan has not taken the cease-fire agreement in the same spirit in which India has taken and, therefore, we must be wary. We must be cautious, in our political moves.

Sir, whatever the discussion that has invested the moves in the United Nations, while the Resolution was being adopted, gives currency to the doubt that all is not well in the United Nations or all is not well with the friends that India is supposed to have. The Prime Minister said yesterday that we have to make the assessment as to who our friends are. From the discussions of the United Nations, it is possible to make a brief assessment. We have the attitude of the United States on the issue of Kashmir. It is necessary to record that the United States has never supported India's position that the accession of Kashmir is final and irrevocable. Every time, there has been an attempt to raise this issue. During the present conflict, various threats have been sent out

[Shri Alvares]

about the suspension of arms aid, etc. in order that our defence initiative may be crippled. I do not know what would have happened if that had materialised—certainly, I am not at all worried about it. But for any country, that is supposed to be friendly to us, to suggest that military and other aid will be suspended is like a grown-up person trying to tell the children that the toys with which they are playing are likely to damage each other and that they will be withdrawn. Such a suggestion which has been made by a responsible opinion in America which is humiliating to the country. We should tell American opinion, at least those who are responsible for it, that, as India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations has said, all the arms that we deployed in the present conflict are the arms paid for by the sweat of our brow and that the profits of the armament industry both in the United States and in the United Kingdom have swelled up.

Nobody has the right to tell us that we should use the arms or should not. The Defence Minister, in making a statement the other day in the House, said categorically that any arms given to us for defence against China would not be used against Pakistan. In spite of that sacred statement made by the Defence Minister, some American opinion still has the temerity to say that they would stop arms aid, etc., so that this war can come to an automatic stop by our defence being crippled.

Let us take the question of the attitude of U.K. It is a senior member of the Commonwealth; it is its Leader. Like the United States, the United Kingdom has always shown a partiality for Pakistan. It has, like the United States, never accepted India's position in regard to Kashmir's final and irrevocable accession to India. In every dispute it has raised this question. Therefore, in this present conflict it is surprising that it has shown its attitude of partiality towards Pakistan; not merely that, there was also a feeling which was growing freely that,

if the ultimatum of the Chinese grew in dimensions against India, that threat of China to India would automatically put a stop to the war and thus save Pakistan. This cynical attitude of wanting the Chinese threat against India to grow in dimensions in order to make India divert her armed forces from the Pakistani war is cynical, if I may say the least. Therefore, we have to find out whether the United Kingdom is a real friend of India and when it can really remain at least impartial in its attitude. As our representative, Shri Chagla, said in the United Nations, there cannot be impartiality in accepting the guilt of an aggressor; a judge has taken sides to make a decision. In this war, the report of Gen. Nimmo and the report of the U.N. Secretary-General, Mr. U Thant, made it clear that Pakistan was an aggressor and Pakistan is the aggressor during the last eighteen years for the third time now. What has the United Kingdom, in whose Commonwealth of Nations we are today supposed to grow and flourish and provided opportunities for growth, if not peace, done to put an end to this conflict? The United Kingdom could at least make an impartial assessment and on the basis of the Secretary-General's report name Pakistan an aggressor. Therefore, with all this background of the United Kingdom and its relations with India, particularly in the context of Indo-Pakistan relations, the question that arises is: what is the advantage or the relevance of our membership of the Commonwealth. If it means something, it must be of advantage to us. If we are members, and it means our not having any advantage at the time of crisis, then it is relevant to question the continuance of our membership. In the alternative, we may pose this question; if Britain, because of its attitude of partiality in the last eighteen years and in other respects, is not in a position to maintain its leadership of the Commonwealth, why not the Asian and African nations be given the opportunity to ask Britain to step down from the hereditary leader-

ship of this Commonwealth and for any of the new nations of Asia and Africa, who are members of the Commonwealth, to take on the leadership of this great body. These two suggestions are for the consideration of the House. It is relevant to question to advantages of our continued membership in the Commonwealth; or in the alternative that Britain should be asked to step down because of her incompetence in dealing with important matters, and any other member from the Asian or African region should be asked to assume the leadership of the Commonwealth. I am sure that if this latter suggestion at least is accepted it will bring a new dimension and a new orientation to the spirit of the Commonwealth. Therefore, I hope that the Prime Minister and his Government will give this suggestion their utmost consideration.

There is also the attitude of Soviet Russia. It has been a painful surprise that the Soviet Government have shifted their attitude from one of unconditional support to India in the Kashmir dispute and have now co-operated with the other great Powers in de-freezing this issue at the United Nations level. The House remembers very well that on every single occasion when the issue of Kashmir's accession to India was raised, the Soviet Government or the Soviet representative vetoed all such resolutions on the ground that that accession was final and irrevocable. But, for some time now, and particularly during the discussion on the UN resolution calling for the cease-fire, the Russian Government have registered a distinct shift in their policy and agreed that on the issue of Kashmir, the political issue underlying the present conflict shall be settled finally. Does it not mean that where once Russia vetoed all references to Kashmir, she has now de-frozen that issue and brought it up as a live problem for discussion?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): How can my hon. friend say that?

Shri Alvares: Mr. hon. friend will have his chance to reply. Let him not interrupt me now. Russia has now de-frozen that issue and made it live for solution in the context of the present conflict.

We are indebted to all the main Powers for their generosity and co-operation in this very international context that we live in, but we cannot help feeling pain and surprise that Russia whose friendship with India has stood the test of time should at this hour of crisis make a shift in her policy and co-operate with the great Powers in hedging this entire resolution with a solution of the Kashmir dispute on which we have said to the world loudly and often before that the accession of Kashmir to India is final and irrevocable.

There are then, if not in the United Nations, the moves made by China in this context. We cannot and should not at any stage in the future make a wrong assessment of the danger of Chinese aggression on India. I have no doubt in my own mind that this danger is ever present. I have no doubt that China at some stage, because of the compulsions of communist philosophy, will be led to commit aggression on India once again. But in this present context, in the context of the Indo-Pakistan conflict, China, I, think, like the other European powers was mainly concerned with saving Pakistan, for who can deny that whatever the great Powers did, particularly the USA, the UK and Russia was similar to what the Chinese did in their own particular way by giving an ultimatum to India, and thereby stampeding the UN in the resolution on cease-fire before the date and time of that ultimatum expired? I think that it was the cleverest move of the whole episode where along with the USA, the UK and Russia, China also came forward to save Pakistan from an ignominious defeat.

We are grateful also to some of the countries of the Middle East who

[Shri Alvares]

supported India and thereby proved that our friendship with them is nothing which is merely altruistic but one of a common endeavour in international relations. But at this stage, the House should convey its greetings to the small and brave nation, Malaysia, which, in spite of being confronted by China and Indonesia, braved the entire eastern world and stood by India in this hour of trial. Malaysia is a small nation, but of the courage of its conviction, of its courage to stand by India in this hour of trial, there can be no question, and I am sure the House will join me in emphasising that our relations with Malaysia, that our friendship with Malaysia, requires special consideration.

It is now time to ask one question: why are the great powers interested in saving Pakistan? Is there an attempt to play the game of balance of power in Asia, as they had played it in Europe for the past many centuries? Are the US, UK and Russia at the present moment interested in some new alignment or balance so that they can get Pakistan along with them, and in the process if they have to incur the ire of India, it does not matter? All the moves made by the US, UK and Russia suggest that in their efforts to save Pakistan from defeat, they want to draw Pakistan into their own orbit, wean away Pakistan from China which is endangering their own interest in this area. As far as my assessment goes, it is curious that both the US and UK have now agreed to let Russia handle this dispute on their behalf. Having failed in the past 18 years to convince either India or Pakistan and bring about a settlement of the dispute, they have now agreed to let Russia take the initiative. That is the only meaning of the invitation of the Russian Prime Minister to the Governments of India and Pakistan to come to Tashkent to discuss this issue in Russian territory. I understand that the Prime Minister of our coun-

try has agreed. There is no harm in discussing issues to come to a final settlement. But let us repeat, once again, that in whatever discussion that takes place hereafter, as far as cease-fire is concerned, as far as the question of subsequent withdrawal is concerned, there shall not be any settlement of this issue, there must be no disengagement at all from our positions so long as our military experts are not satisfied that physically we have made it impossible for Pakistan to send its infiltrators and armed personnel for the nefarious purpose for which it did last time.

The question is often asked: are not international guarantees sufficient? What has the United Nations, the highest tribunal in this world, done about international guarantees? Twice before, the UN had characterised Pakistan as the aggressor. When characterising Pakistan as the aggressor in 1949, did the UN make any move to make Pakistan vacate the aggression in occupied Kashmir? Again, when the report of Gen. Nimmo and the Report of the UN Secretary-General, U Thant, once again characterised Pakistan as the aggressor this time, what did the UN do to get the aggression vacated except to equate the aggressor, and the aggrieved (that is India) and to ask them to cease fire? There is no further solution. Are international guarantees of any value in this context? Why has India not the right in this cease-fire agreement to demand military guarantees which are the only final sanction against intervention? Does not America invoke the Monroe Doctrine in the western hemisphere and say that no nation outside that hemisphere, shall intervene or interfere with the affairs of the Americas? Did not Russia intervene in Hungary on the ground of her security? If Russia and the US can go so far as to prevent the intervention or interference of nations in their hemisphere or sphere of influence in order to safeguard their own security, surely this country has the right to ask for military guarantees

as far as the security and inviolability of its own frontiers are concerned.

Therefore, we have come to a position where the UN cannot give us any guarantee, where international guarantees are not of much relevance. Therefore, in this cease-fire, it is only military security that in the last analysis can give us that security for which our armed forces fought so well.

Hence, I suggest that in all these issues there is need to be vigilant, vigilant not merely in military matters, but vigilant on the international front and on the home front. On military matters, as I said, the lesson has been learnt that unless we are self-sufficient, unless our indigenous production can give us all that we need, there is no final guarantee.

Secondly, as far as international relations are concerned, today they are in the melting pot. Our diplomatic initiative has been weak and faulty. It is necessary to apply the corrective. I do not know what the committee which was appointed by the Foreign Minister to go into the working of our foreign service has done or is going to do. But this is certain, that both at the UN and in diplomacy elsewhere, we have miserably failed both in presenting our case and in exposing the vile ambitions of Pakistan. At least, it could have been possible for us to present our case creditably. Why is it that prestigious papers like the *New Statesman* have misunderstood our decision not to take Lahore and Sialkot in order to save the civilian population. They characterise this decision as an indication of military weakness, seeking shelter on humanitarian grounds to cover up our military weakness. Cannot our diplomats have presented this case squarely to whoever needs to be informed about our objectives? Cannot our diplomats have, with the sense of fairness, with the sense of reasonableness of foreign observers, impressed on them that our decision not to invest these cities with military rule was not due to our mili-

tary weakness but was born out of our desire to save the civilian population from the ravages of war? We are not like Pakistan. In the grey hours between the acceptance of the cease-fire and actual implementation, the Pakistani armed forces had sneaked across the border and rained destruction upon our civilian population.

Shri P. K. Doo (Kalahandi): Even after that.

Shri Alvares: Such an act of inhumanity has never been witnessed anywhere in history. But our desire not to invest civilian populations with military rule has been misunderstood as a sign of military weakness. What have our diplomats done in the foreign capitals to convince those people about our ideas and attitudes? What have they done to convey these things to foreign observers?

Therefore, I want to ask the Prime Minister to pay special attention to this problem, so that at least on the international level our case does not go by default.

There remains the question of the home front. I will not take much time on that. I have said in my introductory remarks that it is the indomitable will of this nation to preserve Kashmir that has finally acceded to India, and it is the secular basis of our policy that have impelled us to make the sacrifice. But this will not be sufficient if the Government is not aware of, and does not implement, the policy that people want. You cannot ask the people to make sacrifice for a war of defence and at the same time neglect the home front on the plea that the country's effort must be defence-oriented. On the food front, on the front of security, on the front of egalitarianism, it is a cataclysm like a war that must set about processes that bring about new changes in society, and if we have to win the peace as we have to win the war, the Government must pay as much as attention to military matters as

[Shri Alvarez]

to internal matters, matters on the home and civilian front.

12 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Azad may also move his resolution.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that India should quit the Commonwealth of Nations."

I am fully conscious of the import of the resolution that I am introducing in the House, but before speaking on it, I would make some remarks on the discussion raised by Shri Alvarez.

I congratulate the Prime Minister on calling the Pakistani bluff and deciding to meet the aggression. We are proud today that we can walk with our heads high and chest out, because of the glorious part that our jawans, army and airmen have played in the hostility with Pakistan. Though the guns have been silenced and the planes have returned to their bases, yet the rattling of the Pakistani politicians is still heard all round. Even this morning, Pakistan Radio, under the pseudo name of Azad Kashmir Radio, said that they would continue their fight, that their infiltrators would continue to invade Kashmir, India's part of Kashmir. Therefore, I feel that though the Security Council has asked us, and we have ceased fire, the other party, the aggressor, has not yet ceased fire; actually, they are still on with the fight. You have seen in this House, after the Question Hour, the anxiety of Members at Pakistan still making aggression on our country. They are firing rockets in Jodhpur, bombing, after cease-fire, Amritsar, Ferozepur etc., and all through the border they are threatening us. Therefore, it is very clear that in this hour we must tell them very pointedly our stand: we should also remind the Security Council that the effort that it has made for the last

17 years has been only to imprison justice, to put the aggressor and the aggressed then and even now on the same footing. Though we have agreed to a cease-fire, I remind them of the nation's will. The Prime Minister conveyed to U Thant in Delhi the two conditions, namely that Kashmir is an integral part of India and that there can be no question of our going back to the old cease-fire line in our own country.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): No cease-fire line.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Therefore, there is no question of our going back to 5th August or anything like that.

Secondly, I put emphasis on the date 5th August. Fifth August is the date when Pakistan started aggression, aggression with armed personnel, not in army dress but in plain dress. It was an aggression much worse than the aggression of an army because that can be seen by the naked eye by all the world. This aggression may for some time befool the world, but I wonder how long it can fool the USA; it will befool the UK for all time to come, I am sure.

Therefore, I say on that part of the discussion, that come what may, this nation, now aroused to defend its sovereignty, dignity and honour, shall not be bound by the other part of the Security Council's resolution. The only political decision that has to be made now is this, that Pakistan must vacate aggression in occupied Kashmir. Therefore, if there is any political question to be discussed in the Security Council, it is only this. The Security Council, if it has the guts or the strength must force Pakistan, the aggressor, to quit that part of Kashmir where it committed aggression eighteen years back. These are my comments on that part of the discussion.

Coming to my resolution, I am sorry that I have to move it. I

would be happy if some of my friends move a substitute resolution to say that the UK should be expelled from the Commonwealth. That will be the only thing that I shall accept.

Mr. Speaker: I have received one.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: That is fine. That will be the only thing that I can accept as an amendment to my resolution.

We remember with what aspirations, with what dreams, with what hopes, our late beloved Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, wanted a comity of nations, an ideal one in which countries could forget and forgive their past and sit together for the common good. I do not want to remind the House of all the exploitations, *zulum*, loot, plunder and what not that the British imperialists committed in this country. The late leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and Mahatma Gandhi, the father of the nation, asked us to forget, and we forgot them, we forgot all that *zulum* and plunder in our country. We wanted to write a new chapter in history in our country after 1947, but what happened after 1947?

The Britishers went out of India, but they divided this country into Pakistan and Hindustan.

An hon. Member: We accepted it.

Shri. Bhagwat Jha Azad: Even for a moment they were not impelled by good motives, but let us presume that they were impelled by good motives, but what have we seen afterwards? We have seen afterwards that it was only a convenient stick that the then Labour Government made in the shape of Pakistan always to beat India, whenever the occasion came. I can show how in the last 18 years the British imperialists—whether it is the blue-eyed

conservatives, whether it is Labour or whether it is Liberal—have all alike been hostile to this country, have always supported Pakistan against us. Both of us are Members of the Commonwealth, both of us have aspirations about the Commonwealth, but why did the Britishers on all occasions try their best to beat us and help Pakistan? The reasons are very obvious. Therefore, for the present I do not go into the past and am only coming to what has happened just now.

It is known to the wide world that Pakistan started aggression on India on 5th August. Day in and day out that aggression continued, and India was forced to move in self-defence when on 1st September naked aggression was committed in the Chhamb-Jaurion part of our country. I ask Mr. Wilson and the Labour Government, the Conservatives and the Liberals, I ask the British people, the British press, the so-called independent press, I ask the BBC, whether they did not know that naked aggression on India had been committed on 1st September, and in a dubious form from 5th August. I ask Mr. Wilson: even though he is not a military man, did he not know that rockets were fired on Amritsar, that on 2nd September, 3rd, 4th and 5th September, the Pakistan army, coupled with the so called invincible Pattons, which have now proved their uselessness, entered our country? Why? to cut off Akhaur and Kashmir from the rest of India. Nothing happened. Mr. Wilson did not denounce the aggression. Mr. Wilson did not even say a word of caution, warning or advice to Pakistan. But when on 6th September, the Indian army in self-defence moved, the paralysed conscience of Mr. Wilson and his tied tongue were suddenly roused and he said that India had committed naked aggression.

Who is Mr. Wilson, is he our boss to say this to India which has given

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

prestige to the Commonwealth? But for India what was the Commonwealth? The late Jawaharlal Nehru gave birth to this Commonwealth, the late Jawaharlal Nehru made this Commonwealth what it is, and this British nation of shopkeepers got all the prestige from us and used this prestige against us every time, to beat us at the time of aggression. Therefore, I ask Mr. Wilson, this question: would he kindly reply to this partner in the Commonwealth? He has no voice. He could not send a message to the Prime Minister congratulating him that he has done a good thing in agreeing to the cease-fire. President Johnson did it, Mr. Kosygin did it, all the nations have done it, but Mr. Wilson had no voice. Mr. Speaker, I would say that Mr. Wilson did not stop there. The Labour government did not stop there. They proceeded further and immediately the next day they put an embargo on war materials which we needed so badly for the defence of this land. Not only did the government put an embargo. Mr. Wilson forced the private British companies not to deliver the two squadrons of hunter hawks which they were under an obligation to supply us according to signed contracts. Is it national honour or national morality not to honour a contract? The pettiness and meanness of the British Government stand more exposed when it is found that a ship on the high seas, in mid-ocean carrying £2,000 worth of spare parts for the radios was stopped and was not allowed to proceed to India. I can quote more instances like that. I have got an entire book here, which shows the history of the British Press and the Wilson government's policy; I can show what they talked and how they behaved during this war. The aggressor Pakistan, was the blue eyed boy of the British imperialists while they called India the aggressor. How petty and mean they are. They did not stop with these things. Leave aside the war materials. We know it now. No nation including Pakistan and

China had played so foul towards our nation as Mr. Wilson and his labour Government. I can understand China and Pakistan because they are enemies. I can face them. This British imperialist government of Mr. Wilson always tried to befriend India and when the time came, when this nation was engaged in repelling naked aggression they stabbed us in the back. Just as history will condemn aggression, history will condemn this naked betrayal, this naked stabbing of the Indian people in the back when they were in the thick of the war.

I would now come to the other part of the story. I have read much about Mr. Wilson. He has written long articles and also made long speeches. He says that he wants to befriend the peoples of the ex-colonies, British empires. He says he is a democrat; he is opposed to dictatorship and religious bigotry and theocratic obscurantism. He has made long speeches and I wasted my time on reading some of them. Did he mean what he said? If he really meant them, if he really opposed dictatorship and theocratic obscurantism, why did he support Pakistan's theocratic dictatorship? Is it anything else? Is it not the anti-thesis of what Mr. Wilson has been trying to tell us all the time? Why should he stand up against India which stands for all that he stands for, for a democracy, a socialist democracy? Mr. Wilson leads a socialist government in his country. I want to remind Mr. Wilson and his labour government what his teacher Prof. Laski has said:

"The French revolution ended an era of despotism and made the right to vote as essential for a very civilised society as air to breathe and food to eat."

He condemned all societies where such a right was denied as an outgrowth of decadent and moribund mediavalism. I want Mr. Wilson and his friends in his cabinet to reply. Is there any right to vote today in Pakistan, as Prof. Laski, his guru had told him? No. Then why does he defend the despotism of Rawalpindi. As if this was not enough, he mobilised the Press and all the other media of publication to support the Pakistani aggression and describe Indian action as invasion. All the BBC broadcasts were invariably loaded against India. I have before me the opinions of the British press and I could go on quoting their hostile behaviour towards India who is a victim of aggression and appreciation of Pakistan who is an aggressor. I will give only two or three, Mr. Speaker, and no more. The liberal paper *Guardian* in its editorial on 7th September, "India persists on the road to ruin; Indians have again put themselves in the wrong by crossing the international boundary" and compares the Pak aggression in Jammu and Kashmir to our liberation of Goa from Portugal tyranny. *The Daily Telegraph* pleads for the concept of restricted self-determination offering the Kashmiris independence from India under some form of international or Commonwealth safeguards. This is what they really want. They want Kashmir to be an international jumping ground for those imperialists to attack India or the USSR our friends or others whomsoever they like, whenever they like. The British newspapers have revived the old plea of independent Kashmir, guaranteed by the United Nations. They advocate that Moslem Kashmir should go to Islamic Pakistan although the first preference is for an independent Kashmir. Now, I would come to one more such British paper, that is the left wing liberal British paper known as the *New Statesman* of which the present British High Commissioner in India, Mr. Freeman was editor for a long time. I am sorry I cannot bring that book where they have pointed a

cartoon telling us about non-violence and all that. I wish I could have shown that cartoon showing naked children. But their idea is clear from what they have written.

