

[Secretary]

request that the concurrence of the House of the People in the said motion and the names of the Members of the House to be appointed to the said Joint Committee may be communicated to this Council."

MOTION

"That the Bill to provide a special form of marriage in certain cases and for the registration of such and certain other marriages be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members, 15 members from this Council, namely—

1. Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand;
2. Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam;
3. Shrimati Violet Alva;
4. Khwaja Inait Ullah.
5. Shri Mohamed Valiulla;
6. Dr. Purna Chandra Mitra;
7. Shri Ram Prasad Tamta;
8. Shri B. K. Mukerjee;
9. Shri K. Rama Rao;
10. Shri Hirday Nath Kunzru;
11. Principal Devaprasad Ghosh;
12. Shri Venkat Krishna Dhage;
13. Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha;
14. Shri Amolak Chand;
15. Shri C. C. Biswas.

and 30 members from the House of the people;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this Council relating to Select Committee will apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make;

that this Council recommends to the House of the People that the

House do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this Council the names of members to be appointed by the House to the Joint Committee; and

that the Committee shall make a report to this Council within two months after its appointment."

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): On behalf of the Finance Minister, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following documents under Article 151(1) of the Constitution:

- (1) Appropriation Accounts of Railways in India for 1950-51. Part I—Review. [*Placed in the Library. See No. IV u.a. (75).*]
- (2) Appropriation Accounts of Railways in India for 1950-51. Part II—Detailed Appropriation Accounts. [*Placed in the Library. See No. IV u.a. (75).*]
- (3) Block Accounts (including capital statement comprising the Loan Accounts), Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts of Indian Government Railways, 1950-51. [*Placed in the Library. See No. IV u.a. (75).*]
- (4) Balance Sheets of Railway Collieries and Statements of All-in-cost of coal, etc. for 1950-51. [*Placed in the Library. See No. IV u.a. (71).*]
- (5) Audit Report, Railways, 1952 (Part II). [*Placed in the Library. See No. IV u.a. (76).*]

✓ MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

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

~ "That the present International situation and the policy of the

Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

At almost every session of this Parliament, this subject has come up for debate and the House has been pleased to express its approval of the general policy pursued by the Government of India in regard to international affairs. In the course of each session a considerable number of questions are put which indicate the eager interest that hon. Members take in international affairs. On my part, I should like to express my deep appreciation of this active interest and the support that this House has invariably given in these vital matters which affect our country and the world.

International affairs are not the privilege of a select coterie of diplomats today. They have to be understood—especially by this House and even, I would say, by the general public—not in their intricate details, but in the matter of policies that lie behind them, because international affairs have become of enormous importance even in the lives of the common people today. They might lead to war; they might lead to other developments which are almost as bad as war and thus affect the lives of each one of us.

Now it is all very well to talk about international affairs or about foreign policy as if that was some integrated whole which you can put forward and say 'aye' or 'no' to it. Of course, the House knows that it is a much more complicated affair than that, and the fact is that even a policy, a foreign policy, which may have and should have, of course, certain fixed and more or less definite ideals and objectives, nevertheless is a collection of foreign policies—not one single item—because the world is not fashioned after our liking. All kinds of different problems arise and there are different interests, and we have to adapt ourselves to them keeping in view this basic policy. Apart from that, international affairs have been taking increasingly a stranger turn. There is an element of

dogmatic fervour, something resembling the old approach of bigoted religion in them, something resembling that ordered division of "either you are with us, or you are against us"; and so we have this, if I may say so with all respect, narrow approach which considers everything in terms of black and white—"those with us or those against us"—and repeating that old, unfortunate bigoted approach of religion which brought about the wars of religion in the past, with not even the saving graces which religion sometimes had provided in the past.

International affairs have ceased to be a game of debonair diplomats discussing some secrets and become something where hard things are said, threats are uttered continuously against each other, and so far as the world is concerned, we live in a precarious state between hope and fear. Some people imagine that a country's policy should be what they call a 'strong' policy—strong policy apparently meaning that we should go about looking as fierce and ferocious as possible, threatening everybody, telling everybody that we will punish them if they don't behave as we want them to behave. Now, that kind of thing may sound very well at a public meeting and may evoke applause, but the fact is that that represents great immaturity in political thinking or understanding. Mature nations—as we are certainly in this matter as in many others,—(*Hon. Members: Hear, hear*), do not behave in this way. We have to show our maturity by trying to understand things, by trying to balance them, by trying always to see and act in a manner which helps, not hinder. Now, all these things put some limitations in our way, limitations in the way of expression, especially for a person who is responsible for the conduct of foreign policy, because on the one hand I would like to be as frank as possible with this House and with our country, and on the other hand I would not like to say anything which needlessly irritates or angers any country—whether I agree with that country or disagree with it is another

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

matter—because I do not think we shall advance our cause, our country's cause or the world's cause by merely showing irritation against other countries' policies, in New Delhi. Naturally, where we differ fundamentally from them, we have to express our own view-points of disagreement or agreement as the case may be. The pace of events has grown progressively faster. Whether all this is due to the fact that we live in an age of some kind of a consummation of the Industrial Revolution that began one hundred or two hundred years ago, or other factors are involved in it, I do not know. But you may symbolise that pace of events by the continuous talk of this latest progeny of the industrial age, the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, or the cobalt bomb of which some people have begun talking about. All this means a terrific threat overhanging humanity, fear and apprehension all over; and oddly enough, at the same time the hope of an infinitely better life for humanity is offered. We have had some extraordinary things, and the choice before the world is between these two. Well, as I have put it, the choice can only be one. But the fact remains that nobody can be sure whether the choice will be war or peace.

Two days ago, the General Assembly of the United Nations began its sessions and they are having very important problems before them. And may I in this connection say something, in saying which I am sure I will be repeating the sentiments of the House, that we express our pleasure that a Member of this House has been elected to the Presidentship of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and in particular that a representative of Indian womanhood has been so elected?

In considering foreign affairs we are naturally interested in particular problems which affect us intimately, whether it is the question, the old question, of the treatment of people

of Indian descent in South Africa or the question, also an old one, of the treatment of people of Indian descent in Ceylon, or other like problems of Indians overseas. We are interested in them. Because, we are concerned with the fate of hundreds and thousands of these people who, though no longer citizens and nationals of India, were in the past connected with India, about whom we have various agreements and assurances and the like, and therefore we have a certain responsibility with regard to them, although they are not our nationals. These problems continue, and must continue to interest the House.

Then there are those other problems of foreign establishments in India, and the House and our country is naturally impatient about them and does not like this delay in their solution. That is true. Nobody likes it. Not only do we not like it in the present from a political point of view, but from many others; they are centres of smuggling, of intrigues and trouble, danger spots even in time of peace. And suppose, unfortunately, some kind of war broke out in parts of the world, they might well become even greater danger spots. We have said quite clearly in this House that if war breaks out anywhere—it does not matter between whom it is—so far as we are concerned, we will not admit the right of any part of India, including those parts that are called foreign establishments in India, to be associated with that war in any way. I want to make it perfectly clear that if these places are used, directly or indirectly, in connection with a war, we shall have to take action to stop that. I say that not, obviously, in any sense as a threat, but because it is well to make clear some things so that others may be aware of the consequences of some action they might conceivably indulge in.

Having said that, I have also to put before the House my view as to how we should deal with these problems.

basically, not in detail. That is to say, it is easy enough for us to talk of strong measures, and it will not be difficult to take such measures in their limited significance. But nothing is limited in this matter, more especially when these establishments are connected with nations abroad, some great nations, some small. Then the consequences are far-reaching. And I think that the House agrees with me that to take some step, merely because of our impatience and irritation, some step which might produce these far-reaching consequences, which might entangle us in all kinds of difficulties will not help us in bringing about the solution that we desire. After all, the way of peaceful approach, though it may appear rather humdrum, brings results more speedily and, what is more, does not leave any trail of bitterness which is left among nations even after they have won a victory.

Therefore [we have proceeded in regard to these foreign establishments firmly, I think, in the declaration of our policy—in the sense of pursuing that policy in a quite way but at the same time peacefully and not trying to take, what I would call, measures that are not peaceful. We are perfectly alive to the questions relating to them. We are constantly giving thought and taking such action as may appear expedient within the four corners of that peaceful approach. The other day we withdrew our representative from Lisbon and closed our Legation there. That was a gesture, no doubt. But it was an important gesture showing how we are going in a particular direction, step by step. No doubt that step will have to be followed by other steps. I need not, before this House, go into the reasoning about these foreign establishments.] But for the sake of others who might perhaps read or hear my words I should like to express my amazement at the fact that any country could still think of holding on any foreign country, could still think of having its foot-holds in India, holding on any territory in India, after the great changes that have taken place in India and elsewhere. So far

as we are concerned, ^{Colonial} we are against any colonial rule in any part of the world. It is true we do not, because of our—if you like—weakness, do much about it. And because we do not do much about it we do not shout much about it, because shouting without doing does not help.

We are against all forms of colonial rule. We also recognise that in a complicated situation it is not always easy merely to solve a problem by trying to give effect to a slogan. It may take time. We recognise also that the days of the old imperialisms are obviously ended—in a large measure they have ended. They continue undoubtedly in places in Asia and Africa, and sometimes create much mischief. The old imperialisms are past history. They may carry on in the present for a while. But even though they are past history, it is extraordinary how old vested interests cling on to what they have got to the bitter end. Now, if we are against all forms of colonial domination and rule, how much more must we object to anything actually on the soil of India? If we object even in Africa or a part of Asia, surely our objection will be infinitely greater for anything of that kind in India itself. And therefore, it is quite impossible for us as a Government and as a people to tolerate any foreign foothold in any part of India. But I think, if I may say so with all humility, we have shown a great deal of wisdom in not precipitating these matters and bringing about conflicts in order to solve them because any such attempt, I think, would have led to other problems and more difficult problems. I shall not say much more about these questions.]

[In regard to Ceylon I would say this, that, as the House knows, I had talks with the Prime Minister of Ceylon—friendly talks—in which we tried to understand each other, each other's difficulties, and I am prepared to say to this House that I recognised the difficulties before the Prime Minister of Ceylon. It is not that he has no difficulties and he is just obstinate. He and his Government have got

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

difficulties as we all of us have, but difficulties should not come in the way of what are obviously right solutions. That is another matter. In recognising the difficulties the Prime Minister of Ceylon and his Government had, I went some distance in agreeing, in putting forward suggestions which normally I would not have agreed to. But it has been an axiom of our policy that we should live on friendly and co-operative terms with our neighbouring countries, and Ceylon is very much a neighbour, very much akin to us; and it seems almost, shall I say, a tragedy for me to think of any conflict between a country like Ceylon so akin to us and this great country of India. So, we approached Ceylon in a friendly way, we made clear the limits to which we can go, beyond which we cannot go without sacrificing the interests of hundreds of thousands of people and making them homeless and State-less wanderers; because, remember, the question is of these people who are no longer Indian citizens or Indian nationals and who, if they are not absorbed in Ceylon, not considered as Ceylon citizens now or later, become State-less and homeless. I hope that this question of people of Indian descent in Ceylon will be further considered in the same friendly way between the two Governments and between the Prime Minister of Ceylon and me, and that we succeed in finding some solution which must obviously be to the advantage of both countries. It is not a question of Ceylon thinking that India, a great big country to the north of it, is trying to bring any pressure or coercion. I do not wish to put it that way, and that is why I do not like anyone here using the language of threat to or in regard to this question in Ceylon. Certainly we have to be clear and we have to be firm about our policy, but we have always to put it forward in a friendly way without rousing any apprehension on the other side.

In regard to South Africa, that question has become, shall I say, a frozen

or a petrified question which does not show the slightest improvement and shows some continuing deterioration. That question, of course, has passed outside the limited sphere in which we raised it originally, in which it was. It has become a much wider issue in South Africa. It has become an issue not of people of Indian descent and the White settlers of South Africa, but a question of the great majority of the population of the Union of South Africa, that is the Africans themselves, and a major question of racial discrimination. There is this racial discrimination in many places in the world, especially in Africa, but more especially in South Africa. In other places it takes place, but there is an element of apology about it, but in South Africa there is no apology. It is blatant. It is shouted out, and no excuse is put forward for it. In fact, this question in South Africa has become one of the major issues, major tests of the world, because there can be not a shadow of a doubt that if that policy of racial discrimination,—of a master race dominating over other races, some colonists and settlers from Europe presuming to dominate for ever the populations of Asia or Africa,—is sought to be justified, then obviously there are forces in this world—not in your or my opinion only, but in this world—which will fight that to the end. Because those days are past when such things were tolerated in theory or even in practice. Therefore, this issue in South Africa, though it apparently lies low today,—to some extent it does not lie low, but other problems have somehow overshadowed it—is one of the basic issues in the world today which may well shake up this world. We have seen other aspects of this racial discrimination and colonialism in other parts of Africa. We have been accused—we meaning India, has been accused—of interfering in the affairs of other countries, in Africa. We have also been accused of, well, some kind of imperialist tendency which wants to spread out in Africa and take possession of those selectable lands

which now the European settlers occupy. As a matter of fact, this House knows very well that all along, for these many years, we have been laying the greatest stress on something which is rather unique—I think unique in the sense that I am not aware of any other country which has laid stress in that particular way on that policy. I do not mean to say that we are very virtuous and all that, and others, other countries, are not, but we have rather gone out of our way to tell our own people in Africa, in East Africa, or in some other parts of Africa, that they can expect no help from us, no protection from us if they seek any special rights in Africa which are not in the interests of the people of Africa. We shall help them; we have told them: "We shall help you. Naturally we are interested in protecting you, your dignity or interests but not if you go at all against the people of Africa, because you are their guests and if they do not want you, out you will have to go bag and baggage and we will not come in your way".

Now, that is a very clear statement which sometimes, naturally, has not been welcomed by our people in East Africa, many of the merchant classes there who have done well; but it is our firm policy and I want them—our Indians abroad—to realise it, and I want others to realise it too. And if that is our firm policy, we cannot actually remain quiescent when things happen in various parts of Africa which, apart from affecting Indians as such, might create dangerous world situations. In Africa, one sees today in its extreme form both racial discrimination and domination, and the old colonialism at work. Recently in North Africa various developments took place which, well, one used to read about in the histories of the second part of the 19th century, and it is amazing that that kind of thing can continue to be repeated now, in the middle of the 20th century. It may perhaps apparently succeed for a while, but I very much doubt if any such policy can possibly bring any

measure of success. Because the fact of the matter is that it has become almost impossible to terrorise the people into submission today, wherever the people may be. We have seen in a country, in a famous country, but in a weak country—a very weak country, either financially or militarily, or otherwise—a weak country in Western Asia which has had ups and downs and troubles in recent years, how many great powers could not force it into coming and following their wishes in some matters. Now, I am not going into the merits of these things. But my point is that it has become almost impossible for this method of coercion to be applied by one country against another. Of course, there are many ways of it, not merely military coercion; there may be promises of reward, there may be help and all that. But the conditions that have arisen today make it increasingly difficult for even the powerful countries to impose their will on the weak. To some extent, they might do it. Now, if that is so, how much more difficult or impossible it is for one powerful country to seek to impose its will on another powerful country? It is patently not possible today, and if one tries to do that, or both try to do that against each other, the result can only be conflict—ultimately war. And that is why we come up against this situation in the world today, this approach of great powers to each other in anger, in fear, in hatred—all this resulting in a continuing thing which has been called 'cold war' and which always thinks merely in terms of some future shooting war. And the problem before all of us in the world is, whether a big war is inevitable and, therefore, one must prepare for it and go in for it when it comes, or whether it can be avoided. That is a big problem. Nobody can prophesy; but I have no doubt that vast numbers of people in the world—in fact, I would say, nearly all the people in the world, in every country—obviously desire peace. And yet I must confess that recent events have made me slightly more doubtful of any permanent settl-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

ments in the near future. I do not, of course, rule them out; I think there are chances and we should work for them. But when one sees the temper of peoples' minds and of statesmen's minds which are moved, as I said, by that old something, approaching that old religious fervour, without the virtue of religion in it, then anything might happen.

We have heard or read about a long argument, about the shape of a table—whether it should be a round table or a square table or an oblong table. But the real question is of the shape and content of peoples' minds. It does not matter what kind of table you use or whether you have no table and sit in the good old Indian way of squatting on a *takht* or a floor. The point is, how to approach these problems, and if you approach them in a spirit of warfare, well, then, naturally the consequences are different.

The House knows that the name of India came up repeatedly before the Political Committee of the United Nations some little while ago and the proposal was made that India might be made a member of the Political Conference that is the child of the armistice in Korea. India was put in a somewhat embarrassing position. We did not put our name forward and—I am perfectly sincere and honest in what I say—we did not want any additional burden. At the same time, we were strongly of opinion—and naturally—that this Political Conference should succeed, that there should be a settlement, a peaceful settlement, in the Far East of Asia, and that if we could help in that, we should not run away from that help, even if it might involve a burden on us. So, placed in this position, we did not put ourselves forward at all. But other countries, thinking that the presence of India there would be helpful, put our name forward. To the last, we made it clear that we could only function if the two major powers to this dispute wanted us to function. We were not interested in being pushed in by one party

against the will of the other. And when I say 'the two major parties', I do not refer to any particular country, however big it may be, but the two parties being, on the one side, the United Nations, and on the other the Chinese and the North Korean Commands. Those were the two parties which brought about the armistice, and the Political Conference which flows from the armistice would also ultimately be concerned with those two parties as such. I repeat this because there was some confusion which was attached to what we had said about this matter in the United Nations. So, this matter, as the House knows, came to a vote and in the voting there was a considerable majority in favour of India and a big minority against it and a number of abstentions. But there was not the two-thirds majority that would have been necessary if it went to the Plenary Session. At that later stage we begged those who had put our names forward not to press for it and so India was out of it.