"Praising the might of Pakistan Victor Anand explained the reasons for its rise and wrote—first, the total support that President Ayub has been given by his armed forces, the morale of the ranks has risen consistently and if this is any criterion then the claims that one Pakistan soldier is worth three Indians is no exaggeration."

I ask the ex-editor, the present editor and Mr. Wilson to see what has been the result.

Shri Daji (Indore): Even one Patton tank is not equal to three soldiers.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: It goes on:

"From what I can find out here it is my belief that it is upto Britain and Americans to have a fresh look at the Kashmir dispute—not India or Pakistan. So far India has been given a fair innings, and, on the available evidence, has made a pretty poor job of it. Is it too much to ask that Pakistan be allowed a say?"

They have given us a long innings and we have done badly; This is what the *New Statesman* says, a liberal paper, of which the present High Commissioner was the editor and the great Prime Minister, Wilson, supporter. He wants America and Britain to have a fresh look at Kashmir. What would he say if we say this about Wales, Scotland, Ulster and North Ireland? I now come to the more sordid story of the Wilson government and the British Press. Not satisfied with this, they have systematically and methodically tried to minimise the Chinese danger on

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

the Sino-Indian frontier. I would have liked to quote the kind of things the British people, their press had said. They say that the danger of China is not much. That is what they plead with the USA. It is just possible that China wants to straighten up its frontier near Sikkim. That is what they say. They suggest to America that this danger is not much. Maybe, there may be a minor skirmish! In small matters, small skirmishes, India will take care of itself. Now, this is what they say. Our Prime Minister has said very clearly, come what may, this nation shall fight for its honour. We are not holding and we cannot hold, a begging bowl for Washington or London or anywhere. Whatever we have asked, supersonics and other things, they never gave them free; we did not beg from them. Whatever we have got we have got after due payment. Thanks to our Gnats, thanks to our ordnance factories, thanks to our Jawans who have now shown how worthless the Patton tanks are, how worthless the Sabre Jets are, the imperialist countries must have known by now how these mightiest weapons in the imperialist war are so worthless and how our nation has fought.

Now, the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Stewart, when asked by Pressmen, "how do you feel about the Chinese danger?" replied—I should rather quote him. He wanted the Chinese to pressurise India or to put India on her knees to surrender its sovereignty to Pakistan, the blue-boys of the British. In answer to a question, he said: "It is possible that the realisation of the danger in this development may make people more eager, more anxious, to get a settlement." This is the reply of the British Foreign Secretary, to a question, "how do you feel about the Chinese danger?"

It is not only Indians, but a Sino-ologist, Mr. Victor Zorza, who said "that Britain's silence and Mr. Rusk's off-the-cuffs remark have given Peking the impression that the

western powers do not want to get involved in the Indo-Pakistani conflict even in the event of Chinese intervention." That is how the British Government and the British people have systematically tried to see that the Chinese invasion should be there and we should be forced on our knees to surrender our sovereignty to Pakistan, the aggressor. This is the behaviour of the Commonwealth's senior partner, who is supposed to be the Head of the Commonwealth. Everytime I go there, they ask us to drink to the toast which is proposed, not to our President, but to their Head, the Head of the Commonwealth. Everytime, we go there that is what is happening; we are a junior partner; we are subject to them; we are under them; we are subordinate to them!

Secondly, I will say that this attitude of the British towards Pakistan is not only for Pakistan but for itself too. It is very well known to the world that Americans are anti-Chinese. It is known to the world that the British and the British Government are pro-Chinese. Why? Because their eyes are on the vast potentialities of trade in the big Chinese land. Nothing more can be expected from a nation of this sort, a nation of shopkeepers. I have just a word for my United States friends too. We have seen that they have tried to dissociate themselves from this. But I want to tell them. Let the two nations, India and the United States, have their own relations and independent relation on independent level. Why do you want to route your foreign relations with India through the dubious and selfish foreign office of petty islanders? Therefore, try to have your own independent foreign relations with this country and not try to route them through the selfish islanders. Hence, I would say that in the Security Council itself, they tried to put such a nasty and bad draft. I hope Shri Chaglia could speak that out—how the British tried to have a

big draft, invoking article 39 and 40, and trying to gag us. But I should like to point out that the Soviet Union did not use the veto; it is true. But it certainly said that they (Russians) shall not allow this distinction to be made, when the British and others wanted this distinction—"that the attack on West Punjab is an aggression from India and the attack from Pakistan on Kashmir is not an aggression". This was the distinction to be made in the Security Council. I hope that my hon. friends would realise how the Soviet Union, at that critical juncture, did not allow that draft to go through, and therefore they are our friends. I thank the Prime Minister—this House also agrees—for having accepted the good offices offered to us by Mr. Kosygin. Let Mr. Kosygin persuade this worst child of the United Nations, Pakistan, to go and sit round the table. We would be too willing to go there and do that.

I thank them. I should also thank wholeheartedly the country of Malaysia, a nation that is small, but yet large in its heart. Malaysia is now facing the Indonesian paratroopers. Nine months before, I was in Malaysia, in Kuala Lumpur, and I knew how these Indonesian imperialists were trying to destroy that beautiful nation. I thank Malaysia, which out of her own experience, has offered us support in our cause.

I now beg of our Prime Minister—I hope he knows the mind of the House, and this House, by clappings says that India should sever its connection with the Commonwealth. This House says it. Let the Prime Minister take courage, ask the friends in the Commonwealth, to expel this naughty member of the Commonwealth, Britain, from the Commonwealth of Nations. If he can do that, I am prepared to withdraw my resolution, but let him promise that he would try to expel it. This is the time to do that. Of course, our agonies are there. We feel very much distressed by their manner.

As I said, I moved this resolution on the ground that circumstances have proved beyond doubt that this artificial link must go. The circumstances have proved beyond doubt that they are hostile to us, the British. The British divided India; divided Ireland; they tried to divide the United States of America in Lincoln's war; it encourages racialism in British Guiana and in South Africa and she tried to impose white rule on South Rhodesia and tried racialism in its own country. It should now be decided to go out of the Commonwealth, and you should say, "Thank you very much; nothing doing with you."

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I shall finish in two minutes. I want to remind this House of one thing. The British, who have divided all these countries and have till now also played this racialism in its own country, have now done one thing: their number here has gone two and a half times more, but they have put a restriction on our entry there. It is, therefore, time that the Prime Minister took courage like Nasser to nationalise all the British assets in this country. We should start with the nationalisation of the tea plantations, the jute plantations and Burmah-Shell. I ask the Prime Minister to stop that agency—Reuters—to whom the All India Radio is giving a big chunk, and have our own organisation—PTI and others—to have a free and impartial collection and dissemination of news and other matters. I ask the Prime Minister to take us out of the shameful association of an imperialist nation which has outraged us and is still all around us.

I therefore beg of the House to accept this resolution, with only one hope—if they want, let them accept a suitable substitute motion—that the Britishers, the British people and the British Government should be expelled from the comity of nations of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that India should quit the Commonwealth of Nations."

Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner): Sir, I have my resolution, but it has not been circulated.

Mr. Speaker: He may move it in due course. The substitute motions may now be moved.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that in view of the present international situation the Government should immediately review the desirability or otherwise of continuing to be a member of the Commonwealth of Nations." (1)

Shri Yashpal Singh: I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

before "This House" insert—

"In view of Britain's attitude in the present Indo-Pak conflict." (2)

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that the Government should reconsider the question of the desirability and the utility of India continuing to be a member of the Commonwealth of Nations." (3)

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Motihari): I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that as it is against the interests of

India to continue to be a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, she should quit the Commonwealth immediately." (4)

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Barh): I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House deplores the attitude taken by the Government of U.K., in regard to Pakistan's aggression on India and considers that the time has come to review India's position in the Commonwealth and the advisability of continuing as a partner of this association of nations." (5)

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated-Anglo-Indians): I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of the opinion that Government should reconsider India's membership of the Commonwealth when a calmer atmosphere prevails." (6)

Shri Karni Singhji: That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that in view of Britain partisan attitude towards Pakistan in the present Indo-Pakistan conflict in the face of obvious facts, it is high time India considered the severance of her ties with the Commonwealth." (7)

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

add at the end—

"or alternatively recommends to the British Commonwealth to ex-

pel the U.K. Government from the Commonwealth".

Shri P. K. Deo: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we, the Members of the Swatantra Party, welcome the cessation of hostilities. I congratulate the Prime Minister on his unique determination and his statesmanship in accepting the proposals of the Security Council and for having agreed to a simple cease-fire. I congratulate the Prime Minister on his timely call to the various opposition parties for their support. The way in which spontaneous support came from all sections of the people is really unprecedented. The entire nation stood as a man behind him, because we know our objective is very clear. We have no territorial ambition. We have no axe to grind. We mean Pakistan all well. As pointed out by my leader our objective is limited. We do not want to conquer Pakistan. We want to teach Pakistan a very good lesson, how she should behave with her neighbours.

Mr. Speaker: This discussion will continue upto 4-30 P.M. when the Prime Minister will reply.

12.31 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

Shri P. K. Deo: Sir, I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Chagla for having put up India's case very ably and properly in the Security Council.

It is a good thing that 22 days of grim fight and full-scale war has come to an end. We have seen that most of the ground and air forces of both the countries went into full operation. Pakistan even used its navy to bombard our Saurashtra coast and the casualties were mostly civilian. We saw many precious lives being lost. Civilians, peasants, children, women, sick and wounded have been very barbarously bombed by the Pakistani bombers. They used the Napalm bomb, which is most inhuman and barbaric. They did not stop bombing even after the cease-fire has been implemented. All these go to prove the sinister

designs of Pakistan against India. I deem it a privilege to join with the entire nation to pay my tribute for the supreme sacrifice, devotion to duty, courage and determination and leadership, shown by our jawans. The bravery and supreme sacrifice of persons like Havildar Abdul Hamid, Lt. Col. H. L. Mehta and Lt. Col. Ajit Singh and others will be written in golden letters in the annals of this country.

The Swatantra Party has all along stood behind the Prime Minister. On more than one occasion, we have suggested that—and we still stand by it—that the right to defend is the right to retaliate, even if we may have to cross the frontier and face the enemy in his own land, whether it is Vietnam or Punjab. High hopes had been raised in this country that this Kashmir question will be solved once for all and the nation was prepared for the supreme sacrifice. Even though we did not achieve, that objective, it is a fact that our jawans have broken the teeth of the Pakistan army and more or less brought Pakistan to its knees. Today the Indian tricolour is flying near the Gate of Lahore and Sialkot. We have captured very very strategic posts in Kashmir. These are our significant achievements. Regarding the clash of tanks that took place, never in recent years has such a thing happened, except in El Alamein in the second World War. Our jawans have proved their mettle in Kasur, Pasrur and Burki by their significant victory over Pakistan.

In this regard, I would like to quote what my leader the tallest living Indian today—Rajaji—says:

"India's commitment to peace is unaltered and firm. But the cease-fire can be on a firm basis only if there is a frank and full admission on the part of Pakistan of its offence besides restitution for damage done and a pledge of non-repetition of the tactics and activities that led to the present unfortunate open conflict."

[Shri P. K. Deo]

I stand by these words. We very well know the sinister designs of Pakistan. During the attack on Kutch, Pakistan used the Patton tanks. At that time, the United Kingdom used its good offices for a cease-fire. Before the ink had dried on that cease-fire agreement, there was this further infiltration of armed Pakistanis into our Kashmir border. I pay my tribute and I congratulate the patriotic Kashmiris who stood by the side of India. It is because of their timely help and co-operation that we were able to apprehend most of the infiltrators. This goes to prove very well how the Kashmiris feel that Kashmir is a part of India and how they will always fight and make sacrifices for the preservation of their motherland. What more evidence is required?

Had the United States given a proper warning to Pakistan when the Patton tanks were used in Kutch, probably the situation would not have been aggravated. But they remained silent spectators to it. When Pakistan's bid to send infiltrators and create chaos in Kashmir was foiled by our timely intervention, they escalated the war to the international border and they used a full division of 70 Patton tanks in Chhamb and Jaurian sectors. This compelled India to open a front in Lahore so that the pressure in Chhamb and Jaurian could be relieved. We have no intention to capture Lahore. We could have captured Lahore, in a few hours, but we did not want to create problems. We just wanted to relieve the pressure in Chhamb and Jaurian sectors and that objective has been achieved.

We are very sorry that in spite of the assurances given by the successive Presidents of the United States that on no occasion the various arms supplied to Pakistan by them would be used against India, those arms have been used. I am sorry to say that there has not been a public denouncement up till now from any responsible quarter either in the State Department or in

the Pentagon of the use of American arms against India. Pakistan has been armed to the tune of 20 billion dollars of military hardware by America, because they thought that Pakistan is a bulwark of democracy and it could put a stop to the expansion of Chinese communism in the world.

But, Sir, in spite of the flirting by Pakistan with China, our American friends did not open their eyes. We are very sorry to say that they tried to equate both the aggressor and the aggressed till the last minute. However, at the same time, I congratulate our American friends, because when there was a threat from China they came out openly and said that they would come out openly with arms aid if there was any Chinese aggression on India.

So far as USSR is concerned, I beg to submit that USSR has been very consistent in her approach towards the Kashmir problem. But, Sir, lately we are surprised at the soft-peddling of the Kashmir problem in the Security Council debate by USSR.

My hon. friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has made out a very strong case that India should come out from the Commonwealth of nations. In this regard, I would like to point out that it is not 'British Commonwealth of nations' today, it is only 'Commonwealth of nations'. Therefore, the character of the British Commonwealth of nations has completely changed. The present Commonwealth of nations, whose main architect is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, is such that it is just a club where every member has got equal rights. It is not the sole property of the Britishers (*Interruptions*). Now the entire character of the Commonwealth has been changed by the emerging African and Asian free nations. So many countries in Africa and Asia have become free and they are equal partners in the Commonwealth. Therefore, I do not think that we should feel small or think of com-

ing out of the Commonwealth of nations. Sir, to be isolated does not help anybody. Has Indonesia gained any point by coming out from the United Nations? I do not think. Now we should utilise this international forum to press our view point and try to convert other people to our side.

Sir, in this regard I would like to submit that this aspect should be discussed in a sober mood. The entire country has been agitated now. We are very unhappy at the unfriendly attitude of the United Kingdom. The attitude of the United Kingdom has given a very rude shock to the entire nation and we are not happy about it. But the solution is not that we should go out from the Commonwealth of nations. There should be a dispassionate appraisal of the entire situation in a cooler atmosphere.

Coming to the question of cease fire, I make this earnest request that we should not repeat the folly of 1949. We should not accept a line which is utterly indefensible. This period has unfolded, the experience of 16 years has proved, that the line which we considered to be a cease-fire line is actually an indefensible line. There have been constant violations of cease-fire. There have been infiltrations going on. We know how difficult it is to stop them. We know how many times attempts have been made from the Pakistan side to cut the vital lifeline to Ladakh in the Kargil border. We know very well that the cease-fire line can never function effectively if we accept the 1949 line. Therefore, in this regard, this is the unanimous demand of this House, I believe, that there should be no occasion of withdrawal from the position we have gained in the Kashmir front. That categorical answer is demanded from the Prime Minister. I request the Prime Minister to make a categorical statement that under no circumstances our jawans will be asked to withdraw from these positions like Kishan-Ganga, Uri Poonch, Titwal, Haji Pir Pass and Kargil area.

I would like to submit, in this regard, that we should be realistic. The Prime Minister himself, in his statement on the 18th, in this House, has categorically stated "We could not possibly revert to a situation in which we may find ourselves once again unable to prevent infiltrations or to deal effectively with those who had already come in." We have seen that in spite of the guarantee of the United Nations, in spite of the posting of the U.N. Observers, this infiltration has been going on and it could not be properly dealt with. Therefore, we will not be able to deal with it properly if we accept this line of 1949.

Coming to our foreign policy, I think it is high time now that we re-orient our foreign policy. The experience of this war has completely exploded the myth of non-alignment. I would like to ask, anybody who can convince me, where our friends of non-alignment have gone, where our friends of Afro-Asian solidarity have gone. Our friends have vanished into thin air. Not a single country, except Malaysia and Singapore—we are grateful to them—has come up. In this regard, I would like to submit that when Malaysia was in trouble, when Malaysia was being confronted by the Indonesian expansionist designs, similar reciprocal gesture was not shown from this side. I would like to point out that our foreign policy should be in the closest proximity to USA and USSR, and we should fully take advantage of the anti-Chinese policy of USA and USSR. If an understanding could be reached, then I am sure there would be peace for at least a hundred years in this globe.

I want to take this opportunity to point out some of the lacunae in our publicity side. Even though we won in the battle field, Pakistan has stolen a march ahead of us so far as publicity in foreign countries is concerned. Sir, there has been this dual fight going on between the publicity section of the Defence Ministry and the Press Information Bureau which is a pamper-

[Shri P. K. Dea]

ed child of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. There should be better co-ordination. The way our Indian correspondents and the foreign correspondents were ill treated in the front lines is not proper. I beg to submit, Sir, that India has got a very good case. There should be a proper person who can project India's case properly in foreign countries and draw sympathy from them. It is most unfortunate that we try to commit the same blunder, we try to send such persons to represent our case who make a mess of it. We still send persons like Shri Krishna Menon who instead of creating friends creates more enemies to whichever country he goes. Sir, he was the man for whom we lost the Chinese battle, the hero of the Chinese debacle, who betrayed our army. Such people are being sent. It is our misfortune. In this regard I beg to submit that truth and righteousness are on our side. God is on that side where there is truth and righteousness. I am reminded of a sloka from the Bhagwat Gita, in fact the last sloka which says:

‘यत्र योगेश्वरः कृष्णो’ यत्र पार्थो धनुर्धरः

तत्र श्रीविजयो भूतिधुवा ‘नीतिमतिममं ॥

Where there is truth and where there is righteousness, there is God Himself. Otherwise, how could we believe that our hand grenades could destroy the Patton tanks or our Gnats could destroy the Sabre jets. It was possible only because of the grace of God. As God and truth are on our side, they must prevail and we must win with our brave fighting men. The result cannot be anything other than victory.

Lastly, regarding Kashmir I will say one sentence. Kashmir is not a debating point or a matter under litigation. It is India's domestic problem. If there are any differences they could be easily ironed out by the people of Kashmir and our Government. There is no question of any third party coming into the picture.

We should not be complacent because the war is over. The enemy is still bombing our civilian population. We should be vigilant on all fronts, both on food and other domestic fronts. In this regard I beg to submit that the entire nation is behind the Prime Minister. So, he should take the entire nation into confidence and try to build a more prosperous and stronger India.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it was a delight a little while ago to listen to our ardent Congress colleague, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, flagellating the historic hypocrisy of the British ruling class and the present Labour Prime Minister. Mr. Wilson, though he puts on the sheep's skin of British Socialism which is a shadow of something that never was, is still equally representative of his predecessors of the British ruling class. Shri Azad brought a whiff of fresh air into the discussion in this House. But I was really a little perturbed when I heard my very able friend, Shri Alvares, who made, I fear, a somewhat funereal opening, as far as this discussion was concerned.

Here is a discussion which we needed very badly. The Prime Minister has made a statement the other day, a dignified, restrained but powerful statement. But it needs to be spelt out so that the country's stand, the stand of Parliament behind the Prime Minister, can be properly stressed.

Sir, our people have been roused in unity, as never before, by this latest perfidious aggression from Pakistan. Our heroic armed forces on land and air have compelled Pakistan, however unwillingly, to agree to cessation of hostilities. President Ayub still seems to be letting out bellicose yells but perhaps he too has learnt a lesson. If aggression again comes from Pakistan, or from her ally China, or if there is an attack on our interests or on our integrity by Pakistan's wily patrons from the West with their CENTO, SEATO and other vile instruments of inter-

national banditry, this country, let there be no mistake about it, will meet their challenge and meet the situation squarely.

And we say this with confidence because we can recall with profit the combination which was arrayed against us till the other day—Pakistan, and of course China, and even the Western allies of Pakistan, all united in their objective of putting pressure on India in order that we may accept Pakistan's blackmailing conditions for peace. But the Indian fighting man and his valour proved superior to the sophisticated machines from imperialist countries. Our jawans performed what can be called a literal massacre of the Patton tanks, the much-vaunted Patton tanks, on which Pakistan depended to give us a telling blow. This reminds me what a pity it is that the United States, whose hands are soiled with Indian blood, could persuade our Government to withdraw from public exhibition the Patton tanks which Delhi citizens were thronging to see. I am told that the Defence Ministry spokesman had announced in the beginning that the Patton tanks would be exhibited not only in Delhi but in many other places in the country. But, for some mysterious reason, the tank has been taken away and even the papers do not report the fact of a tank having been on exhibition for a short while and then withdrawn from public show.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We want to see that Patton tank.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It may be laid on the Table.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The reasons for such conduct can be guessed and discussed but I am leaving it to the Government to say something in this regard.

This will help to tell ourselves, to remind the country that on this occasion all communities have combined, joined hands together. In 1947-48

when Pakistan had committed aggression against Kashmir, the first Indian martyr to get Param Vir Chakra was Brigadier Usman. And on this occasion Havildar Abdul Hamid Khan has been given the Param Vir Chakra. I am reminded of what I heard sometime ago, and I quoted it the other day in this House and I am only repeating it, that the Muslim in India belongs to this country, and on behalf of a Muslim it was said once in my hearing and it stuck to my memory that when a Hindu dies his body is burnt and the ashes are thrown into the river to be carried God knows where but when a Muslim dies he wants 6'x3' of Indian earth. He belongs to this country in life as well as death. The Muslim in India, the Muslim in Kashmir and the Muslim in other parts of the country have shown that they belong to this country in life as well as in death.

Our people have shown courage. One of our colleagues, whom I do not see here, had shown characteristically stoic courage. His only child was martyred during this war and he comes to Parliament and performs his duties like every other Member, Sri Hari Pada Chatterjee. These are deeds which will be written with a sun beam on the scrolls of Indian history and nothing will ever efface the memory of this kind of thing.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, she has committed what I am constrained to call certain barbarous deeds. Bombing by Pakistan has taken place even after the cease-fire was in operation. Napalm bombs secured from the United States, the source of all recent international abomination, have been used on Indian civilians by Pakistan. Attack on non-combatant passenger plane which was carrying Balwant Rai Mehtaji, that was mounted by Pakistan. Bombs on hospitals and places of worship have been rained with impunity by Pakistan. Apart from the treacherous aggression which the United Nations has not thought fit to single out to con-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee].

demn, all these things have been done by Pakistan and we should tell the world about it. The world do not know many things, which is why perhaps many of our friends even do not understand what we are about. We should make a special effort in order to be able to tell the world how Pakistan has been behaving politically, militarily, ethically, in every human sense, how the rulers of Pakistan have been behaving in this most egregious fashion and yet their patrons in the UK and the United States are standing by them in a way which is so very patent.

But there is another Pakistan, not merely the Pakistan which is represented by Ayubshahi. My hon. friend, the Minister of Defence, made a very statesmanlike statement the other day refusing to extend the fighting to East Pakistan in spite of Pakistan having bombed Barrackpore near Calcutta and certain other places in West Bengal and Assam. That was a very statesmanlike statement.

13 hrs.

We have to remember also that the people in Pakistan, the overwhelming majority of Muslims in East Pakistan, also behaved wonderfully. President Ayub was shouting: "Islam is in danger". That was the historic war cry of *jehad*. Yet, in East Pakistan there was communal peace; and, even more, there was open disavowal of the war with India. On the other side, far to the West, in Pakhtoonistan also the *jehad* trick did not work. There the movement is led by an indomitable hero of our united freedom movement, Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Let the Government of my country extend our hand of friendship to these elements in Pakistan. They would come to the surface; they are bound to come to the surface, for a military dictatorship like that of President Ayub can take anything but they can never take a military defeat. They are heading for disaster. This is only the beginning of

the end of the kind of Ayubshahi which is searing in such ugly fashion the history of our sub-continent. To that end the energies of our Government in the proper diplomatic fashion has got to be directed.

Meanwhile, of course, the image of Ayub-led Pakistan shines brightly in the eyes of its powerful and persistent patrons from the West, the UK and the United States. I have said this before in this House and I repeat it that the United Kingdom has never yet forgiven us our freedom. They did not mind Pakistan being nominally independent. India has many faults. Our Government has made many mistakes and has many weaknesses. But India, whoever sits on the Treasury Benches, unlike present-day Pakistan, will never consent to be put in anybody's pocket, be it the UK or the USA or anybody else. That is why, knowing very well that India has a tradition to live up to, India has some principles in conformity with which her 5,000 years' life has so far been constructed, that India will never be in anybody's pocket, the Indian freedom is a phenomenon which has never been forgiven in the West and that is why we find the UK behaving in the egregious way it has been.

Ever since 1947, ever since Imperialism extracted from us the incalculable price of partition before it transferred power, Kashmir has been sought to be exploited against us. Kashmir in our classical texts is *bhooswarga*, a "heaven on earth"; but that has been sought to be turned into hell. If you look up the history, which is much too sordid, of the UK-US combine in regard to Kashmir ever since 1947-48—the role of Mountbatten, of General Auchinleck, of a United States Brigadier called Haight and others—it is a dirty and dismal story whose hangover persists. That is why today we have the problem in the shape that it faces us.

The UK has shown—my hon. friend, Bhagwat Jha Azad showed in beautifully simple and lucid terms—egregious, shameless partisanship. Mr. Wilson has shown—he had the temerity, I want to say, to show—a shabby attitude towards our High Commissioner. He puts on the cloak of British socialism. That is why he behaves like this. If he has an idea, like the *burra sahibs* of old whose mantle he has inherited, that he can order India about, let our Parliament tell him that Mr. Wilson can put that in his pipe and smoke it.

The wonderful aid that comes from the UK and the USA, that wonderful aid they were going to stop; they had suspended that aid because we had committed a crime, because we were trying to defend ourselves against aggression. The UK and the USA behaved in this particular fashion. This is the unstrung aid which they give us! We had begged the US for some F-104 fighter planes, but we were told that our pilots were not good enough for such sophisticated stuff. We begged for a submarine, but we were told that though we had a many-thousand mile coastline, we did not need a Navy at all. And, all the time Pakistan got those F-104 planes, Patton tanks, submarines and, God knows what other enormity. These countries, supposed to be our benefactors, were thought to be assisting us without strings; but it needed the searing experience of the last few weeks for us to learn that even their economic aid for whatever it is worth was not without strings, that in order to punish us for our effrontery in wishing to defend our honour and our integrity as an independent country, we were to be penalised most drastically. No wonder that there is today a powerful clamour in all patriotic circles that we should no longer remain a member of that mockery and make-believe, the Commonwealth of Nations. With men like Jomo Kenyatta and Julius Nyerere we can be genuinely friendly without having to go to St. James and do a lot of bowing and scraping to princes and queens and performing all

the other ceremonial functions which are necessitated by these Commonwealth Conferences and that kind of thing. This is an issue which has been before the country for many years and after what has happened it becomes imperative that we quit the Commonwealth. I need not say more after what Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has said.

I am glad also that Shri Azad referred to the role of the press in the United Kingdom and the United States and the role of the British Broadcasting Corporation which talked about the Kashmir events as a "people's revolt" against India. We have noticed also the sanctimonious hypocrisy of papers like the *London Times* the *Manchester Guardian* and such professional progressive periodicals like the *New Statesman and Nation*. We have seen also the American magazines like *Time* and *Newsweek*. I defy any Member of Parliament to go to our Library, a few paces away, look up the available issues of *Time* and *Newsweek*, and his blood would boil to see the kind of thing that is written there. Our jawans fighting at the front, some of them, read this kind of magazine—they look so slick and so good to the eye and that sort of thing; they have all kinds of saucy things to present to the reader—but they have felt like tearing up these things and throwing them away. We also feel that way.

We are a very patient and a very polite people. These pressmen from the powerful western countries have the run of the land. They sit there and elsewhere as if they own our country and send despatches that are lies, and are immoral. I wish something is done so that in the name of free reporting such enormities are not allowed to be perpetrated. I think, the Speaker of this House has certain rights in this regard and he can see to it that our galleries are kept clean of those people who report in the wrongest possible manner only because of certain ulterior political motives.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

The Security Council Resolution is before us. It has a number of defects which, I am sure, the Prime Minister will take steps to rectify. It suffers from the initial sin of not having done its duty of condemning Pakistan as the aggressor in this case. India and Pakistan, the victim of aggression and the aggressor, have been almost equated. As far as the Resolution goes, infiltration is not a matter which is mentioned but we are in danger because of the pressure of infiltration which took place and which process our Defence Minister has not yet been able entirely to eliminate and wipe out from our land.

There is a reference to the 5th August line. The Prime Minister has said in his letter of September 14—I am quoting his words—

“...when consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective, further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place.”

This is something to which I wish to pin down the Prime Minister in a very friendly fashion so that he gives us a renewed assurance that he stands by this categorical assurance. He has told us and the world that the Kashmir issue is not going to be allowed to be re-opened. We are not going to have a settlement with Pakistan over Kashmir with a number of busy-bodies about us from the United Nations of the kind which the United Nations has supplied previously. We shall have our own settlement and that is why the Prime Minister is ready to meet in Tashkent in order to have a settlement with Pakistan. We can settle it ourselves. That is why we can meet in Tashkent or in any other place, even in Tinbuctoo, whatever the place might be—we are ready to meet Pakistan—and discuss the matter and come to a settlement. Pakistan has known that militarily it cannot get

Kashmir. Pakistan has got to have a settlement in a civilised manner. That settlement cannot come through the instrumentality of the United Nations as it is, at present, constituted, and that is why we shall have a settlement on our own as far as our two countries are concerned.

It is also necessary for us to intensify our diplomatic fence. We have to reach out to the people of Pakistan and explain the origin of India's crossing into the plains of West Punjab and our intentions as to the future. We have to explain to people in Pakistan and in other countries the solid secular democratic policy which we have been trying to pursue. Occasionally, there have been some deviations. In West Bengal, I have heard of some indiscriminate arrests of Muslims and that sort of a thing. Suspicion is always a very uncertain quantity and I do hope that on account of mere suspicion Muslims are not made to feel as if they are unwanted. They have shown by their conduct, by and large, that they stand by the country as much as anybody else.

Shri Raaga: They are treated well by us.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We have also to tell the world about it and that is why, in spite of what my friend Mr. Deo said here, I am very glad that Mr. Krishna Menon has been sent to Cairo in order to convey whatever points the Prime Minister wanted him to convey to President Nasser. We have also to tell the United Nations and other forces that it is not merely the legal case in regard to Kashmir which is important. The United Nations is not a legal body however much we present legal arguments in regard to our position about Kashmir. The total picture is more important. Our stand for decency versus dictatorship and all the concomitant evils which Ayubshahi represents has to be made clear.

Again we cannot spurn our friend like the Indian Government sometimes

seems to do. There is the German Democratic Republic which was the first among the western countries in Europe to support us against China. But even today we treat the G.D.R. rather shabbily.

Then, again the final settlement between India and Pakistan which we want—the Prime Minister said the other day that ultimately there has got to be a friendly settlement between our two countries—has to be a solution acceptable to both and it is good from that point of view we have accepted the good offices of the Soviet Union. The role of the U.S.S.R. has been something which, I think, we can all applaud, and the Prime Minister himself did so, but I am sorry that Shri Alvares made a rather graceless reference to this matter as he bracketed quite unwarrantedly, the Soviet attitude along with the attitude of certain other powers. The Soviet Union have given us aid. They have promised us more. In times of crisis, they were the only friends whom we had among the great powers. They have a principled stand. That is why we can rely upon whatever help they can give. But let me also say at the same time that we cannot expect our chestnuts to be pulled out of the fire by some other States. The lesson we have to learn is the lesson of self-reliance. The Soviet Union is our friend no doubt, but we shall rely on ourselves. We shall continue to be alert and always prepared. We should build and strengthen our defence industry. Our Bangalore-manufactured gnats have beaten the celebrated sabre jets and we should remember Jawaharlal Nehru, and why not?—even Mr. Krishna Menon and Mr. K. D. Malaviya for the contribution they made forwards the setting up of the defence industry.

In the rear which is most important, there has to be a check on the black-guard elements which would come up; communalist chauvinism has got to be checked, and profiteers and hoarders who even in this critical time try to do some damage in regard

to our food situation have to be checked and the monopolists who gloat over it when war comes and shelve any attempt to give some satisfaction to their working people have also to be checked. Production has got to be kept at a very high level of efficiency. On the production front our fight should continue, while so long it was on the battle-front. The Indians who toil in fields and factories, the Indian workers, who are the salt of the Indian earth, must be first and foremost in our thoughts. Let us re-forge our links with our own people. If we do that, if we satisfy the aspirations of our people, who are not asking for the moon, who only want a decent way of living, if we satisfy our own people and keep in check the blackguardly elements, communal and economic, who are disturbing the atmosphere, then and then alone shall we gather the strength and say, as the Prime Minister has said, "come the world against us, our people shall win".

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the very outset let me congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for the bold and dynamic leadership that he gave to this country at this hour of crisis. This frail little man has proved the real successor and heir of the liberator of this country, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. When history will be written, the verdict of history will be that India was liberated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru but India's liberty was defended bravely and heroically by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

I have often pointed out on the floor of this House that in spite of 18 years' freedom, Pakistan has not achieved nationhood. Pakistan's nationalism, its leadership, its history, its culture, etc. is nothing but hatred for India. The retreating British imperialists by leaving this country divided have created a dagger on the heart of India. We have to meet the danger that we are facing from Pakistan. That danger is there and that danger will continue. We know it very well

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

that when India was partitioned against the will of the Indian people, we thought that when the two democratic and sovereign States have come to stay, they will live in peace like two good neighbours and will work for the freedom, for the peace and for the prosperity of the people. But in a year or so, the Pakistani hordes in the shape of the tribal raiders invaded the beautiful valley of Kashmir and our heroic army put them away. Then, the United Nations came in and the cease-fire was affected. We thought that that cease-fire will be honoured. But it was more dishonoured than honoured. From time to time, they kept on committing aggression. We often say, it is Pakistan's naked aggression against this country. I say that Pakistan has been continuing its aggression for the last 17 years—this aggression is not new.

It is often being reminded to us by Great Britain and the United States of America that we had promised plebiscite. We had promised it on the basis that the aggression on the so-called occupied Kashmir will be vacated. The United Nations has failed to get the aggression vacated. It has been 17 years and within these 17 years we had three rounds of elections in the State of Jammu and Kashmir where they elected the Government which was for the merger with India. Today, Jammu and Kashmir is a part and parcel of India and no power on earth, whether it may be the entire United Nations, whether it may be the United States of America, whether it may be the United Kingdom, can take it away from us. That is what our Prime Minister has already declared. The Kashmir question is closed and it cannot be opened. This House, here and now, should strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister by telling him that no talks can be held on Kashmir. Kashmir is as much part of India as Madras or Bombay or Maharashtra.

We had a long-drawn fight. In this fight, a number of our jawans and a number of our officers have laid down their lives. I pay my humble homage to them. Pakistan had completely miscalculated when they attacked this great country of ours. They calculated that the moment 5000 armed soldiers will reach the beautiful valley of Kashmir, the people of Kashmir will rise in their support. But what did they find? The Indian people living in Kashmir gave heroic fight to the infiltrators from Pakistan. The Government headed by Mr. Sadiq stood solidly, like a rock, for the defence of this country and for the defence of the valley of Kashmir. As U. Thant mentioned in his report, Pakistan calculated that there will be communal troubles in both the countries. But what did we actually find?

The Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Parsies and all the communities in this country stood like a rock for the defence of this country. Probably the mad rulers of Pakistan forgot that this country of ours is as much of Muslims as it is of Hindus. I say here and now that this country is as much of myself as it is of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri or Shri Nanda or Shri Swaran Singh or Shri Frank Anthony. In fact, you will forgive me if I say that it is more of mine and Frank Anthony's for we will claim three yards in this holy land of ours to consign our mortal remains. Therefore, if Pakistan thought that the Muslims, the Christians and the other minorities would not stand by this country they were falsified in their infiltrations.

This aggression of India has shaken our faith in the Commonwealth. I do not want to talk much on it; Mr. Azad has strongly pleaded the case of withdrawal of our membership from the Commonwealth; he has been supported very ably by Shri H. N. Mukerjee. Let us tell the United Kingdom that the days of Clives and Hastings are over and that these are the days of Nehru and Lal Bahadur Shastri. We

are not going to be cowed down by those people who lived in the days of Curzon and Willingdon. We suffered enough humiliation in the last 300 years and we are not prepared to suffer any more humiliation from them. If they compel us, we will get out of the Commonwealth; we will not continue in that humiliating condition in which they want us to stay.

Militarily we have won against Pakistan. The cease-fire is there. Our heroic jawans are coming back to their hearth and homes. Our factories are producing for our people. Now, a mightily diplomatic offensive has got to be launched. The Minister of External Affairs is here and I shall appeal to him that he should gear up his Ministry; he should gear up his diplomatic channels. Unfortunately, in the past, most of the diplomatic assignment were given to those people who were mostly file-pushers or district magistrates. This gigantic task cannot be carried on by those ex-district magistrates and file-pushers. People in public life should be taken into confidence and should be sent to various countries. I congratulate the hon. Minister of External Affairs on his having sent Shri Krishna Menon to the United Arab Republic. There are other colleagues who can be sent to Asian and African countries to explain the Indian case to them. The Indian case is very sound; it only needs to be explained and it can be explained by those who have faith in India and by those who have faith in Indian policies and programmes. Therefore, the Minister of External Affairs will do well to take this fact into his notice.

For years together it has been brought to our notice that the publicity of the Ministry of External Affairs is very weak. This war has proved that. Often in defence it has been said: it is not what is publicised, but how the publicity is received that is important. I do not agree with that viewpoint. I believe it is the person who publicises who is more important. Therefore, persons with guts,

persons with idealism, should be sent abroad.

Once again before I conclude I want to warn the rulers of Pakistan and tell them that every Indian Muslim man, woman and child is prepared to lay down his or her life for the defence of this ancient country of ours.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Movers of the two Resolutions before us. But I would confine myself, on account of paucity of time, only to the U.N. Resolution which, it seems to me, is a source of great distress and disillusionment. The U.N. Resolution shows a complete lack of appreciation of the facts of the situation—either deliberate or unwitting. It shows a complete disregard of the compelling merits of the Indian case. The U.N. Resolution shows a rare indifference to the proved fact of aggression by Pakistan. It shows that our case over the years has not been adequately explained in spite of the very eloquent exposition recently by Mr. Chagla. What we are paying for is the accumulated indifference and neglect towards the projection and presentation of our case in an adequate and worthy manner over the years. It seems that the projection of our case has been altogether ineffective and unimaginative. I have been told times without number by responsible legislators in different countries of the world as well as by diplomats representing various countries that they have not been told the facts of the case in an adequate and persuasive manner. Obviously we find that, in the whole range of the United Nations, we have no country other than Malaysia and Singapore outside the United Nations, to understand our point of view. While we cannot but deplore the situation, we must also do a bit of introspection in regard to our external publicity and our diplomacy. It seems that all the chanceries of the world, and the foreign offices have

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

shown a complete lack of understanding on this vital issue affecting Kashmir. While our jawans made decisive thrusts at grave risks to their lives during the Pakistani aggression, we were not able to project their heroism, their deeds of valour and their conspicuous successes to the world at large. While our Army and Air Force vindicated the honour of our motherland and inflicted crushing strategic defeats on the war-machine of Pakistan, Pakistan gave out to the world at large that they were a small, embattled but brave country, being bullied by a larger country. This is an unfortunate state of affairs and I think those concerned with the state of public opinion in the world must take a serious notice of this. While we were really inflicting these defeats militarily on them they were giving the impression that it was Pakistanis who were chasing us around. Pakistan has camouflaged its aggression against us by projecting an image of injured innocence. We have—it is quite evident—a marvellous case on Kashmir, but that case has been not properly explained and publicized before the bar of world public opinion; that case has been lost in the grooves of prejudice; not only prejudice, it has also been little understood because of our omission to publicise our case adequately.

I welcome the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister and supplemented by Mr. Chagla, that what we have accepted is a simple cease-fire. Evidently we have accepted to cease hostilities in the interest of peace, but we are not, and cannot be, in agreement with what the great powers might propose for us or the way in which they propose to dispose of Kashmir. This is welcome as far as it goes, but there is deep anxiety for we are aggrieved and baffled by the U.N. Resolution which runs counter to the Indian position. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we must, first of all, analyse what the United Nations' Resolution seeks to do. Its objectionable features mainly are:

that it does not take into account Lt. General Nimmo's Report and the Report of the Secretary-General in which the fact of aggression by Pakistan is definitely noted; another objectionable feature is that it links a simple cessation of hostilities with a withdrawal of armed personnel to the positions occupied on the 5th of August; another objectionable feature is the omission—this is the most objectionable of all—to record the finding that Pakistan has been guilty of aggression; the fourth objectionable feature is that it reiterates the proposition that political settlement would be sought to be devised by the United Nations. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to Art. 39 of the Charter of the United Nations which enjoins upon the Security Council to give findings in matters where existence of a breach of peace or external aggression is alleged. Such is the case in Kashmir. Why is it then that the United Nations and the Security Council have acted in clear disregard of article 39 of the United Nations Charter? Evidently, they have also not cared to respect article 2, which is the very foundation of the United Nations structure. In article 2 it is clearly laid down that "all Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered; all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

13.26 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

The finding we would have expected the United Nations to give in the first instance was whether there was an act of aggression by Pakistan. This issue has been dodged very deliberately by that august body. Again, it has not been made clear that the breach of peace arose from

the acts of aggression by Pakistan. This, again, was a deliberate evasion of its responsibility by the Security Council. It appears therefore that this body operates as a political organ of a consensus which was arrived at among the great powers, without proper regard for the facts of the case, of justice and the merits of the case. This certainly, Sir, has been the case in the matter of our complaint before the Security Council.

Pakistan which is ruled by a dictatorship regards war as a continuation of its politics and its diplomacy. It has never hesitated to use war as an instrument of national policy. We have rightly desisted from waging a war on our own initiative. This was, however, a situation in which we found ourselves, this time, when Pakistan attacked us first by intrusion and then by open, armed, massive aggression in the Chhamb-Jaurian region. The pattern was repeated once again for our country; the aggression that was committed by Pakistan on Jammu and Kashmir in 1947-48 was duplicated. It is a pattern with which we are not unfamiliar, a pattern of an outcry of holy war and religious fanaticism, a pattern of bullying us into accepting what they want, a pattern of forcing upon us what they consider a political settlement of the problem in Kashmir, a pattern of defeating the very mainsprings, the fountain-head of the ideology of secularism on which our State is based.