But certain interesting consequences flowed from this vote. If that voting is analysed, you will see that apart from the four countries who voted against India, there were 21 votes, 18 of them from the Americas, 17 from what is called Latin America. Now, I have the greatest respect for the countries of Latin America. Let there be no mistake about it. But the facts stand out that nearly the whole of Europe and nearly the whole of Asia wanted one thing in this political Conference while a number of countries, all the Americas, did not want it. They have as much right not to want it as they have to want it. But the question that we have been considering is an Asian question, a question of Asia, and is the will of Asia to be flouted, is the will of Asia and Europe jointly to be flouted because some people who really are not concerned with this question so intimately feel that way? That is an extraordinary position.

An Hon. Member: Why withdraw?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is interesting because in spite of the major developments that have taken place in the world during the last few years, somehow it is not realised by many of the great powers of the world that the countries of Asia, however weak they might be, do not propose to be ignored, do not propose to be bypassed and certainly do not propose to be sat upon. The whole of Asia has been and is in a state of ferment. Changes are taking place and revolutionary changes—whether you may like it or you may not like it, it is there. If you make an objective study you will see that the old days of pressure are gone and are going, and something new is coming in its place. Anyhow the old imperialisms have gone except here and there where they hold on for a while. Unless this fact is recognised by the rest of the world,—I believe it is being increasingly recognised,—you do not get a correct appreciation, a correct understanding of the world today.

10. A.M.

The House knows that one of the issues before the United Nations for some time past has been whether the People's Government of China should be accepted there as a member or not. There has been some confusion of thought about this matter when people talk about China being admitted into the United Nations. There is no question of the admission of China; China is one of the founder members of the United Nations. The only question that can arise is who represents China. Can any one say that the present Government of the island of Formosa represents China? Factually, can any undertaking given by the Government of Formosa be carried out in China? Obviously not. They cannot speak for China. They cannot function there; they cannot give an assurance at the Table on behalf of China. Therefore, it becomes completely unreal, artificial, to talk about China being represented in the United Nations or in the Security Council by someone who cannot speak for China, who cannot do anything

in China, who cannot affect China and can only at the utmost express strong disapproval of China. This is one of the basic things which have been levelled against the politics of United Nations.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Is it also unreal, I mean the U.N.O.?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what is real or unreal, but the hon. Member's nimble wit is very real.

How is this question or like questions considered? As I said, it is no question of likes or dislikes in this matter but of following certain basic realities, trying to change them, if you like. The other day—I think it was yesterday—I saw in the papers that it has been agreed amongst certain great powers that the question of China's inclusion should not be considered this year or this session,—something very much like that. Now, I have no objection to doing things in a way which brings forward the least conflict. It may be that that takes a little time. But, the kind of approach that I see is that an obviously wrong thing is perpetuated and a whole castle is sought to be built on an artificial foundation; and then, if something goes wrong afterwards, complaint is made. It does seem to me to signify that politically these international spheres seem to be getting more and more removed from the realm of logic and reasoning and that is why I said we are entering a bigoted sphere of religion. It is a dangerous sphere applied to politics; applied to ethics and morals, religion is all right, but if it enters the political sphere it has a minus effect on morals; it is only sheer bigotry.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): What has religion got to do with this?

Dr. N. B. Khare: Religion is one of the hon. Member's mental obsessions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is why in another context we have ventured to point out the danger of mixing politics with religion and calling it communalism in this country. However, here is this peculiar position in the world today, when it is not possi-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

ble for one great country to coerce any other great country. It cannot do so. They are too big to be coerced by anybody. What then is the way out? Well, one, of course, is war, an attempt to coerce one by the other. The other is to give up the idea of coercion, accepting the fact as it is and trying to arrive, if you like, if not at a permanent settlement, at least at a temporary understanding of live and let live. That is possible, because the only other alternative means conflict on a major scale and in these days of atomic and hydrogen bombs the House can well imagine what the result of that will be.

Now, these matters are coming up before the United Nations soon and I understand that the People's Government of China in their reply to the United Nations' proposals have made some counter-proposals. First of all, it should be remembered that all the parties agreed to the fact of a Political Conference being held in Korea to carry on the work of the Armistice and to try to settle the problems there. They agreed to the functions of that Conference. The only question that is being considered or is in controversy is the composition of that Conference. It should be remembered also that a Conference like that does not proceed by majority vote. It does not decide that way—obviously not. It has to decide by more or less—if not unanimity—concensus of opinion, and agreement of the major parties concerned. So, it does not much matter whether there are a few more on this side or that side, except that the more there are, a larger crowd may create difficulty in getting down to business; otherwise, there is no particular difficulty.

The real question that arises is whether there should be neutral countries represented in this Conference. It has been our view that it would be helpful if such countries are represented, simply because they can sometimes help in toning down differences and easing a tense situation.

The real agreement will naturally have to come between the others. The neutral is not going to bring about an agreement; he will only help in providing a certain atmosphere which might lead the others to agree. However, that is a matter for the United Nations and the other party to decide and we have absolutely no desire to be there in this Conference. We have undertaken a very heavy burden in Korea as it is. We are in this Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and we have sent our troops there, and they have only begun their work there. But from such information as we have received, they are having to face considerable difficulties. It is not at all an easy matter for them to deal with—not difficulties, if I may say so, from the South Korean people: well, they hardly come in contact with them—but other difficulties. Somehow passions have been so roused among these prisoners that it is not particularly easy to deal with them. But thus far, hon. Members must have seen from reports in the press, the way our officers and men have handled this question has elicited the praise of everybody there.... (Hon. Members: Hear, hear.)...and I should like our representatives there in the Commission as well as the officers and men in the Armed Forces to feel that they have the goodwill and active sympathy of this House and of the country.

I would not like to discuss these matters that are before the United Nations in greater detail, because that might well prove embarrassing to our own representatives there or to us or to other countries. They are difficult questions. Some hon. Members suggest in a fit of frustration that we should withdraw from the United Nations. That, if I may say so with all respect, is immaturity. It is not an understanding of the question. One cannot run away like this from a problem. The United Nations, inspite of all its failings—and they are many—nevertheless is a great world organisation. (Hon. Members: Hear, hear.) It does

contain within it the seeds of hope and peace, and it would be a most unfortunate and rather perverse attitude for any country to try to destroy this structure because it is not to its entire liking. And apart from that, if a country does that, I have no doubt that it is that country which would suffer more than the organisation. So, from the narrowest point of view it is no good. We cannot remain isolated in the world, cut off from everything, and living a life of our own in our limited sphere. Most of us in India are so situated—the House will forgive me for this observation—as to be normally isolated in our minds, in our social habits, in our eating, in our drinking, in our marrying etc. We isolate ourselves in castes, this division and that division, with the result that it is a unique habit in India which does not prevail anywhere else in the world. We live in compartments, and therefore, perhaps naturally, we think in terms of isolation easily as a country too. But the fact is that that isolation in the past has weakened us tremendously and left us rather in the lurch when the world has advanced in terms of science or other developments, and we were left behind. So, it is a dangerous thought—this sought of isolation—and we have to keep in touch with the rest of the world, naturally keeping to our own ways: that way, we may learn things from others. But we cannot be isolated: in fact, no country can be. Therefore, to talk of getting out of the United Nations or of otherwise keeping apart from all these problems is not to take cognisance of the realities of the situation.

There is one other matter to which I should like to refer before I close my present remarks, and that is Kashmir. I have already informed the House—on two occasions, I think—of certain developments in Kashmir in the course of the last five or six weeks. Those developments did not come out of the air or as a result of some secret conspiracy. Those who had been following events in Kashmir saw this crisis developing for several months

past, and the crisis was not so much a crisis *vis a vis* India—though we may take that aspect also—but it was an internal crisis which had affected all other relations and questions. Before I went to Europe in May, I paid a brief visit to Srinagar. I had always kept myself in fairly close touch with events there. I went at the end of May there, and I was surprised and distressed to see what was happening there,—what had happened regarding the state of affairs—economic, political and other—internally. In the past couple of years, Kashmir has been praised by us for various land reforms and they were very good reforms. I do not withdraw my praise for those reforms.

But, unfortunately, while the reforms were good, the manner of giving effect to them was not good. It was not good in two ways; one, that other consequences were not thought of; secondly, in the actual implementation of them, as it appears from subsequent reports, a great deal of injustice was done—it was not fairly done. I refer to this merely to show that a large number of factors, among them being these, produced a feeling of grave economic discontent among the people there. Much later a committee was appointed, the Wazir Committee. Its report was published only recently. It brings out much of this discontent, the way the land problem was not properly dealt with and the discontent that arose after hopes had gone up very high among the peasantry and others. There were other matters too: the co-operatives there failed and other things happened.

Now, as a result of all this, which was entirely an internal matter, grave disputes arose within the Government there, within the party, the National Conference, from which the Government draws its sanction. And when I went there towards the end of May I was greatly distressed to see this, because I noticed that gradually the Government of Kashmir was not functioning. It could not function, because of internal conflicts. Naturally, in a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

friendly way, I advised them to pull together, to lay down one definite policy and carry it out as a Government, and not pull in two or three directions all the time. This was one thing that was happening.

The other thing which gave me some disquiet, a good deal of it, was the fact that over a year ago we had arrived at some kind of an agreement with the Kashmir Government which the House knows well. This House approved of it; the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir approved of it. It was in a very small part given effect to and then the rest remained in cold storage. Now, I could very well understand certain difficulties which, perhaps, the House does not appreciate. So, if there was some delay I would not have minded it. This delay was largely caused by certain events in Jammu which suddenly accentuated a peculiar situation and produced its reactions in the Kashmir valley.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Jammu movement did not accentuate, but only exposed the situation there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It produced its powerful reactions in the Kashmir Valley and those who are not friends of ours, or friends of the Kashmir Government exploited this position fully. This created another tremendous complication there and delayed the implementation of the agreement.

All these things worked together and, as I said, when I went there in May last I was gravely disturbed. I went away to Europe.

When I was away my respected colleague, the Education Minister who has been closely connected with developments in Kashmir and my colleague the States Minister who also, in his official capacity has been connected with it and who had followed developments there, visited Kashmir. The Education Minister went there at the invitation of the Government and gave them a lot of good advice.

Nevertheless conditions continued to deteriorate and when I came back these reports reached me. I invited Sheikh Abdulla to come to Delhi. In fact, even when I was in Europe I had sent word that he should be invited. On return I invited him. He did not come; then he said he would come a little later. Later again this invitation was repeated by telephone, by letter. Ultimately he did not come. Meanwhile—in fact, before I had come back—Sheikh Abdulla and some others began speaking in a way which seemed strange to me and distressed us greatly. I could do nothing about it, except to remonstrate with him and ask him why he did so. Obviously he was troubled by these problems to which I have referred, economic and others, that had arisen in Kashmir and for which he could not see any easy remedy. There were remedies, of course; there are remedies, but he did not see them. So, he drifted in a different direction, and rather unfairly cast the blame for some of the economic occurrences there on the Government of India—lack of help or whatever it is. Anyhow the position we took throughout was that it is for the Kashmir Government to decide what policy they will follow. Let their party decide, let the Government decide and have one policy. If that policy was in keeping with the Government of India's policy, as we would like it, of course, and as we have always endeavoured to be, to have a joint policy in regard to matters affecting Kashmir, well and good. If not, if the Kashmir Government had a policy with which we differed completely, then it was up to us, the Government of India—I told Sheikh Abdulla and other members of his Government—to sit together and consider, even if we parted company, what we could do about it.

The fact of the matter was that Sheikh Abdulla himself was in a minority in his Government in these matters, and a still smaller minority in his party. It was that which pro-

duced this element of confusion. So, apart from giving good advice and feeling rather distressed, I felt I could do very little. The situation was developing in this way. Ultimately it blew up as the House knows and changes took place.

Now, having been connected with Kashmir, politically speaking, for a trifle over twenty years and having been intimately connected in the Government with all these developments that have occurred during the past six or seven years, the House can well imagine the extreme distress that all these developments have caused me. It is not a personal matter, I mean. We have always considered this Kashmir problem as symbolic for us, as having far-reaching consequences in India. Kashmir was symbolic for us to illustrate that we were a secular State, that Kashmir with a majority, a large majority of Muslims, nevertheless of its own free will wished to be associated with India. It had consequences both in India and Pakistan, because if we disposed of Kashmir on the basis of that old two-nation theory, well, then, obviously millions of people in India and millions in East Pakistan would be powerfully affected. All kinds of consequences would flow from it. Many of those wounds that had healed might open out again. So that, this problem was not, it has never been, a problem of a patch of territory being with India or not. It has been a problem of infinitely deeper consequence.

Kashmir is a place of infinite beauty. What is more, Kashmir is a place of great strategic importance, and it has always been a misfortunate for a country to be situated strategically, because envious eyes fall upon it. Certainly, so far as we are concerned, it is desirable for us from a strategic point of view. But however that may be, we cannot impose our desire or wish in this matter. Therefore, we have put it aside and right from the beginning we have laid stress on this that the people of Kashmir should

decide this question,—not other considerations. We have held by it, and we hold by it still, that they must decide it in the proper way, in the proper context, not in the way that one would imagine some people in the Pakistan Press want it done. We have been pretty well used to the tone and contents of the Pakistan Press and sometimes to the statements of their people, more or less responsible people, in the past few years, but the actuality in the last few weeks has far exceeded the wildest of my imagination in this respect. It is amazing that there should be so much wild hysteria without the slightest justification. I can understand irritation, I can understand strong language, but this type of wild hysteria does rather make one feel that one is not dealing with a matter which can be dealt with by logic or reasoning or by any argument.

As for the kind of facts, so-called facts, that are given in the Pakistan Press about happenings in Kashmir, they are so very very far from truth that they cannot be called exaggerations. The number given as killed in Kashmir, I say, is false, whoever may say it and there are people who have said it in Delhi, and I say, after due enquiry, that these statements of happenings in Kashmir are 100 per cent. false. I say so with full responsibility having sent our own men regardless of the Kashmir Government.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Thank you for once.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I wish Dr. Khare would not behave all the time like a Pakistani.

Of course, there has been trouble in Kashmir; of course, there have been disturbances, demonstrations and all that; I do not wish to minimise that. Big things have happened; big upsets have happened, because the National Conference which represented the national movement during all these years there had a sudden split—some on one side and some on the other. All these things have happened. I should say, taking everything into

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

consideration, that it is surprising that very little trouble has happened there, not so much. [Anyhow, we have to approach this question with as much calm and wisdom as we possess. It is a difficult question and I repeat that that question is going to be decided ultimately by the wishes of the people of Kashmir. Whether it is Kashmir or any other part, we are not going to hold it by strength of arms.]

Now, a great deal has been said. Much has been said about foreign interference in Kashmir. These kinds of charges are often made, and if there is a modicum of truth in them, that is greatly exaggerated as expressed and it becomes a little difficult to deal with them. In a matter of this kind, it is not easy for me to state every fact, that may come in our knowledge, before the House, but, broadly speaking, I would say that in the course of the last few weeks, in the course of past few months and some time more, hard cases of this type of interference have come before us—individual interference. It would not be correct to call it governmental interference, but individuals have not behaved properly, because again you must remember the basic fact that Kashmir is a highly strategic area. Many countries are interested in it and they seek sources of information, intelligence and all those things. You go to Kalimpong. It is a nest of spies, international spies of every country—it is perfectly amazing and sometimes I begin to doubt if the greater part of the population is not. News comes out of Kalimpong which sometimes may have some relation to truth—usually it has none. So that inevitably in a place like Kashmir, the people are interested and individuals are interested. There is espionage and the rest, but having said it, it would be unfair for those wild accusations to be made in the Press or elsewhere. Individuals have functioned there. I suppose they try to get contacts and sometimes no doubt the information is passed on from hand to hand and all that and we have checked

it often enough, but that kind of thing is happening in international affairs in many places—not in Kashmir only. It may be that sometimes it happens even in the city of Delhi. So, I don't think it is right for these wild accusations to be thrown out, and if there is any trifle of evidence of something, well naturally we take action. If there is not, mere shouting is not helpful; in fact, it is definitely harmful.

The House knows that recently I saw the Prime Minister of Pakistan when he was here in Delhi and he issued a statement which was an agreed statement. Soon after the return of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, a tremendous propaganda started there in the Press, partly against me and partly against our country as a whole. Now, I should like to say that Mr. Mohammed Ali, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, and I discussed this question at great length and we discussed it in a very friendly way, trying to find some way out of the difficulty, trying to take at least one step, if we cannot decide about others immediately. And, therefore, I was surprised at this barrage of press propaganda from Karachi especially and later from Lahore. This was chiefly directed to the subject of Admiral Nimitz being Plebiscite Administrator or not. It so happens that since the day Mr. Mohammed Ali left Delhi—since the day our statement was issued to the Press, I have not discussed this subject in public anywhere till today. I haven't said a word in public—in private or in the Cabinet I might have mentioned a little of it—but I have not seen a press man as a press man. And an enormous barrage of propaganda started that I was undermining this agreement that I have made with the Prime Minister of Pakistan, and undermining it—well, apparently through the devious method of bringing in Admiral Nimitz into it. I confess I have been greatly surprised at this and I found some difficulty in dealing with it in corres-

pondence elsewhere, with a situation which seems to me difficult to understand or grasp. Here I am, quietly sitting here, and I am being accused of this kind of deep conspiracy. Well, I should like to make it perfectly clear, and I am quite certain that Mr. Mohammed Ali has not only not liked this but actively disliked much of this propaganda there.

Now, so far as Admiral Nimitz is concerned, he is a very eminent person and I would hate to see anything at all in criticism of him. He is a person whom I have had the privilege of meeting. He is not only eminent in his own field but otherwise too he struck me as a very admirable person. I have nothing against him. He was appointed as Plebiscite Administrator about more than four years ago. In a sense he functioned, that is to say, he had an office in the United Nations Building, maybe for a year. Then, about three years ago, he himself felt that nothing much was happening and was not likely to happen soon. So far as we are concerned, we thought that in all probability the thing had ended. But apart from this, frankly the reason I put forward before Mr. Mohammed Ali was this: I said much has happened in these three or four years—just then the discussion in the Political Committee was taking place, this argument about India being in the Political Conference in Korea or not—I told him quite frankly that if we are to get on with this *question of Kashmir*, as we want to get on,—we must try to isolate it from big power politics. Big powers are admirable individually, and maybe collectively!

Dr. N. B. Khare: Then withdraw the question from the U.N.O.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Therefore I said it will not be fair to any of the big powers to ask them to supply a representative as a Plebiscite Administrator, however admirable he may be, because that would be embarrassing and needlessly creating suspicion, not in my mind necessarily, but in some other big power's mind. I said there-

fore it is far better for us—there are plenty of countries in Europe and Asia which are fortunately not too big—let us try to select the man from there. That was all that I said, and having said that, as I said in public, it should have gone away anywhere. So, I would beg the House, if I may say so, and the Press and others that in this matter of Kashmir, we should not lose our bearings merely because the Pakistan Press has no bearings at all. We have to keep firm to our position and to hold by the statements we have made and continue functioning calmly and dispassionately. That is the best way of dealing with this situation as indeed with any situation. Whenever any important occurrence takes place, I shall naturally come to the House for the advice of the House, for such guidance as the House can give me. I have taken a good deal of the time of the House and have referred to some matters. It is a confused picture that one sees all over the world. We may not always unravel it; we may often make mistakes here and there as we no doubt made, but if there are certain basic principles which guide us in our policy, I think that on the whole we shall not go far wrong. It is well known to this House that the policy we have pursued in the past—foreign policy—has not only had a very widespread approval in this country—otherwise we could not have pursued it—but has been progressively appreciated in most countries of the world. And even those who have not agreed with it have reluctantly sometimes expressed their appreciation of it, or at any rate, their understanding of it. If that is so, I have no doubt that we shall continue to pursue that basic policy with such variations as may be necessitated from time to time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved: ✓

“That the present International situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration.”

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

I have received a number of amendments. I shall call one hon. Member after another. They will say whether they want to move their amendments or not, and I shall treat the amendments accordingly. Both the motion and the amendments will be open for discussion. To regulate the debate, I would allow a time-limit of 15 minutes for each, but I would be glad if hon. Members restrict their speeches to ten minutes each. For the leaders of the groups, I will extend it by five minutes, —20 minutes to the leaders of the groups. Of course, hon. Members need not be under the impression that whoever moves an amendment will certainly be called to speak.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): I beg to move:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end namely:—

“and having considered the same, this House regrets that—

(i) in view of the fact that India and Pakistan have agreed to negotiate direct over the question of Jammu and Kashmir, effective steps have not been taken by the Government to curb the harmful activities of the U.N.O. observers in the State, and to secure their withdrawal from the territory of India;

(ii) even after the statement of Mr. John Foster Dulles about the price India had to pay for her neutral foreign policy, namely, deprivation of membership of the Political Conference on Korea, Indian troops have been put at the disposal of the U.N.O. for custodian tasks in Korea;

(iii) in view of the declared attitude of the U.S.A. towards this country, the Government have not dissociated themselves from the activities of the U.N.O.; and

(iv) the Government have not taken effective steps to restore

✓ freedom to the people of foreign settlements in India by securing their merger with this country.”

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having taken into consideration the same this House approves of the policy.”

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): I beg to move:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same this House is of opinion that the policy pursued by Government will further the cause of peace and settle the question of Kashmir without resorting to violence.”

✓ **Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy** (Mysore): I beg to move:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same, this House regrets—

(1) that foreign policy is being conducted on party considerations and is partisan in character,

(2) that it has succeeded to solve some problems of other nations but failed to solve our own,

(3) that it has attracted attention of all nations but failed to gain their real friendship,

(4) that it has failed to evolve a definite and consistent policy for Asia,

(5) that it has led to misunderstanding rather than understanding of India,

(6) that it has been tolerating pockets of colonialism in India, and

(7) that it has failed to get the ✓ full confidence of the House of the People."

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same this House regrets that the Government of India have not taken effective steps to mitigate the sufferings of Indian nationals residing in Ceylon, Malaya and South Africa." ✓

Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same this House accords full support to the policy, and the steps taken in pursuance thereof."

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

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House regrets that the motion does not underline India's special interest in a settlement being arrived at at the forthcoming political conference in respect of Korea and that the motion contains no specific condemnation of the policies being pursued by the British Colonial Office in Africa and by the Malan Government in South Africa."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, regrets that Government is not yet following a consistent and positive policy of peace, freedom and well-being of all peoples which is threatened by the Anglo-American policies particularly in ✓ Asia and Africa."

441 P. S. D.

Shri Morarka (Ganganagar—Jhuni-jhunu): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House endorses and approves the policy, noting with profound satisfaction the global recognition accorded to India's efforts in the cause of peace by the election of Shrimati Vijaya-lakshmi to the presidency of the current United Nations General Assembly."

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, the House approves of this policy."

Shri N. L. Joshi (Indore): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same this House is of opinion that the policy of non-violence pursued by India can alone solve the world problems."

Shri Mahodaya (Nimar): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy adopted by the Government of India, namely, that of non-violence, of non-attachment with any particular group and of advocating and furthering the cause of weaker nations endeavouring to attain full freedom, can alone conduce to world peace, create friendly relations among the nations and bring happiness to their masses."

Shri M. L. Agrawal (Pilibhit Distt. cum Bareilly Distt. East): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having done so this House approves of the said policy.”

Shri K. R. Sharma (Meerut Distt. —West): I beg to move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy pursued by the Prime Minister with regard to international matters is the only policy which can lead to lasting peace in the world and congratulates the Prime Minister on the success of his efforts to ease international tension.”

✓ Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, I move:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the foreign policy of the Government is neither neutral nor dynamic.”

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I beg to move.

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“but regrets that—

(i) it has failed upto now to resist effectively the imperialist and colonial policies pursued by U.S.A., Great Britain and France in various parts of the world;

(ii) it has failed to create conditions favourable for a just and democratic solution of the Kashmir issue outside the U.N.O.; and

(iii) it has by its weak-kneed policies in economic diplomacy facilitated the enmeshing of India into the net of financial and diplo-

matic dependence on great powers.”

✓ Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now all the amendments and the motion will be open for discussion. Acharya Kripalani.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): Sir, may I make a point of order? Yesterday we made some representation that the Communist Party was omitted from several Committees.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not concerned with any Committees now.

Dr. Rama Rao: We gave the names and instead of calling one from the largest party in the opposition you are calling from some other party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very well. There is no point of order in this. It is true that Shri H. N. Mukerjee came and told me that he wanted to speak first. I thought I might allow him to do so. But since sitting here Acharya Kripalani wanted to speak. My discretion ought not to be fettered in this direction. Therefore I have called upon him.

Shri M. S. Garupadaswamy: It is equally strong.

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East): The Communist Party is not the strongest party in the Opposition.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Sir, for a mere Member of this House it is rather difficult to talk with any amount of assurance on foreign policy. This is supposed to be the preserve of the specialists. Often, even politicians have to rely upon service men for much of what they do. We had some service men in the Foreign Department before independence, and though they worked for imperial interests, and often against our own interests, we found them indispensable.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that international politics are intimately connected with diplomacy. It is carried on behind closed doors.

It is not free from cunning. After every international conference a joint and agreed communique is issued. What it says is not the whole truth. In spite of its verbiage it half reveals and half conceals the truth. Sometimes half truths are more dangerous than lies. We do not know all that happened in Teheran and Yalta after so many years. Taking a more recent example, the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of Pakistan met. They had several conferences, presumably alone and behind closed doors. How many conferences they had is anybody's guess! At the end of the conferences a joint communique was issued. Does the communique give all the facts? Already about Admiral Nimitz there is a doubt whether his name was dropped as Plebiscite Administrator in Kashmir. A mere Member thus can not know the internal workings of this crooked international diplomacy. He is always at a great disadvantage. I am specially so. There are people in my party who, in spite of these handicaps, are considered specialists. Unfortunately for me, and fortunately for the Congress, they are not present here. As for myself I have taken a very limited interest in international matters. In the old days before independence, the Congress expert on international affairs was he who is the nation's expert today. We had left all these things entirely to him. I remember when anybody wanted to discuss foreign affairs with Gandhiji he was politely referred to the expert of the Working Committee, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Gandhiji, considered himself an expert only in home politics. There, if anybody asked him any question he did not refer the questioner to anybody else, including Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Often he was invited by foreigners to go and preach his novel doctrine of truth and non-violence in their country and he was promised fruitful field there. But he always declined these offers and said: "I must make good here in India." I am also unfortunately one of those who believe that our foreign policy can succeed only when we are able to solve

the internal problem of poverty, disease and unemployment. Otherwise, I think we are posturing on the international stage. I dislike posturing, however aesthetic, in actual life.

I am in complete agreement with the basic principles of our foreign policy. One of these is that we stand for world peace. I wish we had also said that we stand for disarmament. Unfortunately, we can not do this, because we are ourselves piling up discarded arms from other countries to capacity, and beyond capacity, starving many nation-building activities. I also endorse the stand that we have taken against colonialism and imperialism.

These aims of ours are in consonance with democratic principles. It was, therefore, natural that we should ally ourselves with democratic countries, however formal their democracy. Unfortunately, capitalist democracy has generally been imperialist. Today, on account of fear, it has become reactionary. Everywhere democratic countries are allying themselves with, or at least helping the Fascist forces. Fascist Spain, Franco's Spain, is recognised and it is helped. Even the leader of the democratic bloc, America, is helping France; and French policy, whether in Indo-China, Tunisia, Morocco, or elsewhere, is absolutely imperialistic and reactionary. So far as America itself is concerned, that land of freedom, I am sorry to say, on account of fear, has withdrawn itself within its shell. Any attempt in any country to nationalise industries or commerce is considered by it as a step towards Communism. But all that would not be so bad. What is worse is that in America itself there is a regimentation of thought and its expression. Therefore, unfortunately, in spite of our principles, we cannot be fellow-travellers with the democratic bloc.

So far as totalitarian countries are concerned, our genius, our past history, and our traditions are against all totalitarian creeds whether in religion or in politics. But we have no

[Acharya Kripalani]

objection to any country following within its borders any regime, and yet call it democracy or socialism. What we object to in religion and politics is the spirit of proselytising. We consider it suspect. Also we find that the totalitarian States are not less imperialistic than the democratic States. For instance, Russia, I am sorry to say, follows the old foreign policy of the Czars. In history the Czars never went out of their country across the seas and conquered empires, but Russia under the Czars nibbled its weaker neighbours. This nibbling process is yet going on, even under Communists. It goes on in Asia and in Europe. I must say to the credit of Russia, that it is prepared to wait for centuries to have a bite at its neighbours, and then keep within itself and then when an opportunity comes nibble again. From China we expected something better, but its very first act was to smother the small kingdom of Tibet which had been virtually independent for centuries. Therefore, between this so-called democratic bloc and the so-called People's bloc or Socialist bloc, I believe we are rightly neutral. However sometimes we forget our neutrality in action. The position of a neutral is that he should not take sides. Moreover, we claim also to be peace-makers to the extent that we can affect international politics. I believe that a peace-maker has got to behave in such a manner that he does not create more complications in an already complicated situation.

11 A.M.

Taking Korea as an example, I think from the beginning we have acted in a manner which alternately annoys one party or the other. We first annoy one party and then annoy its rival. We think that our neutrality is proved because we have been able to annoy alternately both sides. In Korea we sided with the democratic bloc, the American bloc, and declared North Korea as the aggressor. Now, either the Korean War was a civil war or it was a war between Russia and

America, whatever may have been the alibis. If it was a civil war, in history, all civil wars for the unification of a country have been justified, which ever side may have been the aggressor. If it was really a war between Russia and America, we should have tried to find the aggressor outside Korea. Only last year we sponsored a Resolution about the prisoners of war. We thought this was the only point at issue, and, Armistice would follow if this point was solved. We gave a formula for the settlement of this issue. I am sorry to say we modified that formula at the instance of America and England. Naturally, we annoyed Russia and China and they rejected our formula; not only that but they paid us compliments calling us the stooges of capitalism and imperialism. After that we roundly condemned the Government of Dr. Rhee in South Korea. Not only that, but after the signing of the Armistice, we denounced him, rightly of course, for trying to sabotage the agreement. So, whether rightly or wrongly—and partly rightly and partly wrongly, we have dabbled in international affairs mostly to annoy one party or the other.

After having this annoyed Korea, we consented to send a Custodian Force for the settlement of the prisoner of war question and see that the prisoners were not interfered with by one party or the other. This Custodian Force naturally could not touch the soil of South Korea as we had annoyed it, and our soldiers had to be transported by air to the neutral zone. It is a needless and costly venture that we have taken upon ourselves.

I believe, therefore, that for some time when nations are suffering from a kind of hysteria, it will be best for us to cultivate our garden and confine ourselves largely to the four corners of the home front. I believe no amount of advertising of our foreign politics in this country and basing our Government's justification on that can be a substitute for a strong and healthy nation.

The question of the two blocs leads me to the question of our membership of the Commonwealth. The Prime Minister has often assured us that this intangible and subtle connection does not in any way affect our policy. I am afraid, intangible and subtle as it is, it affects our foreign policy subtly and intangibly. In the beginning I had thought that this connection would be advantageous to us in some way; not that the other countries of the Commonwealth would help us, but at least they will try to understand our point of view and not wound our feelings. Experience has taught us that this is not so. Some of the Commonwealth countries, with whom we are connected by subtle bonds of affection, show no great affection for us! Dr. Malan, about whom the Prime Minister himself has said something, doesn't want some of his fellow citizens in South Africa, simply because they are of Indian origin. They have as much right to be in South Africa as Dr. Malan and people of his complexion. Not only that. He invites Australia to go on a crusade against India. And Australia itself is an absolute 'white' country and would not allow any coloured people in its territory. England yet continues to be imperial. We dislike English policy in Kenya and in Malaya. In Kenya there is a veritable reign of terror against the Africans—and also sometimes against the Indians.

For all these reasons, I do not see why we should be connected with this old imperialism which calls itself new by the name of Commonwealth. I can understand that it gives an opportunity to our Prime Minister to go out of this land of drought, flood and famine. It is no great pleasure to him here. I can also understand that it enables him to renew his personal and political contacts. But these things can be had without our being members of the Commonwealth. I can assure him that so far as England is concerned and so far as the Empire is concerned, we have recently forgotten with them a more powerful connection by means of the game of cricket.

in which not only the Government but also this august House recently participated. And the English papers say, all that the English people did in India,—these Railways, communications etc. are not such matters of pride for them as that we are playing cricket as well as Englishmen. We have this new bond of cricket. Why should we then have the old bond which offends us so often and which violates our feelings? I see no need now to be in the Commonwealth which repeatedly insults, us and wounds our feelings.

This brings me to the question of foreign pockets in India, of which the Prime Minister has himself spoken. But I am sorry to say from year to year he has used the same words that he has used on this occasion. We do not want these black spots on our white Khadi garment of independence.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): What is your remedy?

Acharya Kripalani: I will tell you my remedy. The Prime Minister has himself admitted that these foreign pockets disturb our economy. There is a great deal of smuggling going on. And I may also tell you that in the two provinces where there is Prohibition, these black spots on our white garment are instrumental in making it more difficult of success than it need have been. I am afraid that after independence we have developed cold feet. We could tell the British Empire without any armed forces at our command to quit, but we cannot tell these black spots on our map to quit! Some time limit may be fixed. We must give them a notice that by a certain date they must quit. It is not necessary always to go to war about these matters. They can be done by other means also. There are sanctions in the world which can be applied only if we are determined. But if we always think that any sanctions that we apply will ultimately lead to war, and a local war would lead to international war, and then to a global war and then the whole world will be destroyed, then I say we can solve no problems.

[Acharya Kripalani]

(Time bell rings)

Sir I rarely take the time of the House though I have been here for years. I never asked any questions, I never raise a point of order; I have never sought any information. Therefore on the very rare occasions that I speak I must be allowed a little more latitude; I believe my colleagues in the House will not grudge me that, and it would not be considered as a precedent.

I shall now say a few words about Kashmir. There is an animal in Africa; when it is asked to carry burdens it says that it is a bird; when it is asked to fly, it says that it is a camel. It is called *autharmurg*. I do not know whether this question of Kashmir is a question in home politics or foreign politics. But, as our Prime Minister treated it as an item in foreign affairs, I think I can venture to say a few words about it. I believe, and I had said so about 4 years back in this House, that it was a great mistake to refer this question to the U.N.O., because we did not know the character of this new organisation. What was our reference to the U.N.O. about Kashmir? We accused Pakistan of being the aggressor. The U.N.O. investigated the case and it was found that Pakistan was the aggressor. This was admitted by Pakistan's itself. Yet this mighty organisation the U.N.O. would not deliver judgment! Seven years has passed. It is, I think, time that we withdraw this case about Kashmir—our reference at least—from the U.N.O. We have the *de facto* and the *de jure* right over Kashmir. The King was with us—he was the *de jure* King at the time and then the popular vote was with us. We should never have referred the case to the U.N.O. If we referred it then, it is time that after 7 years we withdraw it. If there are any technical difficulties, I would suggest that whenever the Kashmir question is discussed in U.N.O. our representatives should not be present there. This is the least that we can do.

Recently something happened in Kashmir which the Prime Minister has described himself. We had left the whole question of Kashmir to him and to Sheikh Abdullah.

An Hon. Member: Not now.

Acharya Kripalani: The result was there was confusion and there has been some change in the Government of Kashmir. That as our Prime Minister has said is an internal affair of the Kashmiris. They have settled it among themselves. But this affair, which we declared to be internal, brings to us the visit of the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He is a very worthy gentleman; he is always welcome to India. But this time what brought him here? He came because there was trouble in Kashmir. We had said that this trouble was internal; yet we consented to talk with him about Kashmir affairs.