I should like to invite the attention of this august House, and indeed of the world body which has committed this sin of omission to the fact that Sir Owen Dixon, one of the U.N. mediators, had observed—

"When the frontier of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was crossed, on, I believe, 20 October 1947, by hostile elements, it was contrary to international law, and when in May 1948, as I believe, units of regular Pakistan forces moved into the territory of the State, that too was inconsistent with international law."

This was the finding of Sir Owen Dixon. However, that finding has been shelved and forgotten.

Once again, we find that Lieutenant-General Nimmo tendered a finding of aggression against Pakistan. But because it suited the great powers, that finding has, again, been shelved. This is something for which Indian public opinion and Indian intelligentsia can never forgive the United Nations. For, they have compromised the cause of justice, and the cause of peace itself.

I should also like to make a reference to two resolutions adopted by the United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan. This Commission had proceeded to bring about an agreement between India and Pakistan on the terms for the settlement of the Kashmir question, and adopted a resolution on August 13, 1948. And in Part II of that resolution Pakistan had agreed to withdraw its troops from Kashmir. In defiance of that resolution Pakistan had continued to retain its troops on a part of Jammu and Kashmir.

Now, Sir, the operative paragraph of the United Nations resolution calls upon us, indeed it decides and gives us a peremptory order, to not only cease hostilities—which is what we had also desired—but also to withdraw to the positions occupied by us and Pakistan on the 5th of August, 1948. This is a clear case where the international body has unwittingly connived at aggression. It is a case about which we feel greatly embittered, because the United Nations has allowed itself to be used as an instrument of its nefarious diplomacy by Pakistan. First of all, they should have given a finding of aggression against Pakistan. What is more, before they can ask us to do anything, they must first of all secure the withdrawal of the Pakistani forces in terms of the resolution of August 13, 1948. After all, Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union and

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

we would not regard, we have never regarded at any time, the sovereignty of this country and the territorial integrity of this country to be negotiable in any way.

China today is working in close concert and collusion with Indonesia and Pakistan. There is a visible axis between these three countries. What we find is that the United Nations resolution is likely to promote this axis. If Pakistan is able to achieve certain advantage as a consequence of this intervention by the United Nations, Pakistan is likely to ascribe it to the credit of Chinese intervention or the threat of Chinese intervention. Obviously this is something that even the western powers are not able to see in the proper perspective.

It seems that the plan as embodied in the resolution is not likely to be a successful plan and an effective plan for securing peace and for securing the vacation of aggression, which is what we went to the United Nations for in the first instance, and now in the second instance.

We are unfortunately without a friend today, and we have found that the United Nations operates, not in consonance with its principles or its Charter, but in consonance with the exigencies of political situations. We found that the Americans evaded the issue. We found that the British definitely aligned themselves with the cause of Pakistan, and, indeed, indirectly with the cause of China in Asia. We found that America is trying perhaps to follow our example on the basis that in the decade of 1950 to 1960 we were able to act as a bridge by our non-alignment and neutrality; they are trying to act as non-aligned and neutral today and are trying to follow our example, at least to cite that example to us although they have always been critical of our non-alignment.

This is a part of the pressure politics which is the very basis, the very bedrock of an understanding of international politics today. We have been through the school of harsh realities in the last two years. I suppose we have to steel ourselves against struggle and adversity. We have to steel our psychology against despair, because we find that in the world today, by and large, nations do not appreciate and understand our standpoint. To put it at its most charitable, the British are today impelled by their anxiety to keep Pakistan in the Commonwealth, by their anxiety to prevent the present flirtation of Pakistan with China developing into matrimony. It seems to me that this might be a worthy motive from their point of view. But they have already gone too far in their anxiety to prevent Pakistan from getting into the arms and embrace of China. It seems to me that inexorably Pakistan is being drawn into the embrace of China and of Indonesia and that any efforts on the part of Great Britain are bound to prove to be absolutely erroneous, misconceived and without any result. It seems to me that the British press has abetted the Pakistani aggression in a manner which is unworthy of the better traditions in Great Britain, and it seems to me that today they are too aligned and too involved. But for the solitary sane voice of Lord Atrincham who wrote in the *Manchester Guardian*, and wrote eloquently, expounding the case of India, we found no understanding in the British newspapers of what is happening here. It has been said by some very responsible spokesmen among diplomats that this is partly our fault because we were not able to give the projection of what we were doing on the front, of what we were doing here, to the various foreign correspondents who happened to be here. I do not know what the facts are. My hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee said that strict and strong action should be taken against some of these press correspondents. I would like Government to examine

this closely and see whether it is because of their deliberate prejudice which envelopes them or it is also because of any lack of effort to project our activities to the world at large that this has been so. It seems to me that the British press has acted in a pre-meditated manner, the British press has acted in a prejudiced manner, and they had already made up their mind and there was hardly any hope for us to be able to persuade them.

I should like, nevertheless, to quote this solitary sane voice in Great Britain which said:

"Most of the comment during the last two or three days has sickened me. Politicians and other opinion-formers in the West are misjudging the issue on a truly Himalayan scale. At the best they are viewing the combatants as Tweedledum and Tweedledee; at worst they are siding with Pakistan. India is receiving virtually no encouragement in a struggle which will decide the fate of free institutions in Asia."

Mr. John Grigg, the author of this brief article goes on to say:

"People seem incapable of grasping the unique importance of Indian democracy, and even those who do realise what a miracle it is—and what a measureless disaster its destruction would be—cannot see the connection between India's freedom and the integrity of India's federal union. Yet the two are inseparable.

Let no one doubt that this is the issue in the present war—an issue, which as we now believe, justified Abraham Lincoln in fighting one of the bloodiest wars in history.... The North's victory preserved American democracy to be the salvation of the Western world. India's victory would have the same vital significance for the East."

But this, as I said, is a solitary sane voice in Great Britain. The whole of that country, steeped though it is in freedom of speech and democratic traditions, has been involved in prejudice against India and hostility against India. This compels us to make a more or less unanimous demand in this country that the whole question of our continued membership of the Commonwealth should be reviewed, and should be reviewed with a view to consider the severance of our link with the Commonwealth.

We are a secular democratic nation. We have an elected government. We are a country which can show the light to the rest of the world, certainly to the countries of Asia. We are the most populous democracy in this world. These are facts which we do not have to advertise, but these are facts which must be imprinted and projected on the minds of the West. They must be made to realise, in fact, not only the West but the entire world must be made to realise what valuable contribution India is making to the cause of freedom in the world and to the cause of developing the lot of the under-dog and the down-trodden in the world.

I would like to say that we should either mend the Commonwealth or we should begin the process which would indeed end it.

Regarding the role of France and the Soviet Union, I have little to add. The Soviet Union has rendered us assistance at a time when it was most needed. Unfortunately she did not consider it appropriate to use her veto this time in vindicating and supporting the position which she had taken earlier for reasons best known to herself. Now, she has offered her good offices to mediate or her good offices to bring India and Pakistan closer. I only hope that an anxiety to mediate and an anxiety to reconcile the two points of view does not make them resile from the position that they have taken so far.

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

I need hardly point out that national interests in this world are always the guiding factor, and, therefore, we must be very vigilant about retaining the friendship of the Soviet Union. We must be careful and we must assiduously foster that friendship and we must try and see that the Western world realises the significance of India for them and the significance of its friendship. No longer should they be allowed to take us for granted. For too long has this happened. It must be made clear by the Prime Minister when he rises to reply to the debate that the lives of our Jawans were not laid down in vain, that our blood was not shed on the battle-field aimlessly and without cause. It should be made clear that in no case would military viability of our frontiers be sacrificed on the altar of international pressures and prejudices. It should be made clear that in no case would India resile from the positions that it has come to occupy as a consequence of Pakistani aggression, as a compulsion of strategy. That is all I have to submit in this momentous debate.

Shri A. C. Guha: Before I come to explain the amendment that I have moved to the resolution of Shri Azad, I have to say something about the Security Council's resolution.

The Security Council's resolution has been a great disappointment to India, primarily due to some lapses. The main lapse is that it has failed to indicate the aggressor and it has practically deliberately avoided the task of indicating the aggressor. It is one of the fundamental tasks of the Security Council to say who the aggressor is and which country is the aggressed. It does not redound to its credit to put the aggressor and the aggressed more or less on the same footing.

Pakistan claims have not been conceded on Kashmir; but there has been a mention in one paragraph in that resolution about the peaceful settlement of the outstanding

differences between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters. What is this dispute on the matter of Kashmir? Legally, Kashmir acceded to India, and that accession was legally valid according to the Act passed by the Parliament of Great Britain, and it was complete. After that, there have been three general elections, and the people there elected a popular government which approved the accession of Kashmir to India. It was not simply the accession of the Maharaja, which, of course also was a legally valid procedure, but that accession of the Maharaja has been confirmed and approved by the elected representatives of the people of Kashmir, not merely on one occasion but on three occasions.

Then, what are the other disputes between India and Pakistan? If there is any dispute between India and Pakistan, it is between a secular State and a theocratic State, between a civilised nation and between a nation which may be said to belong to the age of the uncivilised period of the history of humanity.

The Western democracies profess their anxiety for democracy and civilised mode of life. Is it because of this anxiety that they have been supporting Pakistan in her military dictatorship and also in her theocratic method of government? Surely, these are not modern ideas. So, this profession and anxiety of the UK and the USA about democracy and civilisation and culture is only just a pretence; they have been saying these things, but they have been practising something else which has also been approved of by the UN.

One of the gravest charges against the UN has been that it is dominated by some big powers, particularly the USA. This resolution of the Security Council and the entire deliberation in the UN has more or less confirmed that suspicion and that charge. It is a sad commentary on the performance

of the UN, that they have avoided mentioning anything about the reports submitted by Gen. Nimmo who is the military observer, about the preservation of the cease-fire agreement of 1949; they have avoided any reference to the report of their own Secretary-General. These two reports have clearly mentioned that Pakistan was the aggressor, but there has been no mention of that in the resolution. That is the greatest failure of the UNO and this may lead to the ultimate failure of the UNO as an instrument of peace and civilisation. Just as the League of Nations in the earlier years failed to give support to Abyssinia when it was attacked by Italy and did not enforce its sanctions against Italy properly, similarly in this case also when India was attacked by Pakistan wantonly and without any previous notice or warning, the UNO could not give any protection to India, and could not even indicate that Pakistan was the aggressor and India was the aggressed country.

In connection with the deliberations in the UNO, the attitudes of some of the nations have to be particularly noticed. The attitude of Britain has been most deplorable and blatantly partisan—in favour of Pakistan. In spite of the bitter struggle we have had to wage against Britain for so many years, after the attainment of independence, India decided to remain within the Commonwealth of nations. Personally, in spite of the fact that I suffered under British rule, apart from other sufferings and privations, about a quarter of century of detention without trial—with not even the show of a trial—even then I supported this decision of India to remain within the Commonwealth. But the time has now come when we should reconsider this issue. I do not like to tie the hands of Government by the adoption of the Resolution of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. But the spirit of the country, the sentiments and feelings of the country will support that Resolution that we should immediately quit the Common-

wealth of nations. I would like this House to repose sufficient confidence in its own Government. It should be left to Government to decide what is the appropriate step to be taken in the context of the happenings of these few weeks.

In the Commonwealth, apart from the UK, there are other nations also. I would particularly mention the nations of Africa and some nations of Asia. Before we terminate our connection with the Commonwealth of nations, we should have some consultation with these Afro-Asian nations as to what steps they will take about the future of the Commonwealth. England should realise the importance of India continuing or not continuing in the Commonwealth. India was the corner-stone of the British Empire. As soon as India went out of the British Empire, the whole imperial fabric of Britain crumbled down like a house of cards.

13.52 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

If India decides to quit the Commonwealth, I am sure the structure that is the Commonwealth will also fall down and disintegrate. So Britain should think seriously of the importance of India's continuing or not continuing to be in the Commonwealth of nations. I hope the Government will take the decision after consideration of all the circumstances and also consulting Afro-Asian nations of the Commonwealth who have been helpful to us, who have been with us in all our conflicts and difficulties. Also we should take the decision after giving proper warning to the UK Government and also the US Government as to what the consequence of India quitting the Commonwealth would be.

I am glad there is no mention of Kashmir in the operative part of the Resolution of the Security Council. But there is mention of Kashmir in the preamble. This is the redeeming

[Shri A. C. Guha]

feature, that this Resolution contains no mention of Kashmir or plebiscite in its operative part. But there is mention of the 'political problem underlying the present conflict'. Will they solve the political conflict in Pakistan itself? If there is any political conflict which should be solved, it is in the very composition of Pakistan itself which is ripe for disintegration. The Indian Army has entered certain points of strategic importance as defensive measures. The Indian Army has gone there not as an army of conquest but as a protective measure for the sake of our own defence; if necessary, it might have been an army of liberation for the people of Pakistan.

But I should like to pose this problem before the House, before the United Nations and before the world: what is this Pakistan? It is a creation of Anglo-American combine. It is a geographical absurdity, just as another political structure, Indonesia, is a geographical absurdity, which has been stretched far and wide without any cohesion of either language or race or anything else. Pakistan is also divided into two parts thousand miles apart. I can say this for East Bengal that it is ripe for revolt, it is ripe for secession from the central government of Pakistan, if it is given the opportunity. When Pakistan is clamouring for a plebiscite in Kashmir, will it allow a plebiscite in East Bengal? Will it allow a plebiscite in Pakhtoonistan including Baluchistan? Will it allow a plebiscite even in Sind? I know if that is done, these three portions of Pakistan will decide in favour of seceding from Pakistan and leaving Pakistan confined only to western Punjab which has been the dominating part, dominating over all the other sectors and reducing them to the status of colonial vassals of West Punjab.

So, if any political Settlement is to be effected, it should be on the basis of reconstituting Pakistan, leading to its disintegration and giving East

Bengal and Pakhtoonistan the freedom to decide their own form of government, just as India has allowed Kashmir the freedom to decide its own system of Government, its own constitution and also its own elected government. Will Pakistan allow these things to East Bengal, to Pakhtoonistan or even to Sind? Will the United Nations insist on these things being forced on Pakistan?

Therefore, it is no use of talking in terms of effecting a peaceful settlement. An august body like the UN should not indulge in sanctimonious hypocrisy. When they talk of settling the dispute between India and Pakistan in a peaceful manner, I say it is sanctimonious hypocrisy. They do not mean it. They in the United Nations, the nations that have been dominating the deliberations of the UN, have always been siding with Pakistan openly and shamelessly.

India is weak; surely, militarily it is a weak country. Somehow or other, we have not so far, all these years developed our military power. We have not developed our ordnance factories for many years. We have neglected the productive potential of the ordnance factories. In the last two or three years, some steps have been taken to bring our ordnance factories upto some standard. It has now been shown that our ordnance factories can produce armaments which can challenge the best armaments in the world.

Here I must pay my tribute to the Indian fighting forces. So much sacrifice has been made by them. But then, are we to ask them to vacate those vantage points, those strategic points, making India again liable to further aggression? I do not think the Government will agree to such a proposal just now. We have accepted only a simple cease fire, nothing more, nothing less. The 5th August position is a debatable thing; the withdrawal of forces is a debatable thing, to be settled after proper discussion. But even after proper dis-

cussion, if it is decided that our forces ought to withdraw from those strategic positions they have conquered and occupied, it should not be felt by them that the sacrifices made by them have gone in vain. They have saved the country from an invasion of barbarous hordes. An hon. Member compared it to an invasion by tribal hordes. I would like to say that our fighting forces, both the army and the air force, have saved the country from the ravages to which we would have been subjected if the invaders were allowed to enter the terrain of India. That is the greatest achievement. That is the military victory we have won. Let us hope that we shall have victory also in peace. Victory in war is not the final word; victory in peace is the final word. We hope we will also have victory in peace.

Last night, the Prime Minister who so magnificently guided the nation in this crisis, in his broadcast last night referred to India's future. He has said that ultimately we have to be self-reliant. Our only hope of becoming self-reliant is by developing the might of our nation. I hope we are now on the march, on the way to assert our might. We have shown to the world that India is becoming a power to be counted, to be reckoned with, which cannot be simply taken for granted or ignored.

Before I conclude, I would also like to pay my compliments to Shri Chagla for his performance in the United Nations. I hope it will be possible for him also to represent India in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Before I commence, I also pay my tribute to Shri Chagla for the able manner in which he presented our case, but, unfortunately, he has been a Judge, an honest man, a straight-forward man, talking always in a straight language, he was no match for Bhutto. We have to learn the language of the perfidious

to defeat the perfidious, the hopeless people who are always telling lies that Meerut has fallen, that Connaught Circus is burning, that this House has been bombed and we have all run away. These are the people with whom we have to deal.

It is a wrong approach on our part of consider the United Nations a legalistic body in which a legalistic approach is possible. It is a dismal story. If we look into the achievements of the United Nations vis-a-vis India, from the time in 1947 when we approached them till today not once has the United Nations said that Pakistan was the aggressor, although Sir Owen Dixon did so. This main issue has been lost sight of. Consistent effort was made by Shri Chagla to ask the Security Council to come to this conclusion and pinpoint this issue, whether or not on this second occasion also Pakistan was an aggressor.

Unfortunately, our publicity in the world has failed, and failed in this sense that although we are on the side of truth, although we have been invaded, our case has not come out in the true light before the world at large. What are the reasons? Perhaps the USA has acted in ignorance, but can we accept this proposition that the people in UK are ignorant of the true conditions in India? It is the people of the UK who divided our country. Do they not know the meaning of the word "jihad"? Are they not aware of the fact that in East Bengal genocide of Hindus has taken place? Do they not know that even today Baltistan and Gilgit are under the feet of Pakistan? Are the people of UK not aware of the perfidy of Pakistan? Do they not know that five crores of Muslims are still living peacefully in India? Do they not know the history of India up to date? Do they believe, after having lived in India for so many years, that religion makes a nation? Parsis are Indians, Christians are Indians, Buddhists are Indians, Hindus are Indians, Muslims are

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

Indians. They know all these facts, and yet they believe Mr. Bhutto when he says that it is an insistent statement to say that an Indian can be a Muslim. What a perfidious man he is, and yet we allow him a long rope.

I have added this preamble to the speech which I now make on this point.

The new solution that has been placed before us has set us thinking that after all the sacrifices that our army has made, after all that the whole country has done, after all that we have felt, after all the promises that our Government has made, after all the efforts that our great men have made, are we going to fall back to the old so-called cease-fire line of 5th August? I say emphatically no. The country is not prepared for that, and no one shall dare talk of a position where we have to go back to that position of 5th August.

Kashmir is ours legally, Kashmir is ours morally, Kashmir is ours because of all that we have done for Kashmir, Kashmir is part and parcel of India under our Constitution and by the wish of the people of Kashmir expressed through the representatives elected to their legislative Assembly. If that is the position, the area which we have occupied in Occupied Kashmir belongs to us and we are not going back from that position. We shall remain where we have reached.

We have no territorial ambitions so far as Pakistan is concerned, but the main issue to be determined between Pakistan and India is: who is the aggressor. Instead of deciding who the aggressor is, the point for determination before the United Nations seems to be: what about Kashmir? I would like to know from them how many times the United Nations has applied its mind to Khurdistan, to the Pakhtoonistan. What about Bali, what about the Shan States and the Kachin State what about Tibet? But they

want to apply their mind to this question alone. Is the Security Council meant only for this purpose, to decide this question alone? We went to the Council, made a complaint and asked for a decision on the main issue as to who the aggressor was. That issue has been sidetracked. Why? I do not want to recapitulate the mistakes that have been committed in the past, I need not dwell upon them, that is not going to serve any purpose whatsoever today, but we have to realise India's standing as a nation. India now is a growing nation, India will tomorrow emerge as the fourth Power in the world. We cannot therefore accept this position that India will bow down before Pakistan.

It is an unfortunate fact that, going to the rescue of Pakistan, China threatened us. We used milder language. I am told by big military officers whom I had the good fortune of meeting very recently that they were not afraid of China, that we could have faced China as we faced Pakistan. The jawans and the officers whom I had the good fortune of meeting only yesterday were not diffident in the least about the outcome of this war with Pakistan. They were only waiting for an opportunity to give a complete thrashing to Pakistan. There was not one among them who showed any diffidence. We were also not diffident at heart. The morale of the country was very high. But we wanted peace, we are people essentially of peace, we are the most tolerant people on the surface of the earth, and we have remained so so long. Unfortunately, because we have not been used to telling lies, because we have not made ourselves adopt in the art of telling lies, because we have stuck to truth, we have suffered in this world of falsehoods, and on account of that our country has been shown to have done something wrong.

The other day I was reading an English paper, Yorkshire post, the most conservative paper. I was simply

ashamed to read the whole thing that was put down there is unabashed language about India being the invader. What country have we invaded, where, how did the invasion start, there was nothing about these things except running down India. If Yorkshire Post can talk in that language, I can very well imagine what every Britisher must be thinking. Having lived in England for so many years, I have always felt that if you scratch the average English man, you will find that he is a conservative, he cannot be a liberal. This is an essential feature of the Englishman. In 1963 February, I had occasion to talk about this matter with our late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I did enquire from him how it is that our publicity in England was not working. He was good enough to tell me that unfortunately the 14,000 and odd ICS and other pensioners who are there living in England, for no reason whatsoever, carry on a sort of propaganda against India. We have to meet that, and meet that we will. We have to exert ourselves; we cannot sit tight in our country and talk to our own satisfaction. It is not enough to be satisfied in our own mind that we are very good people but we should show to the people of the world that we are good. Our publicity must be geared to higher levels and must not be confined to the four corners of our country. It is high time that we entered into proper diplomacy. It is no use sitting in the House and patting ourselves on the back, we are very good.