We had decided that in Kashmir there will be a plebiscite, but this was an understanding between the Kashmiri Indians and the non-Kashmiri Indians. So far as international politics were concerned, this was a unilateral announcement by us. We had put upon ourselves some kind of restraint. Pakistan or any other country in the world was not involved in this question. It was a voluntary offer by us to people whom we considered to be our nationals. They were Kashmiris but they were as good India as we are. They simply were the residents of a part of India called Kashmir. This was an internal arrangement of ours which was unilateral; it had nothing to do with others; it had no international implications except in an indirect way. Now Pakistan Prime Minister comes and negotiates with us about the plebiscite in Kashmir which was exclusively our affair! But supposing we consider it to be an affair of India and Pakistan as we have done recently, then we should have told the Pakistan Prime Minister, 'All right, we are going to consider this Kashmir question with you; let us withdraw the reference to U.N.O.'. We have not withdrawn the

reference to U.N.O. But we have brought in another party which had nothing to do with the plebiscite in Kashmir. U.N.O. has for seven years done nothing and the result is—whatever our Prime Minister may say,—of course, we have to accept his word—as the Prime Minister of Kashmir definitely says that there has been much undesirable international activity in Kashmir. I suppose he the Kashmir Prime Minister knows what he is talking about. So far as our Prime Minister is concerned, he says these things—international intrigues and spying—are inevitable. If they are inevitable, then hanging of people who intrigue or play as spies is also inevitable in international affairs. I know that all nations send their agents to other countries but if they act as spies they are also hanged all right.

Though I entirely support the basic principles of our foreign policy I believe that the more inunciation of basic principles is not enough. They must be translated into action. More than that, as I have said, our attention should be more directed towards home politics than towards foreign politics. If we are strong at home, nobody will insult us abroad.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I have listened with much patience and considerable interest to the exposition of the Prime Minister and with perhaps more patience and somewhat less interest to the facetious eccentricities of the Acharya to my right, eccentricities which were punctuated by some sound sense. But, I think I ought to begin, if only for a change, what I am going to say by expressing a sense of gratification at the very substantial contribution which this country led by the Prime Minister has made to the efforts of the peace-loving peoples of the world for a cessation of hostilities in long-suffering Korea and for the emergence of a new hope, a hope of permanent peace which has issued as a consequence of it. I think I should also say that it could only have been in token of appreciation of this contribution of India, an appreciation which

is being snatched from the United States of America in a fashion which one commentator has described as a naive "I love you still", approach made by the jilter to the jilted, because the United State decided after all to support the nomination of Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit to the Chairmanship of the Assembly. But, I am happy, Sir, that this token of appreciation has come to this country and the gracious lady who has gone to the United Nations as the Leader of our Delegation has been elected President of the United Nations Assembly. We have had and still have with her and the Government which she represents occasionally very strident differences but we are happy that she will be adorning the Chair at a very crucial moment in the history of the world at the session of the United Nations Assembly.

Now, in regard to Korea, as I have said before, I do not wish to muddy the waters and I wish that efforts are pursued seriously and truly so that peace of the sort which the peoples of the world aspire for is achieved. But, it is very necessary, Sir, for India to realise its responsibility in spite of the efforts of the United States in particular to administer snubs to us. The snub which the United States tried to administer to us through that "hero" who seems to flourish in an American gold-fish bowl, Dr. Rhee, the snub which the United States tried to administer to us has recoiled on itself. But it is very necessary that we say that we are not going to allow, in as far as it lies in us, to permit that country to pose as the guardian of the anti-communist morals of Asia and the world. We are not going to allow a bumpitious and bellicose country to behave as if it can buy the friendship and allegiance of peoples in different parts of the world. We ought to say, Sir, that we believe neither in preventive war nor in preventive fear, and therefore in regard to Korea we can go ahead and try to see that these objectives which the people of Korea and the people of China, who are most closely interested in it, have set in

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

view, that these objectives are realised. These include the peaceful settlement of the whole Korean question, the withdrawal of all foreign troops including Chinese Peoples Volunteers from the country and the settlement by peaceful means of every outstanding problem including the establishment of a united, democratic, peaceful and independent Korea. That is the objective which the Korean people and the Chinese people have in view and we should try to make our utmost contribution to it.

As we go and make that contribution we find that it is not only the United States of America which is today the leader of international reaction but that there is another about which our Prime Minister has developed a new consciousness—Britain and the Commonwealth which we are told is an association which really works for the fundamental interests of the entire world. That other country also is in the game to such an extent that it is very necessary for us to beware and that is why I wish to refer to certain things which are happening in regard to Korea.

In Korea actually the British Government took up the position towards the end which showed how it really had to jump into whichever hoop the United States provided for them. At the time of the Atlantic Charter, Churchill told President Roosevelt as early as in 1942 that "we know that you know" that the British Empire cannot exist without the support of the United States. That is the basis of every policy that the British Government pursues. Apart from the British and American foreign policies I wanted to hear from the Prime Minister a certain definite expression of consciousness and confidence to face the problems that arise therefrom. I quote from "Newsweek", which is an important American periodical, of the 7th September.

It says:

"The British made a last minute switch to support the U.S. position

on India. This came too late to have much effect on the debate, but it was significant as evidence of a fundamental Anglo-American solidarity."

It goes on to say:

"Had the British realised the extent of Rhee's influence on American policy, there is little doubt that they would have abandoned their sponsorship of India. The British are much less concerned about India's participation than would appear from their public declarations."

The time at my disposal is very limited. Let us turn to what is happening in Kashmir; let us turn to what is happening throughout the Middle East, what is happening in Egypt, Iran, Tunisia, Morocco and all that area. There we find that the British Government in particular behaves in a tenaciously imperialist way. We should not remain under the illusion which is being propagated on the floor of the House by the Prime Minister that the British Empire has liquidated itself; that the British lion now behaves like a lamb and has turned an innocent. That illusion is most dangerous of which we should be aware. That is why in regard to Kashmir which has been a field of intrigues of foreign agents it is necessary for us to take up a very strong view. I wanted the Prime Minister to be more positive about what he was going to do in regard to Kashmir.

I support the policy which you have pursued so far but I say that we have to fight on different fronts. We have to resist the pressure which is being put by these foreign agencies in Kashmir because it happens to be a strategic area which they want to utilise for their own imperialist interest. That is why they are swarming all over the place. I would ask the Prime Minister how is it that these people come to this country in hordes from certain specified countries. They come as students, they come as technical

experts, they come as farmers and they come here as housewives. They are photographed five days in the week with our Rashtrapati or even with the Prime Minister. They go all over the place like the frogs of Egypt; they dip in our dish and sup in our cups. But it is different in other cases, and I will give you one.

On a certain occasion I had asked the Prime Minister's Deputy a very simple thing. A gentleman called Bossi, a senator of the Italian Parliament and two representatives of the all China Federation of Labour wanted to come to a place in Malabar for a conference of the All India Kisan Sabha (Agricultural Workers' Conference). I was told that these people were undesirable. But there are other people who go wherever they choose. Take, for instance, a place like Chamba which is not very far from here, a place I thought was a quiet people. There you see. Foreigners, with cameras slung on their shoulders photographing every square foot of our territory. They know every thing about every bridge, every culvert, every inch of jeepable road. This sort of thing is going on. That is why I say that we have to resist pressure which is being put in the case of Kashmir.

At the same time in regard to Kashmir I was very happy that the Prime Minister told our friend Dr. Khare that he was behaving in a manner which we do not appreciate. An accusation in respect of American interference in Kashmir has come from my friend Mr. Deshpande. He has gone to the press with an accusation that the President of the United States had written a letter to Sheikh Abdullah on the issue of Independent Kashmir. In spite of that I say that the communalists in this country have taken up a stand in regard to Kashmir which is already playing into the hands of the most communal and reactionary elements in Kashmir and Pakistan. In order, therefore, that the objectives which we have in view are going to be realised it is very necessary to have a very conscious realisation of that problem.

I have no time to refer to all the things. I have in mind. Certain reports appeared in London "Times" which talks about the Wazir Committee's Report about the non-implementation of the economic reforms which we thought were going to bring some kind of relief to the suffering people of Kashmir. The Wazir Committee's Report was pigeon-holed by the former Government of Sheikh Abdullah because it pointed out certain things, because it showed how land redistribution had been done in such a bureaucratic fashion that it had not satisfied the needs of the people. If we are going to win over the people of Kashmir to ourselves, however, certain other things need to be done. That is the only criterion which is going to determine their destiny. If we are going to win the affection of the Kashmiri people it is necessary for us to see that the Bakshi Government pursue the radical economic reconstruction policies announced by them.

I say, that in Kashmir we have to resist the pressure of these foreign elements who are swarming all over the place in the shape of U.N. observers. We have to see that these U.N. observers are withdrawn here and now. There is no question about it. There might be some reticence in the Prime Minister's mind about them but we wish these observers are withdrawn straightaway. If he cannot withdraw the Kashmir case from the U.N., he can certainly write to the United Nations and say that U.N. Observers have behaved in a manner which cannot be tolerated.

I was very happy to read reports of what was said by the Prime Minister in the A.I.C.C. meeting at Agra. He had said there was foreign interference which he would not tolerate. Today he says that these reports are exaggerated. He says there are spies in Kalimpong and other places. If so you have to do something not only about Kalimpong but also about these "observers" and others of their ilk. We have been told by Bakshi Ghulam

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Mohammad that these foreign observers are playing havoc with the destinies of the people of Kashmir. We can easily tell our delegation in the United Nations to bring up this issue. I do not know the exact diplomatic implications but I can say that we ought to pursue a straightforward policy and I am sure if we try to do it you will get the co-operation of our people.

I am very happy at the attitude which our Prime Minister has consistently taken up in regard to China. I am very happy also at his awareness of the fact that the U.K. has agreed to the suggestion that as far as China's membership of the U.N. is concerned there should be a "moratorium" for the next year to come. Why should we fall in line with this kind of mischief? Why do we not do something positive about it?

The other day when the American Ambassador presented his credentials to our President he made a speech, about which I had asked a question in this House. I am quoting the expressions which he used. He said: "I am directing the activities of the American Government in this country." It is most inappropriate language for a diplomatist to use. I asked a question about it the other day as to whether, in accordance with international law, this speech was sent to the External Affairs Ministry for prior approval before it was made before our President. The answer I got was that it was sent for approval. I could not ask supplementaries because there was no time. I wanted a half-hour discussion on the point. I did not get that opportunity.

In defiance of international law here comes the representative of a foreign country who says, in effect, "China has behaved so badly. You are behaving very well." He said that one great country of Asia, China, had tried to operate in an undemocratic way. Why should he reflect upon the policies of another country with which we are very friendly? Why should this gentleman be here who says China is

✓ a country which has completely failed as far as the democratic experiment is concerned.?

I find also that no reference has been made to the very black record which we have in regard to our relationship with Nepal: I don't know what to say—*Dushta Saraswati* for the time being has settled on my tongue—our connivance in the recruitment of Gurkhas to the British army. I have looked at the British Army estimates regarding British Gurkhas. It is reported in the *Statesman* of the 22nd July that the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in the United Kingdom told the House of Commons that India had been "most helpful" in securing an agreement by which Britain may recruit Gurkhas on Nepalese soil for the next five years. We have sent units of our own fighting forces—the Uttar Pradesh Armed Constabulary—into Nepal at the request of the Government of Nepal, that is to say, we are always ready to help Nepal. In regard to this, the London Times wrote in its editorial on the 6th August, 1953:

"...India has shown herself sympathetic and helpful."

and goes on to say:

"Bhim Dutt Pant, a follower of the exiled communist, Dr. K. I. Singh, raised the standard of revolution in South-West Nepal."

The "Times" continues:

"In this emergency, Khatmandu appealed to Delhi for help. The response was immediate. The Government of India not only allowed Nepalese troops to take an easy line of march through Indian territory to the seat of disturbances but also placed a powerful body of its own armed forces at the disposal of the Nepal Government. This double manoeuvre upset the calculations of the rebels who were quickly broken. ... Other help—technical experts, communications, and improvement of export trade". and so on and so fourth.

Again:

"India has waived import and excise duty on goods consigned to Nepal so that Nepal can enjoy an additional source of revenue."

Then the "Times" says:

"The most important of all perhaps: the King and his Ministers know that India will not allow communist or other subversive influences to overthrow the Government but will stand by it until a new democratic system has been firmly established."

Is that the position of India—to see to it that communist and other subversive influences are not established in Nepal, our neighbour country? In that case, where is the difference between us and Eisenhower who wants communism to be eradicated from all over the world and says that "therefore, I pay so many million dollars to the French imperialists who are crushing the freedom movement in Indo-China."?

Then, I refer to another report on the Nepal question. In the *Economic Weekly*, a capitalist commercial journal published from Bombay, dated the 12th September, 1953, it is said that there had been—I didn't know myself—Municipal elections in Nepal, and adds:

"Quite unexpectedly, the Communists swept the polls by gaining 50 per cent. of the votes cast though they did not win as many seats. The Communist Party is banned in Nepal. Its leaders are behind the bars. Yet, the electorate of Nepal's capital, in their first election based on adult franchise, gave a decisive verdict in favour of the Communists."

I did not know that. I find it in this paper. Is it the policy of the Government of India to see to it that in a neighbouring country communists or other parties—whatever it may be—do not come into power? In such a case, I say that we are pursuing a policy which is extremely objectionable.

Let us turn to Malaya. I do not want to repeat, for this question has come up over and over again. The other day questions were raised here on this matter. The Prime Minister was not very sure if the British recruiting camps for Gurkhas that had been set up in this country had been entirely liquidated yet. He was not sure, but it seems it takes an unconscionably long time for these things on our soil to be liquidated. Again, I see, Sir, a report in the *Hindusthan Standard* dated 6th September, 1953 about the Nicobar Islands. I do not know about the veracity of the report, but I wish the Prime Minister takes note of it.

"There is a landing strip on one of the Nicobar Islands to the east of Ceylon and this is said to be leased by India to Britain but not under a permanent agreement. Britain, it is believed, is seeking a permanent agreement with India for this."

Why should we lease it out? I do not know the exact position. These are reports which appear in the press, but why should we allow ourselves to be utilized and exploited by these imperialist interests? I do not want for the time being to characterise this by the kind of adjectives which come easily to my tongue—why should we allow these imperialist interests to exploit us in the manner in which they are doing so far?

I find the Prime Minister coming up, over and over again, and saying that the empire has changed, there is no such thing as empire, it is a new kind of association. And last year, to my utter consternation, he even recommended the other states of the world to come and join this wonderful commonwealth which the British have brought about under their aegis. I do not know, but I only thought that I might refer him to what a Labour Member of Parliament, known to some of us personally when he was in this country several times, Mr. Woodrow Wyatt, said. He said in March, 1952, "what would happen to our balance of payments if we had to take our troops

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

out of Malaya?" This is the position of the imperialists and that is the position which we are trying to support. We say that we are very happy that the British Empire has changed. It has not changed at all. The Prime Minister made very fine observations on the situation in Africa, in Kenya and other places. In regard to that, Mr. Lyttleton, who is the Colonial Secretary of the British Government said—it is reported in the *Statesman* of the 31st July, 1953:—

".....recent speeches by Mr. Nehru in which occurred certain remarks about conditions in Africa. Mr. Nehru has been left in no doubt that His Majesty's Government categorically reject these remarks in relation to the territories in Africa for which His Majesty's Government are responsible and deplore their possible effect on public opinion."

So, here is our friend, the British, trying to do this!

Then, about our investments. Only the other day, it was said in the House in connection with another discussion that the Governor of the Reserve Bank. Mr. Benegal Rama Rao chose to speak in Washington. He tried to placate foreign investors and he said: "There are no limitations on dividends or on the transfer of profits or the withdrawal of capital. We have no discrimination whatsoever against foreign capital." I cannot go into all sorts of these declarations and the embargo on international trade which is effectively imposed by our foreign policy which has its reflection on our economic policy. That exactly is the position.

In Korea what did we do? We supported the most crucial pronouncements which the United Nations, which means the United States, made in regard to Korea. When our ambulance unit was coming back, they went to the Penang area,—I do not know why—probably they had a good time in Hong Kong and just wanted to see

Penang—and Major S. K. Banerjee who was the leader of the Ambulance Unit said they were entirely disappointed because they were not permitted to land in Penang. "My men were terribly disappointed because we were not even permitted to land in Penang." Is it because Indians have taken part in the resurgence of the Malayan people for freedom? Indians have given their lives, their treasure, their blood for the fulfilment of the aspirations of the Malaya people—whether Malaysians, Chinese or Indians living there. Perhaps this is why Indians are suspected to such an extent that the Indian Ambulance Unit coming back from South Korea was not even permitted to land in Penang.

I would now refer to another matter which I happened to discover in the Parliament Library only yesterday. I looked up the *Fortnightly Review* for August, 1953, wherein I found an interesting article by Lord Birdwood, who, you may remember, was a former Commander-in-Chief of India. He wrote on "Changing Commonwealth" thus,—he made a comparison between our Prime Minister and General Smuts who had said in 1918:

"We are not an Empire. Germany is an Empire and so was Rome and so is India. But we are a system of nations, a community of states and of nations far greater than any Empire that may ever exist..." And Lord Birdwood adds: "It is interesting to compare this vision with an acceptance of the British Commonwealth in our own time by another statesman, Jawaharlal Nehru. Mr. Nehru may well be experiencing something of that readjustment of the human faculty of loyalty which was the great feature of the early years of Smuts, the servant of the Commonwealth. Smuts fought Britain with the sword; Mr. Nehru with the pen and the spoken word. Smuts became the great advocate of the "British Commonwealth of Nations." Will Mr. Nehru in his

own time pursue the theme into further channels of evolution? This, for me, is the challenging concept which the Coronation meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers offered for our reflection."

He then goes on, after referring to our Prime Minister having gone to see General Naguib to discuss the issue of the Suez Canal which has been referred to critically on the floor of this House, and says:

"We would seem at last to have reached the stage when we can with complete confidence turn to either India or Pakistan for these problems which concern us in the future and which might be regarded as demanding a reconciliation between Great Britain and countries such as Egypt which persist in regarding themselves as suffering under the wicked wayward imperialism."