There is the letter which our Prime Minister was pleased to write and will read that out:

"As already communicated to you in my letter of 15th September, 1965, I am willing to order a simple cease-fire."

I ask the House to pay attention to the words 'simple cease-fire'. It goes on:

"...and cessation of hostilities on being informed of Pakistan's

agreement to do likewise from 7 AM GMT on Wednesday 22-9-1965 as provided in the Security Council Resolution."

On being informed of Pakistan's agreement to do likewise, means to carry into effect such a cease-fire referred to in the antecedent sentence. The reference to the Security Council is only to the time with reference to 22nd September and to nothing else. To put in words in the mouth of the Prime Minister and to say that he did say something contrary to the wishes of the country, I say, Sir, is not the meaning of this letter. The plain and simple meaning that can be attached to this letter is this. We do have a cease-fire from a particular time. There is absolutely no indication in this letter whatsoever that we go back to any other place. The most perfidious thing that happened in Ferozpur was that upto 9.30 A.M. firing across the line was going on and one of our officers and two of our jawans were hurt. I was still delivering a speech in Ferozpur in a public meeting when shells fired from across Pakistan fell over Ferozpur. If we want excuses for not ordering a cease-fire we have sufficient excuses on that ground. Time and again we have been trying to meet their wishes but this is the perfidious manner in which Pakistan behaves so that we find it very difficult to come to proper arrangements with these people.

One thing that surprises me is the attitude of the United Kingdom in that particular instance. I have been noting since 1963 when China needed oil and petrol and aviation fuel and Russia made up its mind not to supply aviation fuel, the trading community of the UK increased its supply through Hong Kong. That is one reason why China does not want to take Hong Kong. In spite of its expansionist policy, it keeps itself content so far as Hong Kong and Macao are concerned. Through Hong Kong the supply of oil from

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

Commonwealth countries, particularly from the United Kingdom was raised to three times the previous level in 1963 when China was in need of aviation fuel. It was a disgraceful act on the part of United Kingdom to stab a brother in the back. Some of my friends have talked of getting out of the Commonwealth. I would suggest that the Commonwealth countries should come together and drive out England from the Commonwealth. Britain is not the master of the Commonwealth. It is a conception of Commonwealth of peoples who are placed in a particular manner with a form of judiciary, rule of law, etc. It is the coming together of all these people, not because we recognise Britain as a symbol for us. So, efforts must be made to drive out UK from the Commonwealth. That would be the step for us next. As the necessary corollary to teach a lesson, we have to break friendship; but before that is done I would ask that this House studies the aspect that I had put before it. Let it be considered by our Government.

We have talked about infiltrators. I do not know what category those who have transgressed into Kashmir will form, but they are all armed personnel. We should not wait to drive them out. We must give an ultimatum to Pakistan that within seven days they order the infiltrators to surrender and if after seven days those people do not yield, they must all be shot in our country. There shall not be any cease-fire on that account. We cannot tolerate this position, that their armed personnel are here and we are talking of cease-fire. This is an intolerable position and it must be made to them very clear.

This is also the opportune moment when we have to take stock of those in this world comity of nations and visualise who our friends are and who our foes are, who have acted in

a friendly manner towards us and who will be prepared to act as friends. It is no use our acting in an illogical manner. We should think logically and come to logical conclusions as to what should be our attitude towards those who have acted as our friends and who are likely to act like that. I want no certificate from the United Arab Republic, no certificate from Turkey, or Iran or Iraq. I want the certificate of our own country as to who has been good to us and kind to us and who was prepared to help us and then go forth to them and extend your hand of friendship, and if they extend the hand of friendship shake it well and keep it well. Do not discard the extended hand of friendship of those who had extended it to us. I need not name any particular country. It is enough for me to say this and the people and the Government know it.

Our diplomacy miserably failed in this sense that it was not able to set out in a proper manner and make use of Taiwan. Why have we failed? We need not consider whether Taiwan is richer or not we have not gone there. The question for us to consider is whether the enemy of our enemy is not a good friend of ours. It is not one country with which we are concerned. It is the whole lot of the countries in the various parts of the world with whom we could have extended our friendship. But we have miserably failed to do so.

I will point out only one thing, and then close this chapter. On the 1st March, 1954, let us remember what the late Prime Minister said then. This is about military aid which has been the subject-matter of controversy in our country and to which we drew pointed attention of the United States of America and to no useful purpose. I will draw the attention of the House to that aspect. Why I want to draw the attention of the

House to that matter is particularly because of this: when the Patton tank seized from the enemy was brought to Delhi for the purposes of exhibition, the American Embassy objected to it and said it would set up people against America and we yielded to the wishes of America and we never wanted to create bad blood. But will this sentence open the eyes of the United States of America, this sentence which is not written by me and not written with my consent, but has been written by a man, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, more than whom, a man of peace, perhaps the Americans never could imagine. The Prime Minister said on the 1st March, 1954, as follows:

"... the President of the United States has stated that if the aid given to Pakistan is misused and directed against another in aggression, he will undertake to thwart such aggression. I have no doubt that the President is opposed to aggression. But we know from past experience that aggression takes place and nothing is done to thwart it. Aggression took place in Kashmir six and a half years ago with dire consequences. Nevertheless, the United States have not thus far condemned it and we are asked not to press this point in the interests of peace. Aggression may take place again and be denied as the previous aggression was denied till it could not be hidden. If conditions are created for such an aggression to take place it may well follow, in spite of the desire of the United States to prevent it. Later, long arguments will be carried on as to whether it was aggression or not. The military aid given by the United States to Pakistan is likely to create the conditions which facilitate and encourage aggression...."

These words have come true. Let the Government open its eyes and let the United States of America open its eyes and see that this aggression

is the direct result of the military aid that the United States of America gave to Pakistan. There is time for it to call a halt to this. I again reiterate, come what may, this country is not prepared to go back to the 5th August line.

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in my opinion, the resolution of the Security Council of the 20th September which we are discussing constitutes a major diplomatic reverse for Pakistan. I cannot say, and I would not be fair to this House if I said, that it is wholly favourable to India. But I can say this: I will put it negatively—it is not unfavourable to India. If the drafting of this resolution was in our hands, we would certainly have drafted a better resolution, but the resolution was drafted by the Security Council, not by our representatives there.

But I should analyse this resolution and satisfy this House that it constitutes, as I said, a serious diplomatic reverse for Pakistan. Let us look at the resolution:

"The Security Council, having considered the reports of the Secretary-General on his consultations with the Governments of India and Pakistan,—

I am reading the preamble to the resolution—

"commending the Secretary-General for his unrelenting efforts in furtherance of the objectives of the Security Council's resolutions of 4th and 6th September,

Having heard the statements of the representatives of India and Pakistan,

Nothing the differing replies by the parties to an appeal for a ceasefire as set out in the report of the Secretary-General, but noting further with concern that no ceasefire has yet come into being,

Then, this is a very important operative part—what we urged bef

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

the Security Council. Look at the difference between the attitude of India and Pakistan. Our Prime Minister by his letter of the 15th September, accepted an unconditional cease-fire. Contrast it with the reply of President Ayub of the 17th and record the fact that whereas India had accepted the cease-fire without conditions, Pakistan had not done so. The Security Council could not go to that length, but I ask the House to see that by implication this preamble makes clear the position which I have just stated, because it says: "...differing replies by the parties to an appeal for cease-fire as set out in the report of the Secretary-General." Anybody who looks at the report of the Secretary-General and looks at the letter of our Prime Minister of the 15th, and the letter of President Ayub of the 17th, will see the thing. I ask you to note the difference between the two English expressions: it is not "different" replies but it is "differing" replies, which means that one reply is quite different in quality and character from the other. Therefore, in this preamble, it is clear that the Security Council has accepted the different attitude taken up by India and Pakistan on the question of cease-fire.

Then, coming to the next paragraph:

"Convinced that an early cessation of hostilities is essential as a first step towards a peaceful settlement of the outstanding differences between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters."

Frankly, I am not very happy at the expression in question and the word "Kashmir" in this part of the preamble. But may I point out to this House that this expression "Kashmir and other related matters" appears in the joint declaration of the then Prime Minister and President Ayub in 1962. May I also point out to this House that nowhere in this resolution is the word "plebiscite" used. Nowhere in this resolution are the old resolutions of the

Security Council referred to. When we talk of Kashmir, as I said, we must not merely think of Pakistan's claim for a plebiscite. Let us not forget that we were the complainants before the United Nations: that we went to the United Nations complaining of Pakistan's aggression. That aggression still continues, and we have every right to say that if there is a Kashmir dispute, the only dispute is about Pakistan's aggression and continuing aggression. So, there is no reason why we should look upon this part of the preamble as prejudicial to us.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What is meant by the "settlement of the political problem"?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will come to that. I then come to the operative part:

"Demands that a cease-fire should take effect on Wednesday, 22nd September, 1965, and calls upon both Governments to issue orders for a cease-fire at that moment and a subsequent withdrawal of all armed personnel back to the positions held by them before 5th August, 1965;"

Now, our argument before the Security Council was that the only issue, as my hon. friend Shri U. M. Trivedi just now said, was who committed aggression, and if it was satisfied that Pakistan had committed aggression, condemn Pakistan as an aggressor. As I said, the time has come when the Security Council should call a spade a spade. It should not hesitate to do so. I said, take the evidence; look at the record and be satisfied. If you are satisfied that Pakistan has committed aggression, that is the only issue and you decide that issue.

Security Council did not say so.

I will satisfy the House how in this operative part is implicit the condemnation of Pakistan. I also pointed

out that really we are concerned with cessation of hostilities and the resolution should be confined to the question of cessation of hostilities; and, all extraneous matters should not be brought in at this stage. The resolution says:

"...and calls upon both Governments to issue orders for a cease-fire at that moment and a subsequent withdrawal of all armed personnel back to the positions held by them before 5th August, 1965."

The most crucial date in this resolution is the 5th August, 1965, because that is the date on which Pakistan committed aggression on our country. I do not merely say that infiltrators entered into our country, because I think this was a naked and unabashed invasion of India. The fact that they entered Kashmir makes no difference, because invasion of Kashmir is invasion of India. 5th August is the date which is to be found in the Secretary-General's report. This is what the Secretary-General says in his report:

"Gen. Nimmo has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on the 5th August were to a considerable extent in subsequent days in the form of armed men generally not in uniform crossing the cease-fire line from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side."

This is not our allegation, not our view of the situation, but the report of the most powerful, most impartial international civil servant in the world today, the Secretary-General of the United Nations. This is his finding. If ever there was a clear explicit and unequivocal finding about an aggression, here it is. His finding is that aggression was committed by Pakistan on the 5th August, 1965. Therefore, when you look at this resolution and see the date 5th August,

as I said, implicit in that is the condemnation of Pakistan for this aggression because you cannot read the date devoid of the report of the Secretary-General. The date is taken from his report and we have to ask ourselves the question, what happened on the 5th August? Why is that date mentioned in this resolution? The only answer is that on 5th August took place aggression by Pakistan upon our country, invasion by Pakistan of our country. So, although there is no explicit condemnation of Pakistan as an aggressor, which this country and this House would have liked, implicit in this operative part is the condemnation of Pakistan.

Shri P. K. Deo: The aggression is there since the last 18 years. It did not occur on the 5th August.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I hope my hon. friend appreciates that in view of the fact that the Secretary-General's report mentions the date 5th August and says from that date a large number of armed people crossed over from Pakistan into Indian side, and this date having been mentioned in the resolution, there is implied condemnation of Pakistan.

Shri P. K. Deo: This is the second aggression on Kashmir.

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I pointed out, Pakistan has invaded India on three occasions. First was in 1947-48 when she invaded Kashmir. Then there was the Kutch invasion. This is the third invasion which is very similar to the first one into Kashmir, when Pakistan sent armed raiders, first denied any responsibility and then Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan admitted that Pakistan was behind it. But I will not deal with that now. I am dealing with this resolution.

Let me deal with the question of the withdrawal of the armed forces. I have made the position perfectly clear before the Security Council

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

to what we mean by withdrawal of the armed forces back to the positions held by them before the 5th August. May I read out that passage? It is in the debate held in the Security Council on the 17th September—page 49. I do not know whether the official text has come yet. This is what I said before the Security Council on that day:

"This deals with the modality of the cease-fire. I do not want to deal with this in detail, but may I say this? All the invaders who have invaded Kashmir must leave. They must be withdrawn. They must be called back. As they were sent by Panistan, they must be called back by Pakistan. Secondly, it must be made impossible for such infiltration to take place again. Thirdly, Pakistan must own its responsibility for this infiltration."

Therefore, I made it clear that by withdrawal of the armed forces back to the positions held by them on 5th August, what I understood is firstly acknowledgment by Pakistan that she had sent these infiltrators, secondly withdrawal of these infiltrators and thirdly, a situation to be created when such recurrence in future would be made impossible I have not spelt out what the situation would be. But I will presently point out how the Prime Minister has taken up the same position in the correspondence, namely, that we do not want to go on from one cease-fire to another. We want to be satisfied that such a situation will not arise in future. We do not want to be put back in a position where thousands of infiltrators can enter our country and do what they have been, doing there, create havoc, devastation, practise brutalities and cruelties, everything which I thought belonged to the past or the Hitler regime and not to modern civilised times.

श्री मधु लिमये : सुरक्षा परिषद के प्रस्ताव में "डिमांड" शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया गया है 47 करोड़ वाले देश के बारे में। आप ने उस के बारे में अपना ऐतराज प्रकट किया है या नहीं।

श्री मु० क० चागला : मैं माननीय सदस्य की बात को समझता नहीं। मैं 5 अगस्त के बारे में डील कर रहा था।

That is the position with regard to the 5th August.

Then, the resolution says:

"Calls on all the States to refrain from any action which might aggravate the situation there."

Sir, this is a plea to all the States, and I take it that China is included although it is not a member of the United Nations, not to intervene and aggravate this conflict. Then comes this:

"Decides to consider as soon as operative paragraph, 1 of the Council's resolution 210 of 6 September has been implemented, what steps could be taken to assist towards a settlement of the political problem underlying the present conflict, and in the meantime calls on the two Governments to utilize all peaceful means, including those listed in Article 33 of the Charter, to this end."

Now, you will notice here that the steps which the Security Council could take are many. But here again there is no reference to Kashmir, there is no reference to plebiscite, and what we are called upon to do is to utilize all peaceful means including those listed in Article 33 of the Charter to this end. This country has always believed in peaceful means. It has always believed in debate and discussion. We are prepared to talk with anyone including the devil if necessary (*Interruptions*). Well, I do not know in whose favour the comparison is. But, Sir, you will

notice that no time limit is fixed. It is left to us. This is a purely recommendatory part of the resolution. We are asked to enter into discussions in order to bring about peaceful settlement, and there is mention of Article 33 of the Charter. Article 33 of the Charter, if you look at it, contains a large number of methods by which a peaceful settlement could be arrived at. Here also there is no prejudice as far as we are concerned.

Finally, it says:

"Requests the Secretary-General to exert every possible effort to give effect to this resolution, to seek a peaceful solution, and to report to the Security Council thereon."

Now, the best way to judge how seriously Pakistan considered this to be a diplomatic defeat is the response that was given by the Pakistan representative of the Security Council. I twice challenged him there to answer unequivocally whether he accepts a cease-fire unconditionally as our Prime Minister had done, and on both the occasions he refused to accept the challenge. This is what he says on the last day—this is very important. On the 20th September, when the resolution was about to be passed, this is the statement that he made. He said—this is on page 23—statement by Mr. Zafar, Law Minister of Pakistan:

"On the other hand, should the Security Council adopt this draft resolution, we feel bound to warn and to put it on the record that unless the basic cause of the present conflict is removed another and wider conflagration is bound to ensue."

I told the Security Council that one aggression is not over, and here is a threat of a new and wider conflagration. You will notice the note of utter dissatisfaction in this particular statement, because you will remember what the four conditions were which President Ayub was insisting on. The four conditions were: (1)

cease-fire—on which we are agreed; (ii) withdrawal of all troops not only from the part of Kashmir of which they are in unlawful occupation but we should even withdraw from our own Kashmir where we are there now; (iii) induction of Afro-Asian force; and (iv) plebiscite within three months. In this statement Mr. Zafar said that as these conditions were not satisfied the resolution was unsatisfactory and another and wider conflagration was bound to ensue. You will notice that even President Ayub when he accepted the cease-fire said the resolution was unsatisfactory and mentioned that unless the Kashmir problem was solved the continent will be submerged in a conflagration.

It is surprising that although at this meeting, notwithstanding the challenge thrown out by me on two occasions, the Pakistan representative was not prepared to answer that Pakistan was prepared to accept a cease-fire unconditionally as our Prime Minister had done. It was only after a lapse of two or three days that President Ayub sent post haste Mr. Bhutto to the Security Council—poor Goldberg was awakened at dead of night, I do not know why, only for the purpose of permitting Mr. Bhutto making a speech to abuse our country. The acceptance could have been sent by a telegram, as we did, to the Secretary-General. But the Security Council was convened solely for the purpose of enabling Mr. Bhutto to appear and abuse our country. I have a shrewd suspicion—I may be wrong—that the reason for this delay, why the challenge was not accepted at the meeting of the Security Council and why some time lapsed before President Ayub accepted cease-fire is that during that interval, a crucial interval, a vital interval, Pakistan was satisfied that China was not coming to her assistance. If Pakistan had felt that China was going to press home her ultimatum and attack us or invade us, I have a feeling that the answer of Pakistan would have been very different. Because Pakistan felt that not

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

only she was militarily defeated but she could not even count on the perfidious alliance of China, that is why she was driven, however much she disliked it, to accept this cease-fire.

Now, Sir, I was telling you with regard to Kashmir. May I draw your attention to the fact that there also I took up an entirely unequivocal attitude. On the 18th September, Speaking to the Security Council, about Kashmir I said this:

"I come now to the question of Kashmir. I do not want to delve into history, I studied history at Oxford and I am very fond of history, but history must be reserved for a proper occasion. Therefore, all that I had to say about Kashmir I said at great length when I intervened in the debate last year. But I want to make my position clear about Kashmir. I do not want this Council to be under any misapprehension as to the attitude of my Government with regard to Kashmir, nor do I want the representative of Pakistan to be under any misapprehension. Kashmir is an integral part of India. Kashmir is a unit of the Indian Federation and we will not permit our Federation to be broken up. The separation of Kashmir from India means the break-up of our Federation of India. It would mean as much a break-up as if any other part of India were separated from India. Therefore, as far as the position of Kashmir is concerned, it has been stated by the representative of the Government of India on more than one occasion and, as I said, I myself stated it clearly and categorically at our last meeting."

Some apprehension was felt by some of the members as to the effect of withdrawing our troops to the 5th of August positions. At the very last meeting when the resolution was passed, I made a statement on this

resolution and I made the position of the Government perfectly clear so that there will be no doubt as to what the position was. This is what I said:

"As I read it, this resolution is not directed against my country. We have already accepted the unconditional cease-fire and we certainly will carry it out if Pakistan will carry it out. To the extent this resolution deals with the cease-fire, it could only be directed against Pakistan, which has not accepted the unconditional cease-fire."

This is the important part.

"With regard to the rest of the resolution all that I am going to say now is that I adhere to everything that I said in the two statements I made in the Council on Friday and Sunday. Various matters are dealt with in this resolution and I have taken up those matters in those statements. My Government adheres to every one of those statements and my Government also adheres to the explanations given by the Prime Minister of India in his letter dated 14th September, which is included in the Secretary-General's preliminary report. Therefore, my position is perfectly clear and the position of my Government is also perfectly clear. We have come here before you to help you to stop the hostilities. We give you our full co-operation. To the extent this resolution deals with other matters, I do not wish to comment on them because I have already done so in my two statements and the Prime Minister has commented on them in his letter of 14th September."

Now it is very necessary to see what the Prime Minister says in his letter

of 14th September because it clinches the matter both on the question of the withdrawal to the 5th August position and the question of Kashmir. This is the letter which the Prime Minister wrote to the Secretary-General, dated 14th. I will read the relevant passage:

"In the light of our own experience during the last few months, we will have to insist that there must be no possibility of a recurrence of armed attacks on India open or disguised. Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective, further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door upon for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place".

The next is about Kashmir.

"I would also like to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will deflect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part".

Nothing can be clearer, more unequivocal, more categorical than this statement of the Prime Minister. I pointed out to the Security Council that this was the attitude of the Government and I had reiterated it.

So, the House need have no misunderstanding as to what is the modality of the cease-fire agreement. We have agreed to the cease-fire. The modalities have to be worked out and in working out these modalities we will adhere to the position that we have taken. We will discuss with President Ayub. As I said, we are prepared to discuss with anybody. But in discussing with President Ayub we will remember what the Prime Minister has said, that Kashmir is a closed

chapter, as far as the territorial integrity of our country is concerned. I said this last year in the Security Council. We are not going to vacillate or wobble. I think our position should be absolutely clearly and emphatically stated to the world that we are not prepared to discuss under any circumstances the holding of plebiscite or....