So, we, Sir, are going to be the go-between. We are the brokers doing the dirty job for these imperialists. I am sorry I have to say this. The same thing was suggested by a very definite editorial comment in the "London Economists" to which perhaps the Prime Minister will attach more importance than to the pronouncement of Lord Birdwood. In its issue, dated the 27th June, the "Economist" of London made a statement exactly on the same lines. It says:

"Both India and Pakistan recognise that they are directly concerned with the security of the Middle-East. Having just come moreover from the Coronation and the Commonwealth Conference in London both Mr. Nehru and Mr. Mohammad Ali are keenly aware of the British views on the subject. Both acknowledge in particular that while Egypt is certainly entitled to full sovereignty which it claims over the Suez Canal Zone, the total withdrawal of British support would be undesirable."

Then it goes on to say:

"There is certainly much to be said for any policy which could lead to the positive exercise of joint Indian and Pakistani influence on Middle-East affairs.

Apart from the question of Suez, the critical weakness in the Persian Gulf springs from the fact that since the disappearance of the old Indian Army, there is no effective force within reasonable distance for use in an emergency."

We are being conceived of as people who could be used in an emergency in the Middle-East. This is the kind of interpretation which they are putting upon our Prime Minister's visit to General Naguib. I know our Prime Minister will say: "Don't take them at their word. I will tell you something very different." I am quite prepared to take him at his word. But I want him to beware of these things; I want him to beware of the tendencies which are the inevitable concomitants of the imperialist system. I want him to take note of the real significance of what is happening in Iran. There the Americans and the British are hand in glove together. General Zahedi says: "I got the first instalment of American money without condition; the next instalment is coming." Mr. Loy Henderson has said: "General Zahedi, the next instalment would come if the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company are given their Iranian properties." Fifteen per cent. of the total income of the Iranian people has been taken away for years by British oil magnates who have been sucking the life-blood out of the vitality of the Iranian people. These are the things which happen all over the place.

Why on earth are we going to link our destiny with these people who are running the world to ruination? There are other ways of doing things. When anything goes wrong,—it has gone terribly wrong in Kenya,—why don't we take up this matter in the United Nations? If we can take up with the United Nations, through the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Asian-African Bloc, the question of Tunisia and Morocco, what on earth prevents us from taking the issue of Malaya or of Kenya to the United Nations? In Malaya a full-scale war has been going on for the last four or five years. Nobody, not even our Prime Minister, can deny it. In Kenya calumny is being perpetrated in a manner which our Prime Minister has denounced in terms which we all applaud. But why can't we go and take it up in the United Nations? I know the Prime Minister would say: You are suggesting impossible remedies." I tried to make a note of what he was saying: "Don't shout". I do not want to shout myself. Actually, Sir, I described this House in jest as a gas-chamber, because I do not like shouting. He said: "We are doing things." Let us be doing things. Let us begin on the right track. Let us set our goal; let us find out which way to go; let us choose our friends and let us not be contaminated by continuous contact with these imperialist forces which have not changed and which cannot possibly change their complexion and their character. That is the lesson which is being taught by the Korean incidents; that is the lesson which we have got to take to heart; that is the lesson which should inspire us to achieve real peace, real freedom for the well-being of all the colonial peoples. That is why India is expected today to champion the cause of the freedom of all peoples and to champion the cause of peace.

You, Sir, are learned in our ancient lore and we know how every single ceremony of ours would conclude with an invocation of *shanti*, of peace on earth. We know how our ancestors in Vedic times chanted:

"मधु वाता ऋतायते मधु, क्षरन्ति सिन्धवः"
(Madhu Vata Ritayate, Madhu Ksharanti Sindhavah).

That was the idea we had. We want a new kind of world. We have great allies. We have most of the colonial people on our side. Our allies are

exultations, agonies, and love and man's unconquerable mind. With these allies we can march ahead with greater determination to that goal, which I know the Prime Minister has also in his own heart, which I know he tries to pursue from time to time with a sort of half-hearted positivity. I want him to be more positive. I want him not to come every time to this House and tell us: "Be mature". In the name of maturity let him not pursue policies which are pusillanimous. Let him not try to talk in terms of practicality and throw away that wonderful complexion of idealism which had been the stamp and the seal of our national movement and which made it the pride and glory of our country. If he is going to act really and truly in consistency with the spirit of our national movement, I wish him to come forward as the champion of the people's cause and to fight for peace as it should be fought for, as every lovely thing has got to be fought for, bravely, courageously and without contamination by those ugly forces which are trying to bring mankind down to the brink of ruin and degradation which we cannot contemplate with equanimity.

Shri Raghuramalah (Tenali): I have followed very closely the speeches of Acharya Kriplani and my friend the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party. What struck me is that Mr. Hiren Mukerjee was unnecessarily working himself up. Obviously he has not got very much to say against the foreign policy pursued by this country. Admittedly he is in agreement with the broad outlines of it. Acharya Kripalani referred to the annoyance caused to some by the policy which we have been pursuing, because of the fact that we have been siding once with one party and then another party. But actually he forgets that a nation which pursues a straight path, an honest path, a path of peace without aligning itself with one group or the other, cannot avoid annoying this group or that group. This annoyance is due to the reason

that we have not sided, not because we have sided this group or that.

When we advised the United Nations not to cross the Thirty-Eighth Parallel the United States were annoyed with us. Recently in the Prisoners-of-War Resolution Russia and China were annoyed with us. I do not know the latest developments regarding the Political Conference: perhaps both the Groups are annoyed with us. Those who sponsored us might have been annoyed because we asked them not to press our case. Those who opposed us might have been annoyed with us because they would have never liked our coming into the picture. The question is not that we are siding this group or that group. The annoyance may be there because we take an unbiassed view. That itself is the greatest testimony to the soundness of our foreign policy.

Regarding the Political Conference the Prime Minister has made it clear that we have no particular desire to be there, unless both sides want us. The reasons given by Mr. Dulles, the American Secretary of State, are really very revealing. In a recent speech he said there are two reasons why they did not want to support India for the Political Conference. One is that India does not fit into any of the sides and two, the tremendous amount of opposition to India, the increasing prejudice against India in South Korea.

In saying that I think he has let the cat out of the bag. In a sense it is not true that the agreement does not permit the inclusion in the Political Conference of people who do not belong to one side or the other. It is also a debatable point whether India fits into either side or not. Because you will recollect that India was a party to the Resolution of June 25th declaring that South Korea has committed aggression and also to the June 27th Resolution calling for military assistance to the Republic of South Korea—we were a party to it. As for the question of fitting in India, the relevant clause in the Agreement

called for a Political Conference of a high level of both sides. It does not preclude,—all that it ensures is, that there should be at least the representatives of both sides of a certain higher level—it does not preclude the parties bringing in any other neutral or desirable countries into the ambit of the talks. The second reason which Dulles has given as I said, reveals—that a small State like South Korea is practically dictating to the U.S.A. and that the U.S.A., is pursuing a certain policy because of that. It is opposing India's inclusion only because the President of South Korea does not like India or does not want the participation of India. It is a very tragic state of affairs. It is not that we are particular to be represented there, it is not that we would like to force ourselves on others, but as the Prime Minister has said, it is a matter of very great importance that in Asia, a country like India, like China and other countries, should not be ignored when it is a question of peace or war in Asia. As a matter of fact, the voting on India is very interesting. The whole of the British Commonwealth, except Pakistan, South Africa abstaining, the whole of the NATO except Greece, all the sixteen nations having their forces in Korea except U.S.A., Columbia and Greece, voted for India's participation. It is extraordinary that there are people in the world who believe honestly that a country like Columbia or Ethiopia or Luxemburg can protect the interests of peace in Asia and not India. It is a very extraordinary state of affairs and while we are not anxious to be there, we think we are entitled to be heard in the councils of the world, particularly when peace in Asia is in question. We have a more abiding interests in it because we are such immediate neighbours and because ultimately it affects us more intimately than it does others.

12 Noon.

Regarding China, the attitude taken by some of the powers and more particularly U.S.A., is very amazing, because as the Prime Minister said, there is no question of admitting

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

China into the United Nations. China is an original member and she has got a right to be represented there and, if I may say so, refusal to admit the representatives of Communist China into the United Nations is a violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It is one of the cardinal principles of the United Nations that they should not interfere in the domestic jurisdiction of any particular member. It is not therefore proper for the United Nations to dictate to China what form of government she should have. The great powers have quite often invoked it when it was a question of interference in the case of the colonial countries. But here is a threat and an interference in the domestic jurisdiction of China by refusing her representation in the councils of the United Nations merely because of her political set up. It is not as though China has been suspended or that China has been expelled from the United Nations either for enforcement purposes or for preventive purposes under Articles 5 or 6 of the United Nations Charter. No such action has taken place. The refusal to seat proper representatives of China is therefore a case of violation of the Charter. One of the principal features of the Charter is that it believes in the equality of all nations, but here China is not being treated equally with other nations.

As regards the foreign possessions in India, the Prime Minister's statement is of very great importance. The statement which he has made this morning is that we shall not allow these bits of foreign territory to be used for purposes of war.

Recently, the Prime Minister of Portugal said that he would not enter into any negotiation with any country for the transfer of any bit of their territory either in India or outside. It is a very extraordinary position and it is still more extraordinary that certain countries should enter into mutual assistance pacts with Portugal which include utilisation of the

moneys or funds supplied to Portugal for the preservation of its territorial possessions outside. I have in mind the mutual assistance pact entered into recently between the U.S.A. and Portugal, which enables Portugal to utilise some of the benefits she receives from the U.S.A. for the defence of the Portuguese possessions in India. I don't want to use any harsh language except to say that it seems to be rather an unfriendly act to this country. We don't mind the U.S.A. or any other country helping any country, but it should not be to our detriment.

Regarding these foreign possessions, no ready made solution can be found. We have to work it out and I think the statement made by the Prime Minister this morning goes a very long way. It is a great advance on the previous position we had taken and I think it will make the foreign powers think whether it is really worth their while to have such possessions here if they cannot be made use of during war. Economically they are already a liability and the foreign powers will have to naturally think what further steps should be taken by them in the context of events that will follow.

One particular point I have noticed in the Members in the opposition who spoke and that is that whenever they have nothing else to criticise the Government, they to harp on the Commonwealth idea. Whatever Great Britain does, they want to crash it on us with a bang. If things go wrong in Malaya, we are not to be blamed as we are not formulating British foreign policy. The real question is—Is there any particular harm done to us by continuing to be a member of the Commonwealth? I am yet to hear one member from the opposition as to how our interests are really injured by participation in the Commonwealth. It is very easy to forget the kind of assistance that has become available to us under the Colombo Plan and other types of assistance by the virtue of our association with the

Commonwealth. Not only that, there are indirect gains also. I am one of those who believe that, directly or indirectly, we have been able to influence the British policy towards China and to the extent there is a difference between the policy of the United States and that of Britain towards China I think the credit should go to us.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The tail wagging the dog!

Shri Raghuramaiah: Well, you better wag it yourself. And I know you will do it when you get a chance I know that is all what you can do, and I am anticipating it. Just because we are associated with the Commonwealth all the sins of omission and commission of Great Britain are being thrust on us. How are we responsible for the sort of things going on in Malaya? Did we support them? One member has asked: you have taken up the question of Tunisia, you have taken up the question of Morocco in the United Nations; why don't you take up the case of Malaya? It is not as though we dictate to the Asian-Arab bloc. It is a matter for consideration between members of the Asian-Arab bloc, and if there is a case and there is no difficulty about that it is for that Group to take it up, and naturally we will not lag behind in supporting such a cause. If something happens in Nepal or in this corner or that corner of the world, however remotely Britain is connected with it, to thrust it on our head is uncharitable and shows a bankruptcy of thinking in the armoury of the opponents. And I hope they will give some specific instances of injustice or harm done to India on account of the association with the Commonwealth.

On the whole the foreign policy of our country, I am very happy to say and I am sure every Member here feels the same way, has received the widest recognition and approval throughout the world, and it is a matter of great pride to us to be associated with that policy and to see within such a short time India being

recognised as the harbinger of peace. And we are very proud of the Prime Minister for having formulated, fostered and nurtured this foreign policy and having kept it up consistently. I am sure the whole House will agree with me that the election of Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit as the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations is the supreme symbol of that appreciation and recognition throughout the world.

ڈاکٹر سعید محمود (چهارن پور):

حضور والا! میری بدقسمتی ہے کہ میں اس سانس میں جو تقریریں ہوتی ہیں ان کو نہیں سن سکتا میں اسی لئے ہمیشہ ذہنت میں حصہ نہیں لیتا تھا - آج بھی بدقسمتی سے میں نے پرائم منسٹر کی تقریر نہیں سنی - پھر بھی ہر لمحے کے لئے کہوا ہو گیا ہوں بلکہ تقریر سنے - اس واسطے اگر میں کوئی شہد ایسا کہہ دوں جو ناموزوں ہو تو معاف کر دیتے گا - ان کی تقریر تو میں نے نہیں سنی لیکن میں نے اندازہ کیا ہے کہ انہوں نے کیا کہا - اس تقریر کے کچھ چند الفاظ سننے کے بعد - کچھ جملے سننے کے بعد میں نے اندازہ کیا کہ انہوں نے کیا کہا - انہوں نے دنیا کے قریب قریب سارے ملکوں کے متعلق کہا - انہوں نے جو کچھ کہا اس سے نہ صرف ان کی واقفیت بلکہ ان کی دلچسپی اور پورا ریلائیشن معلوم ہوا - ہماری فارین پالیسی صرف یہی نہیں ہے کہ وہ ایک نیوٹرینلزم کی یا نکیٹو پالیسی رکھتی ہے یا ہے - بلکہ وہ اس زمانہ میں جب کہ سائنس کے آلات نے سائنس کے حربہ نے دنیا کے لئے اتنا ہوا خطرہ پیدا کر

[ڈاکٹر سید محصور]

دیا ہے کہ نہ صرف دنیا میں بے اطمینانی ہے - بلکہ دنیا کی تہذیب دنیا کی شائستگی - اس کی سمیٹتا سنسکرتی کے مت جانے کا قر ہے - ایسی حالت میں اگر کوئی ملک دنیا کو اس خطرہ سے بچائے اور بچانے کی کوشش کرے تو وہ نہ صرف قابل تعریف ہے بلکہ دنیا کے شکر یہ کا مستحق ہے -

یہ صحیح ہے کہ آجکل انٹرنیشنل پالیٹکس جس حالت میں ہے وہ تمام دنیا کے لئے تکلیف دہ ہے - آج ملایا میں جو ہو رہا ہے - جو مظالم وہاں ہوئے ہیں اور ہو رہے ہیں - وہ بڑے تکلیف دہ ہیں آج کیلینا میں جو ہو رہا ہے وہ تمام دنیا کے لئے تکلیف دہ ہے اور ہمارے لئے تکلیف دہ ہے - افسوس یہ ہے کہ ان دونوں ملکوں میں جو کچھ ہو رہا ہے وہ ایک ایسا ملک کر رہا ہے جس کو کولونیلزم کا بڑا تجربہ ہے - اس کے اس تجربہ سے ہم امید رکھتے تھے کہ وہ پھر ایسی غلطی نہیں کریگا جو پہلے کر چکا ہے - لیکن جیسا کہ بعض دوستوں نے کہا ہے کہ امپریلزم یا کولونیلزم کے جو شائق ہیں وہ جلدی ہی اپنے پچھلے تجربہ کو بھول جاتے ہیں اور پھر وہی کرنے لگتے ہیں مجھے معلوم نہیں لیکن غالباً میں امید کرتا ہوں کہ چونکہ ہم کامن ویلتھ میں شریک ہیں تو بھٹہ شیف

کامن ویلتھ کے ایک ممبر کے ہم انگلستان کی توجہ ملایا کی طرف کیلینا کی طرف متوجہ کرتے ہوئے ابھی کل کے اخبار سے معلوم ہوا کہ اب جو وہاں کے فارمس ہیں - انگریزوں - ان کو ویلانڈیشن ہو رہا ہے اور وہ اس ملک کو چھوڑنے کی تجویز کر رہے ہیں - اہلی جانداں بیچ کر ملک کو چھوڑنے کی تجویز کر رہے ہیں - چہ سے کہ انہوں نے پہلے یہاں کہا - یہ شکر ہے کہ انہوں نے ویلانڈ کیا کہ وہاں ملک میں کیا حالت ہے - اگر انہوں نے اس کو محسوس کیا ہے تو یہ ایک امید دینے والی بات ہے - ہمیں امید کرنی چاہئے کہ وہ جلد ایسا کریں تاکہ بیچارے کولونیا کو اور افریقہ کے دوسرے حصوں کو نجات ملے -

ملایا میں جو ہو رہا ہے وہ بھی ہمارے لئے نہایت تکلیف دہ ہے - ایران میں جو ہوا ہے وہ ظاہرہ تو معلوم یہی ہوتا ہے کہ اندرونی جھگڑا ہے - لیکن دنیا اچھی طرح جانتی ہے کہ اس سب کے پچھلے کیا ہے کوئی معشوق ہے اس پر وہ زنگاری میں جو سب جھگڑے کے پچھلے ہے یہ کوئی چھٹی ہوئی بات نہیں ہے کہ کس طرح فوج میں تقسیم کرنے کے لئے بیس ملین ڈالر بھجھے گئے ہیں اس سے صاف ظاہر ہے کہ کیا معامہ ہے - بحر حال جو اور چکے ہو ہو