Shri Maurya (Allgarh): I would like to have an interpretation of the term "political problem".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The Minister is not yielding.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I hope I have satisfied the House. The resolution that the Security Council has passed is not unfavourable to India, for our stand has been made perfectly clear and there is no doubt, no ambiguity, as to what we stand for and what we will stand for in the future.

Before I sit down may I make one or two general observations on what happened in the Security Council?

Shri Maurya: I would like to have your interpretation on "political problem".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Unless the Minister yields he should not interrupt.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I think the time has come when we should do some re-thinking on our foreign policy. The world is moving and there is a regrouping of forces, regrouping of powers and we cannot possibly take up a rigid attitude or stand where we stood some years ago. We have to move with the world. I think we should give a serious thought to what the position is in the world today.

In this connection, I would be less than doing my duty if I do not express publicly on the floor of the House my deep appreciation for the stand taken up by Malaysia in the Security Council. As I said the other day, it was a speech which a member of the Indian delegation could have

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

delivered. And I must also express my appreciation of the great help we received from the USSR while the resolution was being drafted. If the House only knew that the resolution was passed at quarter to three in the morning and the meeting had been going on the whole of Sunday, every coma, every semi-colon, every sentence was considered and re-considered, it is only then that you realise how the assistance of a country like USSR in getting the resolution in this shape was invaluable.

And let me say this about USA. There was much more understanding of our position this year than I found last year. I am satisfied that on certain matters the world opinion is entirely in our favour, whatever some papers or some people may say. There is no doubt that the world is satisfied that Pakistan was the aggressor. There is no doubt that this myth of an uprising in Kashmir has been completely exploded.

I should also say with regret that I could not understand the position taken up by Jordan. We have stood by the Arab world. We have shown friendship to the Arab world ever since we became free. We were among those countries which stood with the Arab world during the Suez trouble. As against Pakistan, we supported Jordan in the Jordan water issue. So, it came to me as a great disappointment that Jordan practically, if I may use a colloquial expression, toed the line of Pakistan.

An hon. Member: What about the British?

Shri M. C. Chagla: There is one lesson which I learnt and which I have been learning since I joined public life, and that is this, that what ultimately matters is power, what ultimately matters is the strength of your country. We may have all the idealism in the world, we may have all the justice on our side, but if we are weak nobody is going to listen.

If we want our influence to be felt in the councils of the world, we must be strong and must develop all the strength and power that we have. Then we would be listened to with respect.

15 hrs.

An hon. Member: Develop nuclear weapons.

Shri M. C. Chagla: There is one thing that I must say. I was proud when I was arguing India's case before the Security Council. I could hold my head up and felt proud of being an Indian and what India stands for. The first thing was the heroism displayed by our jawans. I could tell the Americans that notwithstanding your Patton tanks and all the modern equipment that you have given to Pakistan, our men are brave enough to fight them. Secondly, I was proud of the fact that not only Kashmir—Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs—had stood by Government and resisted the aggression, but the whole of India was united on this issue.

Please do not forget that Pakistan counted on one thing. The grand design was that when the infiltration took place Kashmir would give trouble. It was exactly like the story of the Bay of Pigs in Kennedy's regime. You remember Sir, the Bay of Pigs. President Kennedy's one great mistake soon after he assumed power was that he relied on his Intelligence. He was told that if he sent a few Cubans from America, the people of Cuba would rise and when the people landed in the Bay of Pigs, they did not rise. And President Ayub—I do not know who was his informant; perhaps, Mr. Bhutto. Sent 4,000 infiltrators to Kashmir thinking that the whole of Kashmir will rise and will fall in his mouth like a ripe plum. That did not happen. He said, send these people to Kashmir and there will be trouble in India. Hindus, Muslims, Christians in India stood together solidly. And, there again he failed.

Sir, I have taken longer than I expected; but, in conclusion, I think, we did wisely in accepting the cease-fire because I assure you, the whole world realised that we were dedicated to peace and did not want bloodshed even for a moment if hostilities could be stopped. I think, on the whole we have secured a Resolution which is not unfavourable to India and, I think, we can look upon this whole incident with pride. We should be grateful to our Prime Minister for taking up this strong line.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यहाँ पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सुरक्षा परिषद के प्रस्ताव में जो 'विवाद' शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया गया है, क्या हमारी ओर से उस पर एतराज किया गया है या नहीं।

डा० राम मनोहर लं हिया (फरुखाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, चागला साहब ने एक बात सी फ्रीसदी सही कही और वह यह कि सुरक्षा परिषद् का प्रस्ताव पाकिस्तान के लिए संतोषदायक नहीं था। इस हद तक यह सदन उन का—तथा और किसी का भी, जो इस के लिए जिम्मेदार है—शुक्रगुजार हो सकता है लेकिन जब उन्होंने यह बात साफ करने की कोशिश की कि सुरक्षा परिषद का प्रस्ताव भारत के लिए असंतोषकारक नहीं था, तब मेरे दिमाग में कई बातें आईं। पहली यह कि न्यूयार्क में तो चागला साहब भारत के वकील बन कर बोल रहे थे और यहाँ इस सदन में सुरक्षा परिषद् के वकील बन कर बोल रहे थे। इस से ऊँचाट साहब को बहुत खुश होना चाहिए, लेकिन मैं अभी साबित कर दूँगा कि उन की यह खुशी खत्म हो जायेगी, क्योंकि इस प्रस्ताव से सुरक्षा परिषद् भी खत्म हो जायेगी।

इसी के साथ चागला साहब हम लोगों पर थोड़ा सा रहम करते और जज की तरह बोलते, वकील की तरह नहीं। अपने मामले को साबित करने के लिए उन्होंने यहाँ पर अपने ही भाषणों

से कई उद्धरण दिये लेकिन उन्हें बताना चाहिये था कि वहाँ पर गोलडबर्ग ने क्या कहा, रूस ने क्या कहा, सुरक्षा परिषद् के प्रस्ताव और टीकाकारों ने क्या कहा। चागला साहब ने खुद क्या कहा, इस से तो चीजें नहीं साबित हो जाया करती।

चागला साहब 31 मिनट तक तो बोले वकील की तरह और 4 मिनट बोले सिपाही की तरह। अगर उन के यही चार मिनट अभी 31 मिनट हो जायेंगे, तब तो भारत का मामला जीत कर रहेगा, लेकिन उन्होंने 31 मिनट तक जो कुछ कहा, उस पर भरोसा किया, तो हमारे लिए स्थिति बहुत खतरनाक हो जायेगी। मैं यह सलाह सिर्फ उन को ही नहीं, उनके सब साथियों को देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह दुनिया सिर्फ वकील बनाते, तो बड़ा अच्छा होता, लेकिन यह दुनिया बनती है, मैं मानता हूँ, कुछ वकीलों के हाथों, कुछ सिपाहियों के हाथों, लेकिन ज्यादातर ऐसे हाथों, जो प्राधे वकील और प्राधे सिपाही होते हैं।

जिनीवा के राष्ट्र संघ के बारे में मेरा जो थोड़ा सा तजर्बा है, मैं ऊँचाट साहब को भी और अपने सरकार के साथियों को भी बताना चाहता हूँ। उस वक्त जिनीवा में राष्ट्र संघ था, जैसे कि प्राज न्यूयार्क में संयुक्त राष्ट्र है। नाम बदल गए हैं। चागला साहब को पहले वाले का पता नहीं है मैं ने पहले वाले को प्राधे से भी देखा और कानों से भी सुना। उस वक्त मैंने एक बात नोट की कि जब उस की लम्बी लम्बी तारीफ होती थी, उस वक्त भी उस में एक रोग लगा हुआ था। और वही रोग मैं प्राज न्यूयार्क की सुरक्षा परिषद में भी देख रहा हूँ। और वह बिल्कुल साफ रोग है कि धमरीका वियतनाम में क्या करता है, उस पर यह सुरक्षा परिषद् प्रस्ताव पास नहीं करती और न कर सकती है, रूस हंगरी में क्या करता है, उस पर यह सुरक्षा परिषद् प्रस्ताव पास नहीं करती और न ही कर सकती है। बः प्रस्ताव पास करती है, सिर्फ उन देशों के मामलों में, जो दुबल हैं, असहाय हैं, कम शोर हैं,

[श० राम मरोहर लोहिया]

जिनकी पल्टनी ताकत इतनी नहीं है कि वे अपने मन-चाहे रास्ते पर जा सकें।

ये बातें मैंने अपने विद्यार्थी जमाने में ही जेनेवा में अपनी घ्रांखों से देखीं और कानों से सुनीं। इस से थोड़ा सा सबक यह सरकार भी सीख ले और ऊं घांट साहब भी सीख लें, तो दुनिया के लिए अच्छा होगा, क्योंकि मैं नहीं चाहता कि यह सुरक्षा परिषद् खत्म हो जाये। मेरी इच्छा है कि यह बनी रहे और दुनिया का कुछ फायदा करे। लेकिन यह तभी हो सकता है, जब कोई चमत्कार, यानी एक बुनियादी तब्दीली, इस में आए। नहीं तो क्या होगा कि यह सुरक्षा परिषद् दो देशों के मामलों को छोड़ कर—और यह साफ है कि वे दो देश कौन से हैं : रूस और अमरीका, क्योंकि याद रखें कि पहले तीस चालीस बरसों में खाली यही दो देश हैं, कोई तीसरा देश नहीं है—जब कभी किसी देश के मामले को उठायेगी तो वह न्याय या नई दुनिया के बनाने के आधार पर अपने प्रस्ताव पास नहीं करेगी—वह करेगी समझौते और लेन-देन के आधार पर। जो प्रस्ताव अभी पास हुआ है या समझौता हुआ है वह लेन-देन वाला है और न्याय वाला नई दुनिया को बनाने वाला नहीं है। लेन देन का है। उस में क्या है नम्बर। पांच अग्रतक का जगहों पर वापिस जाओ। नम्बर दो काश्मिर पर बातचीत करो। प्रस्ताव में ये दो चींजें बिल्कुल साफ हैं। मैं अभी तो नहीं कहना चाहता कि ये दोनों चींजें लाजिमी तौर से आपके लिए खतरनाक होंगी। लेकिन अगर आप 31 मिनट वाले रहे तो खतरनाक होंगी; और अगर चार मिनट वाले रहेंगे तो जरूरी नहीं है अन्तिम रूप से खतरनाक साबित हों। लेकिन याद रखना ये दो चींजें जं. उस प्रस्ताव में हैं हर हालत में खतरनाक होने वाली हैं। दुनिया के लिए भी और भारत और पाकिस्तान के रिश्तों के लिए भी। क्योंकि जो आपने काश्मिर पर बातचीत करने को राह को उस प्रस्ताव में

रखा है तो साफ बात है। जाती है कि बातचीत करोगे। बातचीत अगर पाकिस्तान के हक में जाती है—गएी नहं क्यों कि मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि कोई सरकार हिन्दुस्तान में अत्यामहत्या करने के लिए तैयार होगी—इंस बहुत से लोग होते हैं क्या पता है क्या ठिकाना है कि कब कोई क्या कर बैठे—लेकिन अगर वह बातचीत ऐसे ही रह जाती है लटकी हुई तो नतीजा क्या होगा ? कोई मामला हल नहीं होता। भारत और पाकिस्तान के रिश्ते बिगड़ते चले जाते हैं कड़वाहट बढ़ती चली जाती है। फिर वकालत कोई काम नहीं करेगी।

इस वास्ते मेहरबानी करके घांट साहब को मेरी तरफ से आप यह बात बता देना कि अगर सुरक्षा परिषद को बचाना चाहते हो तो पुराने जेनेवा के राष्ट्र संघ के रास्ते से उसको हटाओ। वरना उन दो बड़े देशों के मामलों में तो यह कुछ कर नहीं पाएगा और जब कभी वे दोनों देश फैसला कर लेंगे तो यह टकरा कर चकनाचूर हो जाएगा और बाकी जितने देश है उनके मामलों में दखल देता रहेगा न्याय के लिए नहीं बल्कि सीदे-बाजी के लिए लेन-देन के लिए। यह बुनियादी बात है।

अब सवाल उठता है कि अंग्रेजों ने क्या किया। बचपन से ही जो मेरे विचार हैं वे मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं। हो सकता है कि कुछ मुझ पर गांधी जी का असर पड़ा हो कुछ अपने जमाने का असर पड़ा हो लेकिन चागला साहब आप उस से थोड़ा बहुत भूलते हैं इसलिए मैं बता देता हूं। मुझ जैसे आदमी ने शायद ही दुनिया में किसी भी सरकार को उतना ज्यादा गन्दा समझा हो जितना अंग्रेजी सरकार को समझा है। चाहे जो भी सरकार हो चाहे जिस पार्टी की हो अंग्रेज सरकार से ज्यादा गन्दा सरकार आप संसार में नहीं देखेंगे। इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी कह देना चाहता हूं कि अंग्रेज जनता

से ज्यादा अच्छी सियासी जनता भी मैं ने दुनिया में हीन देखी है। सवाल है कुछ नतीजा निकालो। सरकारों से काम करना है। और यह सरकार है कौसी? मुझे शक है कि इस सरकार ने जिन्ना साहब के साथ चाहे लिखा और चाहे बेलिखा एक समझौता किया। उसने कहा मत डरना बच्चे जब कभी खतरा आएगा तो हम रहेंगे। हम तुम्हें बनवाते हैं और तुम्हें बचायेंगे। इसका मैं आपको एक सबूत भी दे देना चाहता हूँ। नाम तो मैं नहीं बताऊंगा। लेकिन एक बहुत बड़े भ्रफगान नेता ने जिन्ना साहब से बातचीत की थी उन दिनों जब वह पाकिस्तान बनवाने की कोशिश कर रहे थे कि जिन्ना साहब आप हक मांग रहे हैं आत्मनिर्णय का तो थोड़ा सा पख्तूनों को भी आत्मनिर्णय का हक दीजिये। जिन्ना साहब ने कहा कि मांगो तुम भी। उन्होंने कहा कि हम मांगेंगे तो अंग्रेज लोगों के हथियार तो अभी हैं सरहदों पर और हम पिट रहे हैं और भ्रगर ये कहेंगे तो पीटपाट कर हमें किनारे कर देंगे। तब जिन्ना साहब ने जवाब दिया कि तुम समझते हो कि पाकिस्तान बन जाने के बाद अंग्रेजों के हथियार नहीं रहेंगे। वे हथियार तो तब भी रहेंगे और तब भी रखा करेगे और तब भी तुम्हें पख्तूनिस्तान नहीं मिल पाएगा। यह बातचीत जिन्ना साहब के एक बहुत बड़े भ्रफगान नेता के साथ हुई थी जिससे मुझको विश्वास होता है कि अंग्रेजों का इन पाकिस्तानियों के साथ कोई लिखा या बेलिखा समझौता हुआ है। आपके साथ भी हुआ था लेकिन उसका मैं जिक्र नहीं करूंगा। वह भ्रलग बात है हालांकि बहुत खतरनाक समझौते हुए हैं। लेकिन उसको अभी आप छोड़ दीजिये।

एक चीज का आपको फौसला करना होगा। अभी तक जिस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति का दिमाग भ्रगर दिमाग है तो और शरीर किधर रहे हैं। जीभ यानी वचन यह तो रूसी रही है पिछले आठ दस बरसों में लेकिन शरीर रहा है अंग्रेजी।

व्यापार अंग्रेजों के साथ मशीन अंग्रेजों की जहाज पलटन सब अंग्रेजों के समान सब अंग्रेजों के यहां से खरीदते रहे हैं और शरीर सब अंग्रेजों के साथ रहा है। और दिमाग, भ्रगर दिमाग है, तो वह रूसियों के साथ रहा है। यह खल नहीं पाएगा। कुछ थोड़ा सा सामंजस्य साधो। जिधर दिमाग रखते हैं उधर शरीर को भी थोड़ा बहुत रखो। यह करेंगे तो मामला ठीक हो जाएगा।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद की बात को तो मैं भूल ही गया। दह बहुत अच्छा बोले हैं। मुझे बहुत खुशी है कि वह भूल गए कि किस पार्टी में वह हैं। बहुत अच्छी बात उन्होंने कही आदमी को भूल जाना चाहिए जब वह सच्ची बात कहे सच्चाई के रास्ते पर चले। उस समय उसको तैयार रहना चाहिये कि अपनी पार्टी को टूटकर कर खत्म कर दे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजों से रिश्ते को थोड़ा ढीला करो भ्रगर खत्म न कर पाओ। मैं तो यही राब यूंगा कि खत्म करो लेकिन भ्रगर खत्म न कर पाओ तो थोड़ा ढीला करो।

उसी तरह से फ्रांसीसी टिगान साहब के बारे में जान लेना कि उनकी कोशिश क्या है जरूरी है। उनकी कोशिश यह है कि एक रसिक कौम को पलटनी कौम बना डालें। उस कोशिश में वे छटपटा रहे हैं और ऐसी कार्रवाइयां कर रहे हैं कि जिसका नतीजा कुछ थोड़ा बहुत तो शायद आपने देखा होगा। भागे जाकर और कुछ भ्रगतता पड़ेगा। एक रसिक कौम को पलटनी कौम बनाने की वह कोशिश कर रहे हैं। रह गये आपके अफेगियाई दौलत। आपकी विदेश नीति की धिजियां उड़ चुकी हैं। एक मलेगिया के आप जरूर मुकम्कार हैं। उसने आपकी मदद की और यह भी किन्हीं कारणों से। जाडन को आप समझ नहीं पाते हैं। उसका सीधा सा सबब है। भ्रब राट्टों को आपने बढ़ा। आप देखें कि जाडन को किस ने बनाया किस ने

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

रखा और कोन चला रहा है। अंग्रेज महा-
प्रभु ही तो चलाते हैं और चला रहे हैं।

एक बुनियादी बात मैं कहूंगा। आपने एक बहुत बढ़िया बात कही कि इस साल आपका तजुबा कुछ अच्छा रहा। पिछले साल उतना उतना अच्छा नहीं था। मालूम है क्या फर्क है? इस साल कुछ परिवर्तन जो हुआ है। इस साल हिन्दुस्तान ने अपने सिपा-
क्षियों को लड़ाई इधर उधर बढ़ कर भी करने दी है। यह फर्क हुआ है इसीलिए मैं आपकी सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप अपनी विशेष नीति को बुनियादी तौर से बदलें। एक तरफ तो आप अपने पड़ोसियों की तरफ ध्यान दें। अफगानिस्तान है, नेपाल है, मलेशिया है और अगर कोई और ऐसे देश मिल सकते हैं जो बिल्कुल पड़ोसी हों और वे भी दोस्त बन सकते हैं, घाई देश भी हो सकता है, उनको आप दोस्त बनाने की कोशिश करें। थोड़ा रूस और अमरीका भी हैं दोनों किसी हद तक—मैं शायद ज्यादा कह जाऊंगा,—मित्र रहे हैं। दोनों मित्र बनाये जा सकते हैं। जो कुछ कमियां आप की नीति की रही हैं, उनको आप दूर करने की कोशिश करें। ऐसे दायरे हैं। एक दायरा तो यही है भारत और पाकिस्तान का और दूसरा दायरा दुनिया की गरीबी का है। इन दो दायरों को आप अपनी विदेश नीति का मुख्य उद्देश्य बना कर कसौटी पर लिये। रूस और अमरीका, एक या दोनों, जो हम को इन दोनों दायरों में मदद देता है वह हमारा बढ़िया दोस्त रहेगा। किसी तरह की सिद्धान्त हीनता वगैरह चक्कर में फंस कर, मंत्र वगैरह के चक्कर में फंस कर आप अपनी नीति को खराब न करें।

सवाल उठता है कि मिला क्या इन सब चीजों में? एक चीज तो यह मिली कि पिछले छठारह बरस का चक्कर खत्म हुआ कि हम वहीं लड़ते थे जहां दुश्मन था और हम से

लड़ता था। अब यह शुरूआत हो गई है कि दुश्मन की ताकत को खत्म करने के लिए हम वहां भी जाएंगे जहां हम मजबूत पड़ेंगे और उसको खत्म करने की कोशिश करेंगे। यह बात मिली है। और यह बात मैं हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को खास तौर पर बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार भी मजबूरी में इस बात को पकड़े रहेगी, सरकार पर मुझे भरोसा नहीं, मजबूरी पर भरोसा है, मजबूरी में पकड़ रखेंगे, कि दुश्मन से सिर्फ उस जमीन पर मत लड़ो जिस पर आकर वह तुम लड़ता है, बल्कि जाओ, उसकी जमीन पर भी जाओ।

इसके साथ साथ शायद एक बात और मिली है कि पाकिस्तान का पलटनी घमंड...