رہا ہے۔ - مراکش میں یا ٹیونیشیا میں وہ تمام دنیا کو معلوم ہے۔ وہاں کس طرح کی حالت ہے۔ انسانوں کے ساتھ جانوروں کی طرح برتاؤ ہو رہا ہے۔ وہ تمام مذہبی دنیا کے لئے تکلیف دہ اور شرم کی بات ہے۔ وہاں فرنچ وہاں کے لوگوں کو نکال کر ان کے سروں کو کچلتے جا رہے ہیں اور وہ تھرست بن رہے ہیں۔ خود فرنچ لوگ بھی لوگوں کو تھرانز کرتے ہیں اور وہاں کے لیڈروں کو مار رہے ہیں۔ طرح طرح کے مظالم ہیں کہ جن کی خبریں پورے طور سے ہم تک پہنچتی ہیں نہیں ہیں۔ اس سلسلہ میں گذشتہ موقع پر عرب ایشن کانگریز نے یونائیٹڈ نیشن میں اس معاملہ کو پھینک دیا تھا ایک ریپزولیشن پاس ہو۔ یونائیٹڈ نیشنس کا وہ ریپزولیشن بہت ہی نرم تھا۔ اور معمولی سا ریپزولیشن تھا۔ لیکن اس ریپزولیشن کا کوئی اثر نہ تھا۔ کہا نتیجہ ہوا۔ اس کے بارے میں فرنچ نے کہا کیا۔ ہم کو معلوم ہے کہ اس کا کیا جواب دیا وہاں اور زیادہ مظالم بڑھ گئے۔ انہوں نے اس ریپزولیشن کی یہ قدر کی۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یونائیٹڈ نیشنس کے لئے یہ ایک ذلت بھی ہے کہ اس کا ریپزولیشن کتنا ہی نرم ہو۔ اس میں صرف فرنچ کی ان معاملات کی طرف توجہ دلائی گئی تھی۔ لیکن بجائے توجہ دینے

کے اور زیادہ مظالم وہاں انہوں نے بڑھا دیئے اور کہا کہ اچھا تم ریپزولیشن پاس کرتے ہو۔ لیکن تم ہمارا کہا کر سکتے ہو۔ تم یہ ہمت کرتے ہو کہ ریپزولیشن پاس کرتے ہو۔

لیا میں بھی بھس بنانے کے لئے کتنی کوششیں ہو رہی ہیں۔ ہم کو معلوم ہے کہ ہندوستان کی کتنی کوششوں کے بعد وہ ملک آزاد ہوا ہے۔ ان کو پھر اپنے قبضہ میں لینے کی کوششیں کی گئی عراق میں ہی اور سب جگہ بھس بنے ہوئے ہیں ہر جگہ طرح طرح کی یہ چھڑیں ہیں جو حقیقت میں ہمارے لئے نہایت تکلیف دہ ہیں۔

ہمیں پالیسی صرف نکھینو پالیسی نہیں ہے۔ وہ ایک پازیشن پالیسی رہی ہے جیسا کہ کوریا کے مسئلہ نے ثابت کر دیا ہے۔ کوریا میں جو بات ساری دنیا سے ہم ملک نے کہی۔ آخر میں ثابت ہوا کہ وہ صحیح بات تھی وہ دونوں لڑنے والوں نے اس کو مان لیا۔ لیکن باوجود اس کے بھی بعض اپنی وجوہ پر یا اپنی مصلحت سے ہندوسن کو اس صلح کانگریس سے الگ رکھنے کی کوششیں کی۔ اس ہندوستان کو جو کہ صلح کرانے والا تھا۔ ہندوستان نے کوششیں کر کے عارضی صلح تو کرا دی۔ لیکن معلوم یہ ہوتا ہے کہ انہیں

[ڈاکٹر سید منصور]

دراصل خوف ہوا کہ اگر ہندوستان اس کانفرنس میں شامل کیا گیا تو کہیں واقعی صلح نہ ہو جائے۔ کم از کم ری صاحب کا تو یہ خیال ہے ہی کہ کہیں صلح نہ ہو جائے اور انہوں نے تو اعلان کیا ہے کہ وہ لپہلکے ضرور - بصر حال یہ تمام حالات بہت تکلیف دہ ہیں - لیکن اسی کے ساتھ ہم نے اور ہمارے ملک نے جو پالیسی رکھی تھی اس سے یہی نہیں کہ تمام افریقہ اور ایشیا کے ملکوں میں ایک خوشی کی لہر دوڑا دی کہ ہندوستان جیسا ملک جو بہت کچھ بڑھنے والا ہے وہ ان کی مدد پر ہے - ہندوستان چاہتا ہے کہ وہ کمزور ملکوں کو مدد دے - وہ چاہتا ہے کہ ایسے کمزور ملک جو آج امپیریالزم اور کولونلزم کے خلاف سترکل کر رہے ہیں ان کی مدد کرے - جیسا کہ اس نے لہبھا میں کیا - جیسا کہ اس نے انڈونیشیا میں کیا - یہی نہیں کہ اس نے خوشی کی لہر دوڑا دی تاکہ ہماری پالیسی کا لازمی نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ وہ ہم سے اسد باندھے ہوئے ہیں اور ہماری طرف ایلی مصہبت کے وقت دیکھ رہے ہیں اس کا یہ مطلب نہیں کہ وہ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہم فوج لے جا کر ان کی طرف سے لڑیں - لیکن وہ ہم سے یہ ضرور چاہتے ہیں کہ ان کی مدد کی جائے -

وہ چاہ رہے ہیں کہ ہندوستان ان کو ٹنڈ کرے -

مڈل ایسٹ میں ہندوستان کو جو درجہ ہے اور جو ہمارے پرائم منسٹر کی شہرت ہے وہ کسی سے چھپی ہوئی نہیں ہے - ابھی ہمارے پرائے سائٹی آجاریہ کریلانی نے کہا کہ ہم پروپیگنڈا بہت کرتے ہیں - لیکن میں آپ کو بتلا دوں کہ بغداد کے اخباروں نے لکھا کہ ہندوستان ایک ایسا ملک ہے جو پروپیگنڈا نہیں کرتا اور ہندوستان ایک ایسا ملک ہے جس کو پروپیگنڈا سے بالکل نفرت ہے اور وہ بنا کسی پروپیگنڈے کے دنیا کے سب انسانوں کی طرف اور بہتری چاہتا ہے اور کمزور ملکوں کی مدد کرنا چاہتا ہے - دوسرے ملکوں کو جاننا ہوں کہ پروپیگنڈا پر کس طرح سے رویہ صرف کرتے ہیں - مڈل ایسٹ میں کس طرح سے پروپیگنڈا ہو رہا ہے - لیکن میں آپ کو بتلا دوں کہ ہمارے بنا ایک پیسہ خرچ کئے ہوئے اور بنا کسی پروپیگنڈے کے ہندوستان اور اس کے وزیر اعظم کا کیا رتبہ اور درجہ ہے وہ کسی سے چھپا ہوا نہیں ہے - میں زیادہ وقت نہیں لوٹا لیکن یہ کہنا ہے کہ ہماری پالیسی کا لازمی نتیجہ یہ ہے کہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر جملہوں نے یہ پالیسی کامیابی کے ساتھ چلائی ہے انہوں نے آئیے اوپر یہ ذمہ داری لے لی ہے کہ

دوسرے ملکوں کے لوگ جو امید باندھ کر ہماری طرف دیکھ رہے ہیں۔ ان کی امید کو ہمیں پورا کرنا ہے۔ چونکہ انہوں نے ہم سے مدد کی امید باندھی ہے۔ اس لئے اس کا لازمی نتیجہ یہ ہوا ہے کہ وہ ہم سے چاہتے ہیں کہ ہم ان کو گائڈ کریں۔ میں نے ہر ممالک ایسٹ کے ملک میں پایہ کہ وہاں کے لوگ ہماری طرف امید بھری نگاہ سے دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ ہم ان کو گائڈ کریں اور ہم ان کی اخلاقی مدد کریں۔ اس لئے میں چاہتا کہ ایک ایسی تجویز کروں اور وہ یہ ہے کہ اگر ہمارے پرائم منسٹر اس کو مناسب سمجھیں تو چند مہینوں کے اندر یونائیٹڈ نیشن میں نتیجہ دیکھ کر کہ وہاں اس۔یشن میں کیا ہوتا ہے۔ وہ تمام افریقہ اور ایشیا کے ملکوں کی ایک کانفرنس بلائیں۔ یہ کوئی اکیلی میری ہی تجویز نہیں ہے۔ مجھے علم ہے کہ انڈونیشیا کے لیڈرس برما کے لیڈرس سب یہی چاہتے ہیں اور تعجب نہیں کہ اگر انہوں نے پرائم منسٹر کو اس کے لئے لکھا ہو اور اگر انہوں نے ابھی تک ایسا نہیں لکھا ہے تو مجھے معلوم ہے کہ وہ جلدی ہی ایسا لکھنے والے ہیں۔ ممالک ایسٹ کا ایک ایک ملک چاہتا ہے اور افریقہ کے تمام ملک چاہتے ہیں اور اس امر کا ریزولیشن بھی پاس کیا ہے کہ ایسی ایک کانفرنس بلائی

جائے۔ ظاہر ہے یہ کانفرنس بلانے کے معنی یہ نہیں ہیں کہ ہم کسی پر لوائی کریں یا وا ڈیکلیر کریں۔ اس سے یہ مطلب ہے کہ ہم ایشیا اور افریقہ کے انسانوں پر آج جو مصیبتیں پڑ رہی ہیں اور ان پر جو جانوروں کی طرح ظلم ہو رہے ہیں ان کو ہم سمجھیں۔ ان کا جائزہ لیں اور آپس میں مشورہ کریں کہ ہم کیسے ان کو دور کریں۔ اس کانفرنس کی ضرورت اس لئے اور بھی ہو جاتی ہے کہ جو یہ کہا گیا ہے کہ ہم ایشیا والوں کو ایشیا والوں سے لڑائیں گے۔ اس حالت میں اس کانفرنس کا بلانا اور بھی ضروری ہو جاتا ہے کہ سب لوگ آپس میں بیٹھ کر صلاح مشورہ کریں تاکہ آگے کوئی لوائی نہ ہونے پارے۔

پاکستان کے متعلق میں صرف اتنا کہونتا کہ وہاں کی گورنمنٹ کی جو بھی رائے ہو لیکن میں نے وہاں خود دیکھا کہ وہاں کے عوام ہندوستان کے ساتھ دوستانہ تعلقات رکھنے کے لئے بہتاد ہیں۔ یہ ابھی عارضی طور پر کشمیر میں جو کچھ ہوا اس سے وہاں پہلک میں ضرور شور و غل مچا تھا۔ لیکن اب وہ شور بالکل فائب ہو گیا اور اس سے پتا چلتا ہے کہ وہ شور انجینئریت تھا۔ لوگ وہاں کے دوستی کے خواہشمند ہیں اور یہ بچی خوشی کا مقام ہے کہ دونوں دیکھوں میں دوستی پیدا کرنے کے لئے وہاں کے پرائم منسٹر یہاں آئے تھے

[ڈاکٹر سید محمود]

اور ہمارے پرائم منسٹر وہاں گئے تھے اور دونوں دیشوں کے وزیر اعظموں میں آپسی سمجھوتے اور دوستی پیدا کرنے کے لئے بات چیت بھی ہوئی ہے اور ہم امید رکھتے ہیں کہ آئندہ بھی اس اور کوشش کی جائیگی - پاکستان کو ہمارے خلاف ایک حربہ کی طرح استعمال کرنے کی کوشش ہو رہی ہے ہم کو چاہئے کہ ہم اس حربہ کو صلح و محبت کے ذریعہ دشمنوں کے ہاتھ سے چھین لیں ایک چیز آخر میں اور میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں - جو فارین ایڈ ہوتی ہے یا ہمیں ملی ہے اس کے ذریعہ سے ہم نے جو ریور پراجیکٹس بنائے ہیں ان میں میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اگر چان لیز میٹھس استعمال کریں اور انسانوں کی مہین پارو کو اس میں لگائیں تو اس سے ہم بہت کچھ ان امپلائمنٹ دور کر سکتے ہیں - بس میں اب اور زیادہ وقت نہیں لہتا چاہتا -

[English translation of the above speech].

Dr. Syed Mahmud (Champan East): Sir, unfortunately I am not able to hear the speeches that are delivered in this House and that is why I do not always take part in a debate. Today also I could not hear the speech of the Prime Minister and yet I stand to speak. Therefore, I would crave your indulgence in case I use any in apt word or expression. I have not heard the Prime Minister's speech but, having heard a few words or sentences here and there, I guess what he has said. He referred to almost all the

countries of the world and what he said evinced not only his wide information but also his keen interest and deep realisation. Our foreign policy has not been merely one of neutralism or a negative policy. In the present circumstances, when deadly scientific weapons have created such a big danger that not only has unrest been caused in the world but even human civilization and culture are threatened, any country which saves or tries to save the world from this danger deserves not only praise but also thanks of the world.

It is true that the present situation in international politics is painful for the whole world. Whatever oppression has been or is being done in Malaya today is painful, and so is the situation in Kenya. It is regrettable that a country with sufficient experience of colonialism is doing all that is happening in these two countries. In view of its experience we hoped that this country would not make the same mistake that it has made earlier. As some friends have said, these believers in imperialism or colonialism forget their past experiences and repeat the old practice. I don't know, but I hope that as a member of the Commonwealth we will be drawing the attention of the U.K. to the situation in Malaya and Kenya. From yesterday's paper we learned that the British peasants there are having some realisation and they propose to leave that country after selling their property as they did earlier in this country. Thank God, they have realised what the situation in that country is; and if they have really had this realisation, it is a hopeful sign. We should hope that they will soon act in a manner so as to relieve the poor people of Kenya and other parts of Africa of oppression.

Whatever is happening in Malaya is also painful to us. Whatever has happened in Iran is apparently a domestic dispute but the whole world very well knows what is at work behind it. It is an open secret that twenty million dollars were sent for

distribution among the troops. This clearly shows what the matter is. Anyway, whatever is happening in other places, in Morocco or in Tunisia, is known the world over. What are the conditions there? People are treated like animals. This is very painful and shameful for all religions and for the whole world. The French there are turning out the people of the country and trampling them under their feet and the people are turning terrorists. The French themselves terrorise the people. They kill their leaders. So many atrocities are being committed about which we do not receive complete information. In this connection the Arab-Asian countries put this issue before the U.N. last time. A resolution was passed. It was a very mild and ordinary resolution. How did the French react to it? The oppression increased further—that is how they respected this resolution. I consider it a disgrace for the U.N. that its resolution, mild as it was and only drew the attention of the French to these matters, should have been thus flouted. Instead of paying attention to this matter the French there increased further the oppression they were waging and in this way challenged the very United Nations.

Similar attempts have been made to make Libya a base. We know after what great efforts by India this country got freedom. Yet another attempt was made to gain control over it again. In Iraq and all other places bases have been formed. All these things that are happening everywhere are really very painful to us. Our policy is not a negative policy. It has always been positive as has been proved in connection with the Korean issue. What our country told the world regarding Korea proved correct in the end and both the belligerent parties accepted it. In spite of this, efforts have been made to keep out of the Peace Conference the same India that acted as the peace-maker. India made all efforts and provisional peace was achieved, but it appears that these people are afraid lest there

should be real and lasting peace in case India is allowed to take part in the Conference. At least Dr. Rhee's intention is that there should be no peace and he has even declared that he will certainly continue war. All these events are painful. But, all the same, the policy adopted by our country has sent a wave of hope and cheer among all the Asian and African countries and they feel that a country like India, which is bound to progress by leaps and bounds, is with them and that India wants to help such weak countries as are today struggling against imperialism and colonialism as she did in the case of Libya or Indonesia. Not only has our foreign policy sent this wave of hope and cheer among these countries but the inevitable result of our policy has been that they have great hopes in us and they look up to us in time of difficulty. This does not mean that they want our forces to go and fight on their side, but they certainly want help and guidance from India.

India's prestige in the Middle East and our Prime Minister's fame and popularity there are not hidden from anybody. Sometime back our former comrade, Acharya Kripalani, said that we make too much propaganda but I would like to tell you that the newspapers of Baghdad wrote that India is a country which makes no propaganda, a country which hates propaganda and without making any propaganda it wants the welfare and progress of all peoples and wants to help the weak countries. I know how much money is spent on propaganda by other countries, how propaganda is being conducted in the Middle East. But I would like to tell you that without spending a penny and without any propaganda India and her Prime Minister hold a place of prestige which is not unknown to anybody. I don't want to take long, but I must say that the necessary consequence of our foreign policy is that our Prime Minister, who has worked this policy with success, has taken upon himself the responsibility to fulfil the hopes of other peoples who look up to us.

[Dr. Syed Mahmud]

As they rely on us for help, it is necessary for us to guide them. I have found people in the Middle East looking up to us for moral help and guidance, and I, therefore, feel that I should suggest that after watching for a few months the activities in the United Nations during this Session, the Prime Minister should, if he thinks it proper, call a conference of all Asian and African Nations. This is not my individual suggestion. I know that the leaders of Indonesia and Burma also want it and it is not surprising if they have already written to the Prime Minister in this connection. If they have not written so far, I know that they will be writing to this effect in the near future. All the countries of the Middle East and Africa want such a conference to be called and they have also passed a resolution that it be called. Needless to say that the aim of the conference is not that we will declare war on anybody or turn aggressive. The aim is that we may understand the present difficulties and hardships of the people of Asia and Africa and the British oppression that is being perpetuated on them, and review the situation and consult among ourselves as to how we can eradicate these hardships. The need for calling such a conference is all the more imperative in view of this open declaration that Asians should be made to fight Asians. It is, therefore, necessary that all the countries should sit together and consult together with a view to ensure that no war breaks out.

About Pakistan I will say only this: whatever be the opinion of the Government there, I have myself seen there that the people are impatient to have friendly relations with India. There certainly was some hue and cry in the public after the recent temporary happenings in Kashmir. But now that hue and cry has disappeared and it is clear that it was all engineered. The people there are desirous of friendship and it is a happy sign that the two Prime Ministers exchanged visits and had talks

with each other with a view to establish friendship and understanding between the two countries. We hope that such efforts will be continued in future also. Attempts are being made to use Pakistan as a tool against us and we should free this tool from the hands of the enemies by love and friendship.

Lastly, I want to submit one point more. We could remove a great deal of unemployment if we follow Chinese methods and employ our manpower in the construction of the river projects for which we have got foreign aid. I don't want to take any more time.