एक माननीय सदस्य : चूर हो गया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : चूर शब्द का इस्तेमाल तो नहीं कर सकता, हालांकि चाहता था कि कर सकता, लेकिन कम से कम उमे धक्का लगा है। नरम पड़ा है ऐसा लगता है। लेकिन किस हद तक नरम पड़ा है, नहीं जानता। अगर इस हद तक नरम पड़ा है कि पाकिस्तान के मौजूदा नेता लोग या तो अपने पुराने खयालों को बदलते हैं या फिर उनको हटा कर कोई दूसरा बढ़िया नेतृत्व पाकिस्तान में प्राये, तब उसका बड़ा अच्छा नतीजा होगा, और तब मुझ जैसे लोगों की बात यहां और वहां थोड़ी बहुत सुनी जायेगी। यह दो चोखे तो मिलीं, और क्या नहीं मिला इस को भी याद रखना।

इस लड़ाई में एक ही वाक्य निकला जो याद रखना जा सकता है और याद रखना जायेगा, शायद एक वाक्य के हिसाब से, और वह है कि हिन्दुस्तान एक युद्धबन्दी से दूसरी युद्धबन्दी में हमेशा सफल नहीं करता रहेगा। यह बढ़िया और ऊंचा वाक्य था। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस होता है कहते हुए कि

बह लफ्फाजी निकला । हम एक युद्धबन्दी से दूसरी युद्धबन्दी तक सफर करते चले जा रहे हैं ।

एक दूसरी चीज जो नहीं मिली, ऐसा लगता है सुरक्षा परिषद् के प्रस्ताव को देखते हुए वह यह कि प्रधान मन्त्री साहब ने इस उड़ी पूछ के झोल को खत्म करने के लिये बचन दे रक्खा है । खैर, इसके बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहता हूँ । खाली इतना याद दिलाता हूँ कि देखो, बचन है तुम्हारा । मेरा नहीं, मेरा तो उससे बहुत आगे जाता है ।

तीसरी चीज जो उनको नहीं मिली वह यह कि चाहे हजार वकालत करो कहीं भी, चाहे ताशकन्द में या कहीं भीर, पाकिस्तान के साथ बैठ कर बातचीत करनी पड़ेगी भीर यह बहुत खतरनाक होगा । मैं मान लेता हूँ कि वह बहुत चालाक रहेंगे, मीठे धादमी हैं, चालाक रहेंगे, लेकिन बातचीत करने में बड़े खतरनाक नतीजे दुप्रा करते हैं, क्योंकि अगर पाकिस्तान असन्तुष्ट हुआ तो बिल्कुल साफ बात है । (Interruptions) मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त मैं कुछ इस ढंग से बोल रहा हूँ कि शाहद सरकार के लिये भी फायदेमन्द बातें हों । तो नतीजा बड़ा खतरनाक हो सकता है । चाहे बातचीत फिर भी जाये, ऊंट किस करवट बँडे, चाहे ऊंट हिन्दुस्तान के करवट बँडे—हिन्दुस्तान नहीं, माफ कीजियेगा—भारत के करवट बँडे या पाकिस्तान के करवट बँडे, दोनों हालतों में बात खतरनाक है । क्योंकि अगर पाकिस्तान का नेतृत्व नहीं बचला, पाकिस्तान का पलटनी घमंड, जिसको मैं समझता हूँ कि धक्का लगा है, चूर नहीं हुआ, तो पाकिस्तान फिर से हमला करने की कोशिश करेगा । भीर यह बात कही जा चुकी है, भुट्टो साहब वहाँ फरमा चुके हैं—युद्धबन्दी नहीं हो पाई थी, जिस समय युद्ध जारी था, उन्होंने फतवा दे डाला । इस बात को शास्त्री जी को याद रखना है जब वह

अपनी बात कहेंगे कि फिर से हमला होने की बातचीत चल पड़ी है ।

इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत धीरज के साथ मुझ को सुनना । गुस्सा मत होना, भाप लोगों के भले की बात कह रहा हूँ, भीर वह यह है कि लाहौर भीर स्यालकोट के इलाकों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा चार, पांच या छः दिन में भारत को ले लेना चाहिये था । लेकिन वह ले नहीं पाया । इसके क्या कारण थे । हो सकता है कि पलटनी प्रयोग्यता रही हो । इस पर मुझ इस वक्त कुछ नहीं कहना है ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) :
नहीं, नहीं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : देखो, रघुनाथ सिंह साहब, कुछ जानो तब बोलो । मैं "हो सकता है," कह रहा हूँ । इसलिये इस पर मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है । लेकिन यह भी हो सकता है कि जिन चीजों के दिल जरा नाजुक थे भीर उन्हें डर लगा कि पहले धक्के में जब हम नहीं ले पाये तो अगर दूसरा या तीसरा धक्का देगे तो धादमी भीर सामान का इतना नुकसान हो जायेगा कि फिर हम चान का मुकाबला नहीं कर पायेंगे । ऐसा हो तो मैं इस सदन में बड़े जोर से कह देना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी पलटनी या विदेश नीति इस तरह से नहीं चला करती है । जब एक मकसद बना लेंगे तो उस मकसद को हासिल करने के लिये अपने धादमी भीर अपना सामान डाल दो भीर उस को हासिल कर लेंगे । मकसद होना चाहिये था लाहौर भीर स्यालकोट वाना क्योंकि अगर भाब लाहौर भीर स्यालकोट भारतीय पलटनी के हाथों में होते भीर फिर वहाँ से हटना पड़ता, मान लो पुंड विराम के बाद हट कर भाते, तब जरा नाक कुछ ऊंची होनी । तब बात समझ में आती कि पाकिस्तान का पलटनी घमंड टूटा है । चीन वाला बान भारत सरकार को हमला के लिये आने दिमाग से

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

निकाल देनी चाहिये । अगर पाकिस्तान के मामले को हल करना है तो चीन बीच में टपक पड़ेगा, इस डर और संकोच को दिमाग से बिल्कुल निकाल देना चाहिये । चीन आयेगा तब देखेंगे उससे भी निपट लेंगे ।

जो लड़ाई हुई उस में दो शब्दों का बड़ा इस्तेमाल हुआ, और होना चाहिये । एक अंग्रेजी शब्द ने हमारा बड़ा नुकसान किया है और वह है सेकुलरिज्म । माफ करना, सेकुलरिज्म का मतलब बहुत कम लोग जानते हैं । घमं निरपेक्ष जिसे कहते हैं वह तो उसका एक छोटा सा अंग है । सेकुलरिज्म का मतलब है लोकवादी । जिस तरह से परलोकवादी उसी तरह से लोकवादी । अगर वह करने जाते हो तो हिन्दू, मुसलमान के मामले में पहले साफ फैसला कर डालो । उस एकता को खत्म करो जो पिछले 18 वर्षों से चली आ रही है कि दोनों अलग रहते हुए एक हो जायें । मैं चाहता हूँ कि दोनों के अलगवाब को घटाते हुए दोनों को एक करो, और उस रास्ते पर चलो तब जा कर पाकिस्तानी जनता और पाकिस्तानी पटलन में बगावत कर सकते हो ।

इस के साथ साथ मैं कहता हूँ . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो चुका ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं चार मिनट में अपनी बात खत्म किये देता हूँ ।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : बोलिये बोलिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आज आप लोगों के सामने मुझे बड़ी खुशी हो रही है कि कुछ तो पुराना जमाना याद आया ।

तो इस तरह से एक थोड़ा याद रखना कि बार करोड़ 99 लाख मुसलमानों को अब पकड़ने की कोशिश करना और 5 हजार

खानदानी मुसलमानों को अपने से थोड़ा दूर रखना । यह सरकार की बड़ी भारी गलती रही है, न सिर्फ मुसलमानों के मामले में बल्कि हिन्दुओं के और सभी के मामले में भी, कि खानदानी लोगों को पकड़ कर दुनिया को बदलना चाहते हैं । अब ज्यादातर जनता को पकड़ कर दुनिया को बदलने की कोशिश करो ।

इसी तरह से पाकिस्तान के मामले में यह याद रखना कि खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां, सरहदी गांधी, जो पन्द्रह सोलह सालों से जेल में रहे, और खान अब्दुससमद खां, बलूची गांधी, ये मामूली आदमी नहीं हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि वह अपने यहां की आधी से ज्यादा जनता की नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं । वह भी जेल में रहे । फिर मैं ने एक खबर सुनी है, शायद आप लोगों को न मालूम हो कि खिजर हयात खां पंजाब के पिछले आठ या दस दिनों से नजरबन्दी या जेल में हैं । जरा इन सब चीजों को ध्यान में रखना । इसलिये अगली दफे . . .

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : तिबाना ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हां, वही खिजर हयात खां तिबाना । जरा अपनी सरकार को यह सुना दिया करो । चागला साहेब तो यह बात याद रखना कि अगली दफे जब पाकिस्तान हमला करने आये तो मेरी जो यह राय कि पाकिस्तान छूटे ही बह जायेगा इस बुनियाद पर है कि यह पठान, यह बलूची, यह बंगाली, यह सारा भानुमती का पिटारा जोड़ कर वहां रखा गया है, बशर्ते कि आप लोरुशाही और लोकबाद इन दो चीजों को पकड़ कर चले

संसार में दो बड़े रोग हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में ये रोग सबसे ज्यादा है । ये रोग हैं गैर बराबरी और अलगवाब । और इनको दू

करने की एक दबाई तो है समता की और दूसरी दबाई है सामीप्य की। इन दोनों का सारी जनता के बीच इस्तैमाल होना चाहिए।

तो मेरा कहना है कि एक तरफ तो पाकिस्तान और चीन के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति सुधारो और दूसरी तरफ अन्न के सवाल को हल करो। लोगों को भ्रनाज चाहिए। और यह याद रखना कि जब मुझे जैसा धादमी भीड़ से कहता है कि देखो भूखों मत मरना, मरने के पहले मंत्रियों और अफसरों के घरों में चले जाना और उन्हें उस वक़्त तक मत खाने देना जब तक कि तुम न खा पाओ, तो इस को धमकी मत समझना। यह हिन्दुस्तान और दुनिया के स्वास्थ्य की धावाज है।

इसी तरह से जनतंत्र के बारे में मैं बता दू कि जनतंत्र की खाल है, यह तो अपनी चमड़ी है, केवल इसको छोड़ लेने से काम नहीं चलेगा। इसके अन्दर जनतंत्र की धात्मा होनी चाहिए।

और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा आप से एक नम्र निवेदन है कि इस दफा तो हुआ, लेकिन अगली दफा ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि बीस तीस दिन से लड़ाई चलती रही लेकिन उस लड़ाई के बारे में वेष्ट की लोक सभा में चर्चा नहीं हुई। एकतंत्र की धात्मा है और जनतंत्र की खाल है। इस चीज को कुछ बोझा सा उन अंग्रेजों से, जिनको मैं सरकारी पैमाने पर बुरा कहता हूँ, हम को सीख लेना चाहिए।

और रही मेरी अपनी बात, सो हम को तो सफर मिला है। हम ने पहाड़ तोड़ कर सड़क बना दी। लेकिन अब आप हम को उस पर चलने भी नहीं देते, धीरों को पहले बलने देते हो। दुनिया इसको देख रही है और समझ रही है, आप भी समझो और इस पर ध्यान दो।

अन्त में मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बात पर ध्यान दो कि जनतंत्र और

लोकवाद के इन दो सिद्धान्तों को पकड़ कर भारत को मजबूत बनाते चले जाओ, और मुझे पक्का विश्वास है कि चाहे लड़ाई से हो या रजामन्दी से हो, हम अपने और पाकिस्तान के बीच में ऐसी स्थिति पैदा कर देंगे कि पांच, दस या दो बरस में पाकिस्तान खरम हो जायेगा और भारत भी खरम हो जायेगा और फिर से हिन्दुस्तान बनेगा।

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit (Phulpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, today's debate arises from the Security Council's resolution calling for a cease-fire.

For the last few weeks we have passed through and faced the most serious threat since our Independence. The story of Pakistan's perfidy and deceit and the manner in which she aggressed for the third time on our country is a shameful one, but we are a proud people today, for we have given a reply in no uncertain terms. We have told those who sought to violate our territory and destroy the values on which our nation is built that they must keep their hands off, and not only keep their hands off, but keep their minds off certain concepts which belong to the mediaeval age and which they still choose to foster.

I would like, before I go on, to pay a respectful tribute to the bold leadership of the Prime Minister in this crisis. To those who have laid down their lives to defend the values by which we live, all I can say is that we, the people of India, will not forget their sacrifice and that we will continue to carry forward the ideals and the noble traditions and pattern of life for which they died to defend.

I share with the House and this country the concern regarding the nature of the reply that our Government will send to the Security Council. But after what the hon. Minister has just told us, I feel that the case of India will be well guarded, and neither our military nor our psychological advantage will be

[Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit]

sacrificed today or at any other time. Shri M. C. Chagla has told us very clearly that the case for India has been expressed with firmness and in very clear language. This is a good thing for us, and as far as it goes, it will be very helpful. But the ways of diplomacy are crooked, and I would merely like to say with great respect to Shri Chagla and to all those who will handle our case in the days to come that they must not only rely on the dictum Satyameva Jayate but also rely on the fact of the stand we have taken; the stand of strength and as he himself has admitted, it is unfortunately strength that counts. By strength, I do not only mean strength of aeroplanes and bombs and the nuclear weapons about which there has been so much talk in the last few days, but also that much strength which our jawans and our young pilots had, who were able to destroy the much bigger and stronger weapons (such as the Patton tanks) than the weapons which they themselves possessed; that is the strength that we want to create first in the country, and together with that all the other forms of military strength that evidently are needed in this day and age which in spite of the efforts of so many great statesmen and others seem to be falling back on the ways of the jungle.

There has been a very clear indication of the feelings of this House about our relationship with certain countries. One thing that this war with Pakistan has done is to remove the blinkers from our eyes, and we have suddenly seen clearly that we are not surrounded by the host of friends that we fondly imagine were standing behind us to back us on every issue. Nor am I prepared to accept in its entirety the criticism that this is due to bad publicity. It is true, and I have had my share in criticising the Government for their lack of publicity, their weak publicity and sometimes no publicity at all. But in this case

I think we cannot say that this was the only factor involved.

It would be good just to look back a little and see how it was that we became involved in this Commonwealth partnership. That was a moment in history when the world was full of tensions, and the war was ending, and when there was hatred and fear and suspicion in men's hearts, and it was felt in our country by our leaders that no steps should be taken that would further disrupt a situation which was already a threat to the peace and to the growing up of all those new nations that had just then emerged into freedom. It was with this idea in mind that the then Prime Minister looked for and found a formula which permitted of our joining the Commonwealth, and we joined it in the hope that with the ending of the Empire, we would bring a new life, and a new approach to this new association of free nations. It was a completely free association to be ended at the free will of the partners concerned. And we entered it, as one hon. Member told us, a little while ago, with great hopes for the future. We believed that India as a member of this association could lend support to many of the ideals and aims and objectives we had at heart, and could form a bridge between the West and the newly emerging nations and could bring dignity to a new concept and through it work for the peace and progress of the world and the advancement of all those nations which were then newly released from the colonial yoke. But right from the very beginning, the ideals that we had remained more or less theoretical. Britain as the senior partner somehow could not forget that you cannot run a commonwealth like you run an empire, there is a difference between the two, and she assumed on all occasions the role of the senior partner who does not discuss things or enter into consultations with others because their knowledge is less, is limited

and their experience is not so wide. Now, this is all right up to a certain extent. But I recall during all the period that I was in England on the many many occasions when there was need for consultation between the various High Commissions and Whitehall, that when we were summoned, it was always to be given a piece of paper announcing the decision already taken; and on our way back, we bought the evening paper in which we found this decision, so that the telegrams we sent to our governments were late by several hours because the radio had already announced the decision of Whitehall on a certain commonwealth matter which should have been reported at least one day ahead by the members of the High Commissions concerned.

Then, Sir, there are so many other small matters on which one found the crystallising of a peculiar attitude. It was nothing that one could take any great objection to at the moment, but it was something that gradually paved the way for much that happened subsequently. For instance, even when there was need for some discussion, somehow the commonwealth fell into two divisions, the white and the black.

Take the question of Suez. I admit that that was a very delicate business. It was not easy for Whitehall, for the Prime Minister of England perhaps to share his thoughts entirely with the Indian High Commissioner or with the Ceylon High Commissioner or the Ghanian High Commissioner and others who were quite obviously supporting President Nasser. But I would just like to refer to one instance which will show the manner in which Britain acted and the way in which we responded even when it meant the sacrificing of considerable interest of our own. When the Canal was nationalised, there was great heat and great feeling all over England. We were asked, as you will, no doubt remember, to intercede with President Nasser and request him to accept internationalisation of the Canal and certain

international guarantees. Now that would have suited us fine because the Canal meant a great deal to us, a great deal of our shipping went through the Canal and the loss of the Canal would have been a very heavy loss indeed in financial terms to India. But our reply was absolutely straight, unhesitating and given immediately. We said we could not possibly do that; President Nasser, who had so recently thrown off the colonial yoke himself, was entitled to take any steps he liked in the interest of his country and we would not be parties to again making Egypt or rather the Canal a playground for international politics.

So, of course, that naturally meant that there was a little feeling of suspicion between the various members although even there I am happy to say that the division did not quite fall in those terms and there were countries of the commonwealth which tried very hard and with great tact and with great effort to bridge a situation which was threatening to get very ugly indeed.

One thing about England which I have always admired and will continue to admire is that there is a distinct difference, as Dr. Lohia just pointed out, between the Government and public opinion. I am sure you will remember that even in the darkest days of our struggle for freedom when we really felt as if we were friendless, there was always a small group of people in England who held aloft the torch of justice and gave us hope that they at least, to the limited extent possible, were fighting our battles for us. What has happened today, it seems to me, is something quite extraordinary, for this group suddenly seems to have vanished into thin air.

First of all, the newspapers have taken a similarity of tone by which it is impossible to distinguish which political party they belong to. They have all become one and united in their partisan support for a Commonwealth country in a dispute between two Commonwealth countries.

[Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit]

We had always been told in the past, and I myself have had occasions many, many times to be given this lesson in and out of the United Nations, that Gt. Britain could not support us on certain issues because it meant voting against or showing disagreement with a fellow-member of the Commonwealth. This is what happened on the question of apartheid in South Africa for years and years and because the USA and Gt. Britain could not take a straight stand and join in the condemnation, the people of Africa had to go through a long period of travail and humiliation, and we had to go time and again to the United Nations to raise the same old plea that they were not doing anything about the aggression in Kashmir.

If things could be looked at without the background of a double standard, then life would be so much easier on the international plane. If it was wrong for a partisan attitude to be taken in the case of South Africa and everybody set on the fence, how is it now that the UK and USA and various other nations have jumped into the ring with Pakistan and equated Pakistan with ourselves? I can only think that so far as the UK is concerned, this again is not due to the fact that they do not know what is going on. Which country knows us better, both Pakistan and ourselves, than the United Kingdom? They have all the background material, they know how we have functioned since independence, they know all our motivations because so many of us are influenced by the British. Here am I speaking in the Parliament of my own country, a free country, an independent country, expressing myself in the language of the British.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : बहुत
खराब कर रही हैं ।

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit:
Therefore, the British know us very well, but I believe the reason why

they take this partisan attitude towards Pakistan is that they want to retain a special influence in Pakistan, because they have a nostalgic feeling for this part of the world where they cannot believe that their influence has gone for good and that their old prestige cannot be restored. So, by whatever manner of means, however crooked they may be, they seek to find a foothold in Pakistan. Of course, the other thing is that India is never going to be anybody's stooge, come what may. We have never been and we never intend to be, and this has been a lesson which generations will not forget. So, we cannot be bribed by offers of any kind of assistance. We want assistance, we have accepted it in the spirit in which it was offered. There is no need for friends to refuse assistance from one another, but we have now seen that though there were no outward conditions imposed, yet there were certain invisible ties by which we put us in difficulties and when it came to the moment of trial, and we wanted our friends to get up, to stand and be counted, there were no friends.

Here again, I would like to refer to my personal experience of the seven or eight years in which I had the honour to lead the Indian delegation to the United Nations, when everyday, many times in the day, I was told by the Western democracies: "Well, you have sided so many times with the Soviet Union and only so many times with the Western democracies because you said you were trying to judge all issues on their merits with a view to keep the cold war at bay, but when it comes to your own situation, then it is very different." Now, Sir, it does not hurt one when those one does not care about criticism or leave one in the lurch. But what is very hurtful is when those one has trusted somebody on the back. I do not want to go into the long history; Mr. Azad has gone in great detail with quotations to show how this present government in Great Britain has fac-

ed a situation in which it was called upon not to take sides, not to apportion blame but to declare where justice lay. I would have thought that comparing India and Pakistan, Pakistan a theocratic State, practically going back to the middle ages, and India a modern secular democratic State which has taken so much of its constitution and its pattern of life and its rule of law from Great Britain and from other western democracies, it would be the easiest thing for these people to get up and say: well, there is something very wrong going on here and we must apportion blame where it lies. But no such thing happened. Therefore, we have at this time to re-assess the situation. Human beings change their clothes according to the season. As we grow older we adjust our habits to our age. So, our country must adjust its policies to the age and times in which it finds itself. There is nothing about a policy which is sacrosanct. If a policy serves you it is a good policy. The day it ceases to serve you it must be rejected in favour of a better policy. The guiding principle must be one's national interest and ability to make allowances that are useful to oneself to begin with and then, secondly, to the world. I would not like us ever to forget that we have been brought up in a different way to many other countries. We must never forget the lessons we learnt in our national movement and the lessons that followed during the early days of Independence. Changing or trimming or modification of policies has to be done here and now or we shall find ourselves in very grave circumstances after which it will be difficult for us to go. We have to decide now who are the people who will stand us in good stead in peace and in war because, evidently, war is not ruled out. I would like to say a word of personal explanation. I feel humiliated today as I stand here talking about war when I have been pledged to the principles of peace since, as a little girl of 18, I joined the women's league for peace and freedom. It goes against the grain

for me to say war is a necessity, but having seen what happened in my country I should say that we must so re-assess our foreign policy and our relationship with other nations as to get and derive the maximum benefit for ourselves and then to help in creating a better state in the world. This is the moment to do it. I do not believe that this cease fire means peace. It might mean an uneasy peace for a while only. Until the Security Council has fairly and squarely labelled Pakistan the aggressor, until the world has accepted the facts of the last few weeks, until that time, it is no use our relaxing or relying on outsiders. We must gear our efforts to speed up our defence production, our food production, our human production... (Interruptions.) I do not mean creating more human beings but better human beings, stronger human beings, men and women who will understand the need and respond to it as they did in face of the last calamity that took place. It will lie down if it is not kept up. I do plead with the Government not to relax the effort in anyway at all.

Regarding which countries we shall sever our connections with, I would like to say, let us think of it when we are cooler, assess the situation and come to our decisions when we are able to take an objective view and only, first and last, always, in the interests of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Muhammad Ismail. Order, order; those who wish to go out will please go silently.

Shri Muhammad Ismail (Manjeri): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, we have to pay our undying gratitude and tribute to the armed forces of the country, who have served and sacrificed splendidly for the honour and security of the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. There is too much of noise in the House.

Shri Muhammad Ismail: Our congratulations are also due to the Government for the brilliant success which has attended their war efforts in defence and honour of the country. We cannot also forget the solidarity of the whole population of India, including all sections people belonging to various creeds and communities, in the cause of the defence and integrity and the security honour of the country.

The subject-matter of the discussion is the resolution passed by the Security Council. Whatever may be said of the content and character of the resolution, the fact is there: it has produced, so far as our country is concerned, only an uneasy truce. We find that the other side has not taken it in the same spirit in which we have taken it. Even up to the last minute of the cease fire, there has been continuation of violence; apart from the bombings of men who were travelling in unarmed plane on business of the State and bombings on unarmed and innocent people, there have been bombings also on holy places of worship such as churches, gurdwaras and mosques. This is a matter which deserves condemnation not only by people in India but of every sensible man in other parts of the world.

In connection with this resolution, we are disappointed in one thing. In spite of our diplomats' claim to have argued and done well, the resolution does not proclaim the fact as to who is the aggressor. That goes to show the strength of our diplomatic front. Even though our armed front was up to the mark, more than was expected of them, the achievement of our diplomatic front has not matched that of our soldiers. Once again the old questions are being raked up. To mention one, the old Kashmir question is not yet given a rest, as we expected it would be given. They speak of self determination and plebiscite. Self-determination is a thing which must be claimed by a people. It is not a gift that is given to a people by another people. The people who want

self-determination and plebiscite must claim it themselves. That is what we mean by self determination. But here in Kashmir the people decided long ago that they wanted to be with India and that decision has been made by the people of Kashmir.

16 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now what happened during the present crisis? Village after village caught hold of the infiltrators and gave information to the police and other authorities. That shows their determination in keeping by the decision they have come to 18 years ago that they would continue with India. That is the decision so far as the people of Kashmir are concerned that has been made. Now, who is it who wants self determination for these people? Not the people themselves. It may be pointed out that there are certain people in Kashmir who are speaking about plebiscite and self-determination. Who are they? These are the very people who in the beginning led and guided the people to come to this decision of acceding to India. Now in national matters, in the formation of a country or settlement of a country's affairs, one cannot be changing his decision on such matters again and again as one would change his coat or cap. When a decision is made in such matters, it stands for ever. That is the practice all over the world. Therefore, whatever may be said by certain propogandists, the position is this, The Kashmiris themselves, for whom others want the right of self-determination, have shown that Kashmir forms an integral part of this country. That cannot be changed. If anybody does anything against this established fact, that is really an aggression against the integrity and honour of the country. What has our diplomatic front done in this matter of making the world understand clearly this situation? Nothing. That is why I say our diplomatic front, our diplomacy, must still make head-

way and improve in the matter of conducting the affairs of the country in the international front.

Coming to the Security Council resolution, the first thing is it has not declared who is the aggressor. They could have done that very easily. There were UN observers there. If it is not their function to see where and by whom the aggression was committed, I do not know what other functions they have got there as observers of the UN. The Secretary-General came here and spoke with the leader of the UN observers and the result of his finding was conveyed to the UN Security Council. In spite of all that, they could not come to a decision that Pakistan was the aggressor and that India was always for peace. Unless such a decision is come to there is no end to the matter and we need not wonder why the truce, the peace that has been brought by the resolution is only an uneasy truce. There is also no guarantee for the future. Things that are happening now and have happened until the last minute before the case fire do not encourage us to think that, that guarantee would be forth-coming.

In this connection, I have to associate myself with what was said by some speakers with regards to our friends. Our friends, whose number was fairly large in the past, were not with us during the crisis. But a small country, which is now fighting for its own existence, which has got to meet a confrontation from its neighbour which is a big country, a country whose federation itself is being sought to be shattered—a part of it, Singapore, has already gone away from her—and who finds herself in a tight position, had the boldness to speak out the truth in the Security Council and to say that their government was in favour of our country.

Sir, if there is proper diplomatic endeavour and conduct on the part of our embassies, our position would not have been what it is today. Our country is a large country, a big country,

an ancient country, and a country which is carrying on its affairs in a democratic way. We, therefore, naturally, should find many friends in the world to co-operate with us. The diplomacy and friendship of other nations, after all is said and done, is based upon a care of self interest on the part of the other nations. They care for their interest. They ask the question as to how they will be benefited by joining a particular country. When they ask such questions, our country being a large country, a democratic country, will surely influence those people if only our diplomatic front works in the right way about it. That is what has not been done, to my mind, by our diplomatic front.

Therefore, when we think of revising our foreign policy, we must give thought to our diplomatic front also, how to improve it so that our case might be put very clearly before the world. Even though we have got a strong case in this matter, the world has been kept in doubt about it. They have not understood what they ought to do not only in justice but also even in their own interest. Losing the friendship of India will not be a gain to the other countries of the world, to the diplomatic front of the world. This has not been sufficiently impressed upon the world and our Government must take every step to see that this defect is rectified.

As I said, the truce has not brought real peace to us. Therefore, the country has to be prepared for any further eventuality. As has been said by Dr. Lohia, strength is the best of all arguments in such affairs. We must always pay our attention to the strength and in maintaining that strength. Our readiness for any eventuality is a thing that is required for maintaining our honour and integrity and security. Therefore, I want to tell you that in that attempt all sections of the people, the whole population of the country, is at the back of the Government. When the

[Shri Muhammad Ismail]

country was facing the crisis, which is not completely liquidated, people from every corner of the country, from one end of the country to the other, joined together and rallied behind the Government. They have shown their solidarity in the effort to secure the honour of the country. That same solidarity and same co-operation will be extended to the Government in making further efforts in securing and maintaining the honour of the country.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Mr. Speaker, Sir, for years our people have been suffering from many difficulties and inconveniences. But, in spite of that, when the country was in danger they rose as one man and did what they possibly could do in the circumstances. Our fighting forces gave us a splendid account of themselves. They performed deeds which were reminiscent of reckless Rajput bravery. Their bravery was sometimes suicidal. I hope that we will be worthy of the great sacrifices that our fighting forces have made.

There are certain problems which we must re-think. It is not enough to say that we are wedded to the status quo ante. In this moving world there can be no status quo. The conditions under which we are living require radical and revolutionary policies if we are to get out of the troubles in which we find ourselves. We have, therefore, to re-think not only our foreign policy but also our home policy. I have no objection if even today the Government and Congressmen go on chanting hymns of non-alignment. Keep yourself as non-aligned as even China is. But, for God's sake, keep your diplomacy, your strategy, your tactics in a fluid condition. These must change with the time, place and circumstances. We should have no permanent enemies, no permanent friends. We have seen that though our cause was just, though it was crystal clear that Pakis-

tan had committed aggression, though it was clear that it had crossed the line that was established by the United Nations at the time of the cease-fire and although they crossed the international boundary, we found no friend except Malaysia.

An hon. Member: Singapore

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Singapore. We are thankful to them. But, remember, they sided with us because it coincided with their self-interest. No nation sides with another unless their interests coincide. Unless we have some good understanding with people and unless we cultivate friendship, we will find ourselves in the same position as we found ourselves in when this war began.

It is not difficult at least for the democratic countries of the West to understand us as against Pakistan. The cry that Kashmir should go to Pakistan is based on communal lines. It should not be difficult for democratic countries to understand that if India is to be divided on communal lines, there can be no place for the 50 million Muslims in this country. This is such a simple thing that anybody can understand it, that is, those who want to understand it. But they do not want to understand it.

It is also a fact that we have not properly explained to them the position in India. Who will be responsible for these 50 millions of people? Will the UNO be responsible for them if we hold that religion decides nationality? It is a good sign that the Muslims in India, and in Kashmir even, had shown that they do not believe in this theory of two nations. We never accepted it. We repudiated it. Ours is a democratic set-up. We live by certain values which, if the democratic countries of the West do not understand, it means that they are prejudiced; it means that they have certain interests of their own which impel them to go not with truth but with untruth. The

question is crystal clear and if they do not want to understand it, as I said—I am glad that a member of the Government also said that—we must rethink our international policy. We should know where we have committed our mistakes and where we should correct ourselves. We must be friendly to those who are friendly to us and we must not be friendly to those who are not friendly to us.

It is said that we should be friendly to our friends and we should do only justice to our opponents and enemies. Beyond that a nation cannot go. We cannot, maintaining an army, take shelter under the creed of non-violence of Gandhiji. Even Gandhiji in his days did not say that free India will not keep an army and will not use it. We have to keep an army and we have to use it. We have to make it as powerful as we can and, while doing this, we must rely mostly on our resources. But there should be no opposition to relying on our resources and also getting things from outside. It appears to me that some people think, or at least some time back some people used to think, that there is a dichotomy between helping ourselves and our getting help from our friends. We must remember that no country in the world can defend itself alone. We must have friends but these friends must be such who are bound to us and help us in all emergencies and are not friends of convenience who take a neutral attitude when a critical situation arises in India.

I agree with Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia when he said that the United Nations, the Security Council, is dominated by the big nations. It will be so dominated. It suffers from what is called power politics. It has passed a Resolution. We are glad that there is cessation of hostilities. But this cessation of hostilities took place 17 years ago also. What was the result?

The problem was not solved. Today also the Security Council has shown no way of solving the problem. There are certain points in the Resolution of the Security Council which are dangerous and ominous and I am afraid that we may, in order to secure the goodwill of the world which has shown no goodwill towards us, succumb to the implications of those two clauses which say that we should move back to the old cease-fire line of 5th August and that this question is capable of political solution and there should be a political solution.

I think there is danger in what Russia has said that the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India should meet on the sacred soil of Russia. I think there can be no meeting, there can be no talk, there can be no conversation, between Pakistan and ourselves, considering what they have done even in the last 24 hours, considering the fire and brimstone that they are breathing from day to day, considering what comes on their radio and all that. There can be no talk unless they change their attitude. Unless they admit the proposition that nationality is not co-extensive with religion, unless these basic principles are settled first, there would be no use in meeting together. I say that this line of 5th August was a line drawn ad hoc, I am afraid, by people who did not know geography. If they had known geography, they would not have allowed Haji Pir Pass to be in the hands of the Pakistanis. The line has not been drawn scientifically and from the military point of view. It was drawn in a hurry in order to placate world opinion. I am afraid, today also what we have done, has been done in a hurry and to placate world opinion. World opinion does not count and this United Nations Organisation is only a little better than its predecessor, the League of Nations. It is dominated by power politics. It is dominated

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

by a desire to keep balance of power. As long as this idea of balance of power continues, as long as there is power politics, truth can never have its way. It will only be compromised and that compromise will land us again and again into difficulties. If we fix a new line, then also we will be again in difficulties. So, we must make it clear to this Security Council which is afraid of saying what is right and what is wrong that when it cannot diagnose a disease, when it cannot give a remedy, when it is not prepared to say that this country is right and that country is wrong, its opinions are absolutely of no avail.

We referred the matter of aggression of Pakistan to them in 1948 and they brushed aside that question; they did not decide whether aggression had been committed or not. This time also they have refused to name Pakistan as the aggressor, which aggression was as clear as daylight. What do you expect from that Security Council? I say you cannot expect any justice from that Council, which is dominated by big nations and which is not prepared, even when there is a clear evidence of aggression, to say that there has been an aggression. Even if they had said that there had been an aggression but that we should have peace in the world because the world could not afford a war, one could have understood it, one could have even appreciated it. But to evade that question is very dangerous and I think we must not put our trust in Security Council, however anxious we may be to support it; in fact we have shown our anxiety to support this United Nations on all occasions. Let us not rely upon it; let us rely upon our own strength and if we have to rely upon our own strength, then we must reframe our foreign and internal policies.

We were relying upon the Arab world as our great friends; we were

supporting them in everything that they did; we went so far as it gives their League the status of an international government. What has been the result? The utmost that they have done is that some of them are neutral in this struggle. To have expected that we would be supported by any Islamic country was a mid-day dream. We irritated people who were anxious to be friendly to us, for instance, Israel, from which we could have got very much material help, from which we could have got technical help, whose agricultural problems are just like ours, who have been trying various experiments in co-operative farming; we could have learnt from that country, but we never allowed it to approach us even. Why? Because we wanted to placate the Arab countries and it has given us no dividends at all. I think in this matter also we must reconsider our foreign policy.

In our home policy, I say that, even though America is our friend, we must refuse to accept anything from them, be it money or economic aid or food. I assure you that, just as people have risen this time, so would they rise to produce more food. Put trust in them. You do not put your trust in them but prefer to get inferior food that comes here and produces sickness. You go on asking for more and more. I say that we must stand on our own legs. What is our deficiency in foodgrains? If the Government's figures say that it is only five per cent, we can make up that five per cent. If the cultivator is given good seeds, is given manure, is given water at proper time and if there is no bureaucratic repression of the tenants, then I say with confidence that, even with our present methods, the production can be increased by 30 per cent.

We forgo many things and send them to foreign countries in order to earn foreign exchange. We do not cultivate the home market. We have an

7545

immense home market for tea, for jute and for everything that we have, but we do not distribute money to the poor who can purchase. And how can we distribute money to the poor who can purchase unless we diversify our economy and unless we diversify our industry?

So, we must not rely on outside help. I have been a friend to America, but I say that we cannot rely even on America. We must progressively stop taking arms from her, taking economic aid from her and taking even food from her. We must rely upon our own resources. That was the lesson that was taught to us by Gandhiji, and this war should teach us very clearly this lesson that we can rely upon no nation and we have to rely upon ourselves.

I am glad that a Member of the Government has said that in this world power alone counts, and weakness is the greatest sin that a man or a nation can commit. What did Gandhiji do when he came to India? He first put strength among the people, strength against the British Government of which we were afraid, strength against the Britisher before whom we trembled and we could not speak the truth, strength against the police and against the magistracy so that every urchin in the street could stand up and say 'This is a satanic government and we want to destroy it'. That was the strength that he infused, and I saw what he did in Champaran and I saw it again in Punjab.

This strength can be infused only if our leaders are strong, if our leaders are determined, if there is no jockeying for positions and for power, if there are no quarrels among ourselves, if there are no quarrels among the members of the ruling party. If

the ruling party is united, they will get the support of all the parties as they have got on this occasion. But I am afraid, and I hope I shall be proved wrong, that as soon as the danger is past, we shall again go to sleep; as we went to sleep when the danger from China was past. The people gave an excellent exhibition of their enthusiasm and their spirit of sacrifice. They gave without any stint, and they gave without knowing whether they were going to give to the proper parties or to the wrong parties; men, women and children gave their all. I am sorry to say that up to now no proper accounts have been given of the money and of how it has been spent. I hope that this time at least we shall mobilise the enthusiasm of the country and the determination of the country to be free and independent. Let us build our hopes upon our people. What were we before Independence? We were a slave nation. But in a few years strength was infused in us, because Gandhiji believed in the common man. We refuse to trust the common man; we refuse to go to the common man and we think that governments can go on without the support of the common man. The present crisis will pass and may pass; it cannot pass until we have been able to fix a new line of demarcation. The old line has been repudiated even by Gen. Nimmo who was said that the old line exists no more. Why should the Security Council talk of the old line of 5th August, when its own observer has repudiated it? We must have a line which is scientifically defensible, which is militarily defensible. If we are not careful we shall lose the battle that we have won and this great sacrifice of our young men and of our aviators will have gone in vain and with it the response that has been given by the people. It is not for the first time that we have neglected this response of the people. If we do it this time we may not get it again.

श्री यशपाल सिंह: अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इस अवसर पर फौज में लड़ने वालों को या जिन के भाई, बेटे व भतीजे युद्ध-क्षेत्र में कटे हैं, देश की खातिर जिन्होंने अपनी जान कुर्बान की है उनके पिताओं को मौका मिलना चाहिए था। यहां न सरदार मजीठिया को मौका मिला, न चौधरी लहरी सिंह को मौका मिला और न एच० पी० चटर्जी को बोलने का मौका मिला।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आपने कहा वह बिलकुल ठीक कहा लेकिन मैं इस के लिए माफ़ी चाहता हूँ। मैं इस वक़्त और किसी माननीय सदस्य को नहीं बुला सकता।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : सवेरे से शाम तक यहां हाउस में बोलने के इंतज़ार में बैठे रहे लेकिन एक मिनट का समय भी बोलने के लिए नहीं मिला। अब जब यहां इंसान नहीं मिलेगा तो बाहर कहां मिलेगा ?

श्री बाल्मीकी (खुर्जा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि उधर लड़ने वाले हैं, तो इधर भी लड़ने वाले हैं।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must express my gratitude to all the hon. Members who have participated in the debate today. There have been several speakers, and they have expressed themselves in words of their choice. But I have heard from every side of the House only one voice—the voice of patriotism, of national will to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India no matter who the invader may be. This is the voice of the people of India expressed in unmistakable terms through their chosen representatives in Parliament; this is the voice of the sovereign will of the people. Hon. Members would permit me to recall that, while speak-

ing in this House in April last, I had appealed for the unity of heart amongst our people. That unity has been achieved in the fullest measure and has been demonstrated effectively in these critical days. In fact, it is this unity which has been the biggest source of strength to all of us in these testing times.

The cease-fire has already come about in spite of Pakistan's intransigence. It is likely that when we consider the subsequent step, further difficulties and complications might arise. It is by no means going to be an easy task, specially in view of the threats given even after the acceptance of the cease-fire, by President Ayub Khan and his Foreign Minister. I have made India's position absolutely clear in my letter of 14th September, 1965 addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Our understanding of the three resolutions of the Security Council is that they are applicable to both regular forces and the infiltrators from Pakistan. Pakistan must own and discharge the responsibility of withdrawing the infiltrators from our State of Jammu and Kashmir. However, they are continuing to disclaim all responsibility for the infiltration despite the report of the Secretary-General himself. If Pakistan persists in this attitude, India alone must deal with the infiltrators effectively and force them out. Moreover, we shall never allow any arrangement for the future in which there may be possibilities of further infiltrations.

About our State of Jammu and Kashmir, the House knows our stand which is firm and clear. This State is an integral part of India, a constituent unit of the federal union of India. There is hardly any case for exercise of self-determination again. The people of Jammu and Kashmir have already exercised the right of self-determination through three General Elections held on the basis of universal adult franchise.

I feel grateful for and heartened by the unanimity of support for the policy which the Government has followed in meeting the challenge of recent aggression. However, I would like to say that dangers still lie ahead even after a cease-fire has become effective. These dangers are very real indeed. We should surely be prepared to meet them and our preparations will not be relaxed.

Shri Peter Alvares had expressed the opinion that the Soviet Union had apparently agreed to "de-freezing" the Kashmir question. It would not be correct to say so. The Soviet Union is today an ardent champion of peace. They have known the horrors of war and they do want, in a friendly spirit, to endeavour to bring about an improvement in the relationship between India and Pakistan. Their intentions are pure and we have, therefore, welcomed their initiative.

Discussion on the non-official resolution of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad will be carried over to the next session. I would not, therefore, like to say anything just at present.

Some hon. Members have referred to the work of our Diplomatic Missions abroad. I can tell the House with complete sincerity that on the present occasion each one of our Missions has been alert and vigilant. They have done a good job in keeping the Government to which they are accredited fully informed of the developments and of the justness of our cause. The attitude which some Governments take is not in my view dependent upon or even affected by what our Ambassadors have to say. There are pre-conceived notions and prejudices which one has to contend with. It must, nevertheless, be our persistent effort to project our case in the best possible manner and to win friends for India in all parts of the world.

A few words are necessary, Mr. Speaker, about the home front. The momentum which the nation has gained will have to be kept up, our defence preparedness will have to be improved continuously, we will have to remain vigilant all along our frontiers. For strengthening our defences, a good deal of sacrifice will be needed on the part of the country as a whole. We may all have to accept privations and even our economic development may have to be slowed down somewhat in order that our defences are not weakened.

To the tasks that lie ahead, we shall address ourselves in a realistic manner and in full awareness of the fact that self-reliance must be our watchword. I am grateful to this august House for the magnificent support which it has given in these historic times.

Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the House to authorise you to convey, through our Defence Minister, the admiration and gratitude of this House to our Armed Forces for the splendid job they have done.

I would also, with your permission like to suggest that the House should rise and observe a minute's silence to honour the memory of those soldiers, sirmen, policemen and civilians who have become martyrs in the defence of their motherland.

Mr. Speaker: The House may stand in silence for a minute.

(The Members then stood in silence for a minute)

16.45 hrs.

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table following four Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the Cur-