सेठ गोविन्द बास (मंडला-जबलपुर—दक्षिण): सभापति जी, अपनी वैदेशिक नीति का मैं आरम्भ से ही समर्थक रहा हूँ और अभी जब मैं दुनिया के बहुत से देशों में गया तो वहाँ से लौटने के बाद मैं अपनी वैदेशिक नीति का और भी प्रबल समर्थक हो गया हूँ।

अभी जो दो भाषण यहाँ पर हुये, हमारे कांग्रेस दल के अतिरिक्त, श्री कृपलानी जी के और श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी के, उन भाषणों में भी एक बात तो स्पष्ट ही मालूम हुई कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के जो मूल तत्व हैं उनसे उनका भी विरोध नहीं है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति संसार में व्यापक शान्ति चाहती है, वह प्रेम की नींव पर अवलम्बित है और कृपलानी जी ने तथा हीरेन मुखर्जी ने उस सम्बन्ध में अपने भाषण में यही कहा कि जड़ों तक हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के मूल तत्वों का सम्बन्ध है, वे भी उनसे सहमत हैं। कृपलानी जी ने एक बात यह कही कि हमें अपनी घर की समस्याओं को हल करने में अधिक ध्यान देना चाहिये। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अपनी समस्याओं को हल करने ~ हमारा अधिक ध्यान है ही, लेकिन आज

दुनिया कितनी छोटी हो गयी है। इन शीघ्र-गामी वायुयानों के द्वारा जिस दुनिया को थोड़े से घंटों में नापा जा सकता है, उसमें यदि हम दुनिया का ख्याल न कर केवल अपनी समस्याओं को हल करने में लगे रहें, तो मैं कृपलानी जी से, जिनके लिये मेरे हृदय में बहुत बड़ी इज्जत है, यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम अपनी समस्याओं को भी हल करने में समर्थ नहीं होंगे। एक तरफ तो हमको अपनी समस्याओं को हल करना है और दूसरी तरफ दुनिया में क्या हो रहा है और अपनी समस्याओं को हल करने में हमको दुनिया से क्या मदद मिल सकती है और हम दुनिया को क्या मदद दे सकते हैं, इस पर भी हमारा ध्यान होना चाहिये।

कृपलानी जी ने एक बात और कही कि कोरिया के मामले में हम ने दोनों पक्षों को अप्रसन्न किया है, वह यहाँ पर इस समय मौजूद नहीं हैं, नहीं तो मैं उन से पूछना चाहता था कि क्या वह कोई ऐसा उपाय बता सकते हैं कि जो हम करते या जिसे अभी भी करें जिससे दोनों पक्ष हम से खुश रहें।

अगर हमारे सारे कामों का अवलम्ब सत्य है और यदि हम सत्य का अनुसरण करेंगे तो कभी कोई पक्ष हम से अप्रसन्न होगा और कभी कोई अप्रसन्न होगा। सब को प्रसन्न करने के प्रयत्न से वही बँल के क्रिस्से की हालत होगी जो क्रिस्सा मशहूर है कि एक बँल के साथ एक बाप और बेटे जा रहे थे और उन्होंने यह प्रयत्न किया कि सब प्रसन्न हों।

कुछ माननीय सचिव्य : आप भूल गये, मोहरा था।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जी नहीं, अगर आप चाहेंगे तो मैं कथा बता दूंगा, वह बँल

था। तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि कोई प्रसन्न नहीं होगा और हमारी हानि हो जायेगी।

श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने जो कुछ कहा उस से मुझे ऐसा लगा कि वही पुराना नारा उन का अब भी मौजूद है कि रूस और चीन बहुत अच्छे हैं और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन और अमरीका बड़े खराब हैं, हमें अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन को छोड़ कर दूसरे गुट को अपनाना चाहिये। मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि हम न रूस चीन को बुरा कहते हैं और न अमरीका और ब्रिटेन को बुरा कहते हैं।

Shri H. N. Mukarjee: On a point of order, Sir. I did not refer either to Russia or to China or to the good things done there. I do not speak in Hindustani. He does not follow me

सेठ गोविन्द दास : उनके कथन का अर्थ यहाँ था, चाहे उन्होंने रूस और चीन का नाम न लिया हो। रूस और चीन का नाम न लेने से अगर मतलब निकल आये तो क्यों किसी का नाम लिया जाय।

श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी : साम्राज्यवा खराब चीज नहीं है तो कौन चीज खराब है।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : रूस और चीन अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन जितने भी राष्ट्र हैं सब हमारे मित्र हैं, हम सब को प्रेम की दृष्टि से देखते हैं। अगर कोई गलती अमरीका करे, ग्रेट ब्रिटेन करे तो हम उस की मुखालिफत करेंगे, अगर कोई गलती रूस और चीन करेंगे तो हम उस की भी मुखालिफत करेंगे। कोरिया में हम ने जो कुछ किया उस से यह बात सिद्ध होती है कि हम ठीक गस्ते पर चल रहे हैं। हम ने शुरू में कहा था कि ३८वीं अक्षांश कोरिया के युद्ध में पार न की जाय। मैं श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी को याद दिलाता हूँ कि उस वक्त अमरीका

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

हमारे ऊपर बहुत बिगड़ा था। अगर उस समय हमारा कहना मान लिया जाता तो कोरिया का युद्ध जो आज समाप्त हुआ वह इस के पहले कभी का समाप्त हो गया होता। हम ने कोरिया के युद्ध को बन्द करने के लिये कुछ महीने पहले सुरक्षा परिषद् में एक प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया था। उस समय रूस और चीन हम से बहुत बिगड़े। कहा कि हम तो अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन की एक तरह से हिमायत करते हैं। लेकिन आखिर में आपने देखा कि उम्मी प्रस्ताव के अनुसार कोरिया का युद्ध समाप्त हुआ। जैसा मैं ने कहा अगर हम सत्य का अबलम्बन करते हैं तो कभी हम से कोई अप्रसन्न होगा, कभी कोई अप्रसन्न होगा। लेकिन हमें इस की परवाह नहीं करनी चाहिये। जिस रास्ते को हम ठीक रास्ता समझते हैं उस पर हम को चलना चाहिये। श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने अपने भाषण में एक बहुत फूहड़ शब्द का उपयोग कर डाला। उन्होंने कहा कि हम तो ब्रोकर्स हैं। मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय सुरक्षा परिषद् में श्रीमती विजया लक्ष्मी पंडित को उस का सभापतित्व मिलता है, जिस समय एक ओर अमरीका और उसके साथी और दूसरी ओर रूस और उस के साथी दोनों विजया लक्ष्मी जी का समर्थन करते हैं, उस समय हमारी लोकसभा में हमारे लिये ही इस प्रकार के शब्दों का प्रयोग करना कोई बड़ी अच्छी बात नहीं है।

मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ। कुछ लोगों की यह प्रवृत्ति हो गई है कि विदेशों की प्रशंसा करना। कोई अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन की प्रशंसा करता है, कोई रूस और चीन की प्रशंसा करता है। दूसरों की हम प्रशंसा करते हैं और अपने को हम न

मालूम क्या समझते हैं। जब आज दुनिया हम को अच्छा समझती है, उस समय हम अपने को बुरा समझते हैं। मेरी समझ में यह बात अभी नहीं आती।

जो संशोधन इस प्रस्ताव पर आये हैं उन सब को देखने पर हमें यह मालूम होता है कि यथार्थ में जो संशोधन हैं वे इस कारण नहीं हैं कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति बुरी नीति है। मुझे तो उन सबों में राजनैतिक गंध आती है। राजनैतिक दलदल के कारण इस प्रकार के सुधार आते हैं। कम से कम कुछ चीजों को तो हमें राजनैतिक दलदल से परे रखना चाहिये। अभी कुछ दिन पहले विनोबा जी ने कहा था कि कुछ चीजें ऐसी हैं जहाँ हम सब राजनैतिक दल मिल कर काम कर सकते हैं। प्रजा समाजवादी दल के नेता श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण ने भी इस बात को दोहराया था और उन्होंने कहा था कि भारत की जैसी स्थिति है उस स्थिति में कुछ चीजें ऐसी चुननी चाहिये कि जिन चीजों को हम सब मिल कर करें। भूदान यज्ञ का काम यदि हम सब मिल कर कर सकते हैं, तो जहाँ तक हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का सम्बन्ध है उस में भी हम मिल कर, एक राय हो कर काम करें। इसका नतीजा यह निकलेगा कि विदेशों में हमारा प्रभाव बढ़ेगा।

पंडित एस० सी० मिश्र: शुरुआत कीजिये न मिल कर काम करने की ?

सेठ गोविन्द दास: दुनिया की आज जो हालत है वह हम से छिपी नहीं है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में जो सुधार आये हैं उन को ढ़िद आप देखें तो जिन बातों की ओर हमारा ध्यान मुख्यतः आकृष्ट किया गया है वे दो तीन ही हैं। एक दो

यह है कि कोरिया की राजनैतिक कान्फ-रेन्स के हम सदस्य न हो सके। मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि, जैसा हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी कहा, इस के लिये हम कोई बहुत चिन्तित नहीं थे और यह एक बहुत छोटी सी बात है। हम उस झगड़े से अलग हो गये इससे जल्दे हमारी महत्ता बढ़ती है। हमारी निस्पृहता दिखाई देती है जो दूसरे देशों ने माना भी है।

दूसरी बात दक्षिण अफ्रीका, सीलोन और मलाया के सम्बन्ध में कही गई। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि हम इन प्रश्नों को हल नहीं कर सके, पर दक्षिण अफ्रीका का जो प्रश्न है, जिस पर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी बहुत कुछ कहा, आज नहीं तो कल, कल नहीं तो परसों हल होने वाला है। यह हो नहीं सकता कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका के पंचमांश श्वेतांग अपने से चौगुनी आबादी को हमेशा दबा कर और कुचल कर रख सकें। आज हम देखते हैं कि यह प्रश्न बहुत उग्र प्रश्न हो गया है। मैं इस को मानता हूँ कि बड़ा उग्र प्रश्न है और उस का आज निपटारा नहीं हो रहा है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी आदमी के जीवन में दो, चार, पांच वर्ष बहुत हो सकते हैं, लेकिन किसी राष्ट्र के जीवन में दो, चार या दस वर्ष कोई बहुत लम्बा समय नहीं है। मैं अफ्रीका हो आया हूँ। जिस समय वहाँ मैं सन् १९३७-३८ में गया था, उस समय वहाँ भारतीय अपने हक़ों के लिये लड़ रहे थे। उस समय वहाँ पर एक संयुक्त मोर्चा तैयार किया जा रहा था और आज वह संयुक्त मोर्चा तैयार हो गया है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ कि चाहे दक्षिण अफ्रीका हो, चाहे पूर्वी अफ्रीका हो, चाहे मलाया हो, चाहे सीलोन हो, जहाँ कहीं भी हमारे वहाँ के निवासी हों उन्हें अपने एसे हक़ों के लिये नहीं लड़ना

है जिन से उस देश के रहने वालों के हितों को हानि पहुँचती हो। जितने भी वहाँ के निवासी हैं और जिन के हक़ों को सदियों से कुचल कर रखा गया है उन सब को मिल कर अपने हक़ों के लिये लड़ना है। मेरा यह विश्वास है कि यदि ऐसा किया गया तो दक्षिण अफ्रीका का प्रश्न, जो आज इतना उग्र प्रश्न बन गया है, आज नहीं तो कल, और कल नहीं तो परसों हल हो कर रहेगा, क्योंकि जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया एक पंचमांश श्वेतांग अपने से चौगुनी आबादी को, चाहे वे रंगीन हों, चाहे हब्सी हों, चाहे भारतीय हों, कोई भी क्यों न हों, कुचल कर नहीं रख सकेंगे।

हमारी वैदेशिक नीति हमारे लिये और संसार के लिये, दोनों के लिये, कल्याणकारी है वह हमारी संस्कृति, हमारी परम्परा के अनुसार है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति पहले कभी चीन की समझ में नहीं आती थी, रूस की समझ में नहीं आती थी, कभी अमरीका की समझ में नहीं आती थी, लेकिन अब मैं ने देखा कि वह दुनिया में सब की समझ में आने लगी है। हम यदि एक दूसरे की समस्याओं को सहानुभूति पूर्वक समझेंगे और उन को निपटाने का प्रयत्न करेंगे तो ही संसार में शांति रह सकती है। इसके लिये हमारी वैदेशिक नीति ही ठीक नीति है।

अन्त में मैं श्रीमती विजया लक्ष्मी पंडित को उनके चुनाव पर बधाई देना चाहता हूँ और उनसे एक बात निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। मैं ने अमरीका में देखा कि वहाँ पर सुरक्षा परिषद् में और यू० एन० ओ० की परिषद् में स्पेनिश बोली जाती है, रूसी बोली जाती है, अंग्रेजी बोली जाती है, फ्रांसीसी बोली जाती है। हिन्दी हमारे ४० करोड़ मानवों की ज़बान है। आज हमारा यह सौभाग्य है कि श्रीमती विजया लक्ष्मी पंडित उस परिषद् की अध्यक्षता निर्वाचित हुई हैं। मैं उनसे

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

इस लोक सभा के द्वारा यह अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि उनको यह प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि जिस प्रकार ये चार भाषायें वहाँ पर बोली जाती हैं उसी प्रकार हिन्दी को भी वहाँ उसका उचित स्थान दिया जाय।

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister has made an extremely lucid and comprehensive statement on the international situation and the policy of India in relation to some of the subjects involved in it. As I watched the progress of the debate, I became more and more convinced that the plea I had put forward last year when I opened the first Foreign Affairs debate in this House, that there should be some sort of an attempt at a bi-partisan foreign policy in this country, is gaining momentum. In fact, Sir, unless I have misunderstood with my limited knowledge of Hindi my hon. friend Seth Govind Das, he also has made an appeal today in favour of reducing the area of disagreement between the various political parties in this country with regard to the pursuit of a foreign policy, to suit the needs of this great land.

Sir, when the main opposition speech was made by Acharya Kripalani, I was happy to note that basically he and his party are in agreement with the policy of the Prime Minister and the Government of India in respect of foreign affairs. Whether it is the dry witticism of Acharya Kripalani or the torrid eloquence of my friend, Prof. Mukerjee, both of them arrived at the same decision, namely, basically we are for peace, basically we do not want to involve ourselves, basically we would like to give our hand wherever it is necessary and needed and accepted, towards the solution of the tensions in various parts of the world. I think, Sir, we have this very important advantage about the Prime Minister, namely he is unexceptionable in enunciation of the first principles on which I had

occasion to comment in this House on the last occasion. None of us in this country have any quarrel with him on that. Where we try to make suggestions or even to criticise the foreign policy of this Government, particularly the policies as enunciated by the Prime Minister, it is only with a view to emphasise certain aspects of our national needs which seem to have been forgotten in respect of the pursuit of foreign policy towards a country, A, B or C. My hon. friend—here again I am at a great disadvantage—in his fervent Urdu made a reference to the prestige gained by this country in the Near Eastern countries, and also of the Prime Minister. These are all happening nowadays, but in the grim reality of world affairs I find sometimes this country's interests are either dropped in the middle or even jettisoned. I am sure the Prime Minister will bear with me if I try to offer one or two observations on this Korean question. Let there be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, that the part played by India in respect of the Korean question is indeed glorious. It was an Indian who presided over the first Korean Commission, Mr. K. P. S. Menon. Our resolution was the basis on which the present arrangements are made. Our custodian forces are doing their worthy part. As the Prime Minister said yesterday or the day before yesterday, I think on the supplementary grants, we have even undertaken financial burdens even though we are least equipped to shoulder them.

But, where I felt hurt was in regard to the decision taken suddenly to withdraw from the field when in the Political Committee of the United Nations we did not get a two-thirds majority, concerning which the Prime Minister made a reference this morning. Sir, I know a number of occasions previously in the United Nations when India stood four-square to all opposition and took defeats with great grace. I refer to the defeats willingly sustained and voluntarily

received when we stood for election to the Security Council. I should have expected that in the case of Korea we would press forward and go to the General Assembly. If we did not get the two-thirds majority we could have shown who the saboteurs are and what increasing opposition is there. I am not going to vent my spleen against any single nation. Mr. Chairman, I am not against any particular country, not in the least against the United States. But, I feel very strongly against the statement of such a high personality like Mr. John Foster Dulles, that this is the price India has to pay for her neutrality on this Korean question. I am quoting his words. They make me feel extremely unhappy, at the manner in which we are unable to stand up to the black-mail which is going on against our increasing world position. Of course, I will be told immediately that Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit has been elected President. That election brings happiness to India. But, let it not become a sop so that the major issues involved are forgotten. There is a new diplomacy, a new imperialism which is now strutting across the world, and the countries both on this side and on that side of the iron curtain are involved in this.

I am afraid I have not much time at the fag end of the debate and I will make my observations brief. I would like briefly to limit my remarks to Kashmir. Opening the Kashmir debate last year, on the 7th of August, I said: "anything done to jeopardise the foreign policy of India, anything done to disrupt the defence system of this country should be deprecated, and I take this opportunity of deprecating it. I may make an appeal, especially to friends on this side of the House, that nothing should be done to imperil the security of our country or our defence." I am speaking this morning in the same mood, namely, that Kashmir is a vital issue for us. I always felt that Kashmir should have been discussed on a domestic level, but, unfortunately on account of certain circumstances, on account of

forces beyond our control, it has become an international question in certain respects. I was unhappy to note, Sir, that our Prime Minister casually disposed of some of our amendments, about the activities of the U.N.O. observers. Sir, here I have got a number of names, and irrefutable data, about the presence of these people in Kashmir. Particularly because this data is to be published by the Government of Bakshi Gulam Mohammad, I do not propose to give the names. What I want to do is to ask some simple questions of the Prime Minister, and I hope he will have the good nature to answer them in public interest. What are the duties of the U.N. Observers? Why should they have their headquarters in Srinagar? Why should they have their private transmitter? Why are they not confined, shall we say, to barracks round about the cease-fire line? These are very elementary questions. They have not come here to map out our strategic and other installations in Kashmir. They have come here under certain international obligations undertaken by India, to supervise the cease-fire line. Why are they being allowed to roam about the whole of Kashmir and map all installation to our detriment? I must ask these questions. I understand that Shankar Villa in Srinagar is their headquarters. Sir, there are 50 U.N. Military observers according to my information; there are 20 and odd secretaries including a number of Mata Haris—I am using that word with a sense of deliberation—and why should they be permitted to become something like an army of occupation? Sir, you recall the incident in which Major General Delvoie transported the effects of Sardar Effendi from Srinagar to Rawalpindi, and we declared him *persona non grata*. But what have we done to ensure that all these things do not reoccur. On the 9th August, when the first disturbances broke out in Srinagar, there was one Major Holts—I do not know the correct spelling, I have got the name written down—who was deliberately interfering with the police and magistracy.

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

in the discharge of their duties. What action has the Government of Jammu and Kashmir taken, what action has Government of India taken to prevent the recurrence of incidents of this character?

You would recall, Mr. Chairman, that some time ago another U.N. officer by name Major Ludd was flown by Indian Air Force plane to Ladakh, and this gentleman is now working in the Pentagon. Ladakh is not on the cease-fire line. What was the necessity for him to go there? Why did the I.A.F. plane give him a lift? What action was taken against him?

I have a number of such instances but for the sake of my country, for the sake of security, I would not give them here. The point I make is that these U.N. observers have completely forgotten the duties for which they have been sent out here. I would put another question to the Prime Minister. How far is the cease-fire line from Gulmarg—not *via* Baramula but *via* Buniyar? I consider it is about five or six miles across by bridle path. Have any steps been taken to prevent incursions across the cease-fire line? I may say here that on that fateful night of August 8, when Sheikh Abdullah went to Gulmarg, there were foreign agents waiting to receive him. Along with the apprehending of Sheikh Abdulla, I am given to understand some of these people are apprehended. What action is being taken against them? I am raising this question to strengthen the hands of the Government of India, to strengthen the hands of the Jammu and Kashmir Government, and not to embarrass the Prime Minister, and I hope something will be done to see that these activities are curbed.

You would recall that Kashmir, as the Prime Minister described in such beautiful language, is a beauty spot and an attraction for tourists. I have written down certain figures to show that normally there are something like 30,000 tourists who go to Kashmir,

of which about for 4,000 to 5,000 are foreigners. The income of Kashmiris from tourism is about 60-70 lakhs a year. It is a very vital point for their existence. I have suggested to the Prime Minister in another place that we should seal off Kashmir against these foreign interests, who in any case must be screened. My complaint is—I am talking with a sense of urgency—that the security measures are not adequate as yet.

There is a barrage of criticism and propaganda against this country for the part played by the Indian army or the Government of India on that fateful night of August 9 when the domestic changeover took place. I would ask the Prime Minister to tell this House whether Article 352 of the Constitution was at all invoked by the Jammu and Kashmir Government? You would recall, Sir, that the Prime Minister made a statement on the 24th July introducing in this House the Agreement with the Sheikh Abdullah Government. He said that in favour of the Kashmir Government a certain variation of Article 352 was agreed to. This is the variation: "But in regard to internal disturbances, at the request or with the concurrence of the Government of the State". I am bringing this to your notice in order to request the Prime Minister that the malicious propaganda going on abroad may be counteracted. The point at issue is has any request been made to the Government of India for assistance? Our troops in Kashmir have been strictly neutral when the changeover was taking place. It is their domestic affair and the Prime Minister should tell the world that this Article was not invoked, that India was not at all involved.

One of the basic issues of Kashmir has been forgotten even after seven years. We referred this matter to the Security Council somewhere in October 1947 saying that Jammu and Kashmir has been invaded. We asked for the intervention of the United Nations to arrange for the withdrawal

not only of the raiders but also of the Pakistan troops. That basic question has been forgotten today. A great portion of Kashmir territory is now in occupied hands, the so-called 'Azad' Kashmir. To the extent to which Jammu and Kashmir state which is now with India and 'Azad' Kashmir do not come together, I am convinced that there will not be a plebiscite. I believe, Sir, that when the Prime Minister replies to the debate he will try to clarify this point and until this clarification is forthcoming, until the people of Kashmir are united—whether they be in Ladakh or Jammu or Gilgit, until the unity of the people of Kashmir is made possible, I do not conceive of any possibility for a plebiscite taking place.

Finally I must pay my tribute to the Sadar-i-Riyasat of Kashmir for tackling the crisis, and I do hope that this House and the country in general would support the present Government and the Government of Jammu and Kashmir. Tremendous reforms have been announced within a space of few days *viz.* abolition of procurement, reduction of prices of grain, reduction in transport charges so that prices will be lower in Kashmir when the goods come from India; universal education etc. In the major revolution going on in Kashmir, India is with Kashmir. Destiny has been kind to the Prime Minister. His Kashmir policy was ending up in smoke, but for the events of August 9. I am sure the country will be with the Government provided it stands four square against all saboteurs, internal and external.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Chairman, Sir, my amendments seek to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the motion moved by the Prime Minister does not underline India's special interest in a settlement being arrived at at the forthcoming Political Conference in respect of Korea and that the motion contains no specific condemnation of the policies being pursued by the British Colonial office

in Africa and by the Malan Government in South Africa. May I say at the outset that I entirely endorse the view expressed by Acharya Kripalani, fundamentally I agree with the foreign policy of the Prime Minister. As the Prime Minister has rightly remarked: "Foreign policy is a complex affair and one cannot dogmatise about it or lay down definite formulae and prescriptions". It is only in respect of certain facets which deal with the dynamic neutrality—certain facets must necessarily assume varying importance according to change in conditions in the international spheres and it is there that I feel certain differences in emphasis arise.

I am aware that this Political Conference poses a difficult and delicate problem and I agree that we do not wish to make that difficult and delicate problem a more difficult one. An argument has also been adduced that this Political Conference in respect of Korea is a matter which is the concern of belligerents and India has no real concern. This argument, I respectfully submit, is only partially true. I think we have got to look into this problem from this point of view that what has happened in Korea is something unique in international history. I believe it is the first time in international history that such an action has been taken by a large number of nations—22 I think—and they have acted under an international banner.

The League of Nations failed because it resolved itself increasingly into a debating chamber. The League of Nations failed although it tried to face crisis after crisis—Manchuria, Euthopea and others—because it was unable to organise joint sanctions. The United Nations for the first time in international history has been able to forge and to introduce sanctions against the declared aggressor. India has quite rightly declared her faith in international co-operation and I join issue with Acharya Kripalani and Hiren Mookerjee when they say that

[Shri Frank Anthony]

✓ we should take lesser interest in international affairs.

After having declared our faith in international co-operation may I ask the Prime Minister how is it that the U.N.O. with all the short-comings represents the maximum opportunity for international co-operation? I think the Prime Minister tends to be a little unduly modest not only with history, not only with geography, but I think on an elaborate pattern his successful policy has placed India in an important position. We may not influence the policy but I do think that India can play an important part today in influencing international decision.

✓ May I say one word about India's exclusion from the forthcoming political conference. I think India's attitude ✓ was entirely right. It was right that we did not wish to thrust ourselves into the political conference and that attitude was an attitude not only of self-respect but an attitude of dignity. But I am bound to say this also, Sir, and I say that with all respect. I think the decision of the American policy-makers was an unwise, unstatesmanlike decision. In excluding India they have lost one of their greatest assets. I do not know whether this conference is going to materialise—I hope it will—but if it materialises, what is going to happen? People who were recently belligerent people who have suffered a great deal of blood-letting on both sides,—they are going to stare across the conference table with blood-shot eyes. And had America had the vision, the statesmanship, to include India, my own feeling is that India's participation would have meant poring over these deliberations in the political conference in an objective manner—pouring over these deliberations a kind of cool, clear spring-water out of a jug. By excluding India, America has gratuitously divested herself of the undoubted influence which India would have been able to bring to bear on the political conference. ✓ India today can, and does speak for

South-East Asia. More than that, India today can be and is as well the spokesman—the major spokesman—of democracy in Asia. I regret, Sir, that the American foreign policy seems to be characterised by a succession of tactless, unstatesmanlike statements. My friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram referred to one of them. Mr. Dulles may have thought that he was making an exceedingly good debating point when he referred to India's exclusion as being the price for her neutralism. But I say this with all respect—that American policy is today, in some respects, immature. As a child shows a sense of adolescence, American policy shows in many respects an unawareness of Asian Psychology. Mr. Dulles does not seem to be aware that the memory of colonialism in India is still fresh. In some quarters it is still bitter and when he talks about the price that anybody had to pay for her neutralism, he does not realise that he creates in us a psychological feeling. People in this country have great ideals—we must always implement them—but we are people with idealism. When he talks of price, people in this country immediately react and say that American foreign policy has nothing to do with moral values, that American foreign policy is conceived in terms of prices, and is conceived in terms of dollars. That is where a wrong statement has been made by Mr. Dulles. I think an even more tactless and an even greater blunder was committed when he said the other day—it was a statement which was credited to him—that if after ten days, America was convinced that the political conference was a sham and unproductive they would walk out with Dr. Syngman Rhee. I do not wish to misjudge Dr. Syngman Rhee. It is easy to misjudge people from at a distance. This country has suffered perhaps in a degree which has no parallel in history, but Dr. Syngman Rhee, rightly or wrongly, has assumed a character of an intransigent in international affairs. People think that he is unduly belligerent, that perhaps he has a secret

interest in a resumption of hostilities, and fight the United Nations in order to secure the unification of Korea of which he will be the first President. That was an essentially a tactless statement. The United States may or may not withdraw from the political conference if it proves to be a sham, but what decisive role that India can play here is to point out to America, even though she is not in the political conference, that America will be committing a fatal blunder and will by her foreign policy cause irreparable disruption not only to the United Nations but to the whole cause of democracy if she gives the impression that she is going to offer undue compensations to Dr. Syngman Rhee. India can as well emphasise this America that if America gives this impression to the international world at large, that if she is prepared to make this undue concession to the intransigent Dr. Syngman Rhee, then she will stand in danger of not only isolating herself from India but from all western democracies. That is a role which, I say, India can and should still play, and impress on America the real danger of America losing the support or isolating herself not only from India but from the western democracies so far as the dubious compensation of having Dr. Syngman Rhee as her sole ally, is concerned.

1 P. M.

There is another aspect in respect of which I say that India can still play a decisive part in foreign affairs. We cannot be so ingenuous as to imagine that there will be no kind of cold war brought into this political conference. My own feeling is that all the paraphernalia of the cold war will be brought to bear on the political conference, that this political conference is going to lead to a hard bargaining indeed. Now, India can, as I said give this salutary warning to America, that if America gives the impression that she is out unduly to appease Dr. Syngman Rhee, she will isolate herself from the democracies. At the same time, I say, that we should not be—we cannot be—overborne by what emanates from the

communist grip. We have to remember this: that India joined in naming North Korea as an aggressor, and in this respect, at this political conference the communists are going to enjoy a tremendous advantage; all those countries are going to speak with one voice; all those countries will tow a dictated line; they will all speak in regimented unison. There is a real danger that the democracies may be divided; they will have differences of opinion—it is inevitable—but here again India can, as I said, exert a salutary influence on any undue intransigence of America and at the same time make the world realise that all that emanates from the communist camp is not accepted at its face value.

Whenever we review our foreign policy in this House, we should restate at least the principle, certain basic facts. My friend Acharya Kripalani joyified issue with the Prime Minister. He felt that we live in an international vacuum. To my mind this is an amazing statement of policy. How can any country, least of all a country which, by the circumstances of geography and history, has come to occupy a better position, live in a vacuum? Some of my friends in this House suggested that we should not live, impliedly, in a vacuum. We thunder against communism; against sabotage and foreign agents; I think they thunder against democracies. I can quite understand my friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee suggesting that we live in an international vacuum, because as has been rightly said, communism abhors a vacuum, and if India can ever begin to live in an international vacuum, communism would feel that effect. I say this: some of my friends may not agree with me. First, the paramount way of a constructive foreign policy is to secure the interests of India and let us ask ourselves this question: what, and who could ever constitute a real threat to Indian security or to the democratic way of life to which India is committed? I say the answer is categorical: the only threat that can happen to Indian security and to the democratic way of life would be a threat

[Shri Frank Anthony]

which can emanate from the communist world. And that is why I say this....

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It is never so.

Shri Frank Anthony: Both underground and overground it will be so. That is why I say, Sir, that while it is impossible to dogmatise, yet, India, although regrettably she has been excluded from the political conference owing to lack of vision on the part of America, can by emphasizing two sorts of opposite aspects—two facets in the same medal—one: bringing home to America the real dangers to the world from the policy enunciated by Dulles and secondly, the promises made by Robertson who went to see Dr. Syngman Rhee in order to mollify his obstinacy and truculently gave him some undertaking—India can warn America of the supreme need for sobriety and statesmanship and at the same time save the rest of the world from the regimented professions which are bound to issue from the communist camp.

✓ I would like to say a few words about happenings in Africa to which my amendment refers. My hon. friend Prof. Hiren Mukerjee read out a statement made by a member of the British Government that our statements with regard to Africa are resented by the British Government as a gratuitous intervention in their domestic affairs. Personally I believe that what is happening in Africa is something which constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. It has ceased to be a domestic affair. What is happening throughout Africa, in South Africa or Kenya, or Central African Federation, constitutes a denial of elementary human rights. I say this, Sir, although our Prime Minister suffers from an undue modesty, that there has been a certain polarization of circumstances, historical perhaps, some of them accidental, but India today because of this polarisation of circumstances, has been ✓ placed in a position of trust. Today

India—whether she likes it or not—is looked upon by the coloured and the exploited peoples of the world, as their champion, their spokesman. It has become history. She has become a trustee. It is a duty which has been placed on her by certain circumstances and it is a duty from which, even if she wanted to, she cannot escape.

✓ The Prime Minister has said that the South African problem is a chronic problem, but it is lying low. ✓ I say, with a due realisation of the fact that we do not wish to offend people unduly, that we should lose no opportunity of exposing and condemning the kind of racialism that is being practised in Africa today. We know what is happening in Africa. It is an ironical situation, it is a tragically ironic situation. You have an alleged democracy, an allegedly Christian Government bringing both democracy and Christianity into disrepute. The irony is emphasised when you remember that Dr. Malan is not a Doctor of Medicine, but a Doctor of Divinity and Dr. Malan does not seem to, realise the utter immorality of his policy. While Dr. Malan worships Christ, he does not realise that Christ was an Asiatic. If Christ came down to earth under Dr. Malan's policy Christ would be consigned as an Asiatic to a ghetto.

What is happening in Central Africa? I know it is a delicate problem. But here also, Sir, I feel that it is a problem which overflows the boundary of domestic concern. The majority of chiefs in Africa have protested against this reactionary, medieval policy pursued by the British Colonial Office. There, six million Africans in Central Africa are now going to be handed over to a minority of three million Europeans. If democracy is to mean anything then India must tell both America and Britain that they must make it convey real significance not only for Europeans, it must have equal significance for all ✓ people of all colours throughout the

world. Today the policy pursued by the British Colonial Office is to entrench with bayonets or terrorism the rule of a European minority over a vast majority of the indigenous people of the country. That is the state of affairs in Africa, in the Middle East and Far East. That is why India is considered as not only the sole spokesman of South-East Asia, but she is considered the apostle of progress in Asia. She should tell Britain and America that we have reached the crossroads and that they should make democracy have real significance for all people, of all colours, that they should repudiate what is happening in South Africa, that they should give up their colonial, the unabashedly colonial policy in Kenya where atrocities have been committed not only by the black Mau Mau, but also by the irresponsible trigger-fond white Mau Mau. It is now a question of the survival of democracy. India should play a decisive role by telling America and Britain that it is now a question of survival of democracy and that they should by their actions, not by mere lip service, make democracy have real significance for all people all over the world. This racialism, this colonialism, these are the 'isms' which are the greatest enemies of democracy and the greatest hostages of communism. India should ask America and Britain to decide, because upon that decision will depend not only the future of democracy but the future events and history of mankind.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Sir, I rise to lend my humble support to the policy pursued by the Government of India in regard to her foreign dealings. Some of my hon. friends have said that the policy of non-alignment and non-involvement has landed the country into trouble. Just now my hon. friend Mr. Frank Anthony quoted what Mr. Dulles, the Foreign Secretary of the United States said a few weeks ago at St. Louis, that the Government of India lost a seat on the Korean Political Conference because of her foreign policy. I am glad that he said so. I am also equally glad that the Government of India is pur-

suating a policy which has annoyed the imperialist nations of the world so much so that they have gone to the extent of guaranteeing through the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation all-out support to the Fascist Salazar if anything goes against his interest in the Portuguese possessions in India. What is true of Portugal is equally true of French possessions in India and both these possessions are likely to be utilised not only by France and Portugal to serve their nefarious ends, but by all the war-mongering imperialist nations of the world if any emergency were to arise in Asia.

I am very glad and happy that the Prime Minister has just said while moving his motion that he will not tolerate any interference here and he won't allow any sort of imperialist war to be carried on by their footholds in Pondicherry and Goa. What the Prime Minister said has completely cleared the darkness which surrounded the atmosphere in India. I should advise the Government of India, or I should impress upon them that the Government should go a step further and should take immediate and effective steps to end all these foreign pockets here where innocent people are being butchered like wild beasts by hired goondas and mercenary forces of France and Portugal.

Coming to the United Nations, I notice that the diplomatic battles which are being waged in the United Nations and elsewhere are such that Asians are being put against India, reflecting thereby the policy adumbrated by President Eisenhower of America in which he wanted to put Asians against Asians. The stand taken by President Syngman Rhee of Korea to keep Indian troops off Korean soil, the recent opposition by a Siamese prince to Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit's candidature to U.N. Presidency are clear indication of that policy at work.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is likely to take some time. He may resume his speech after lunch.

The House then adjourned till Four of the Clock.

*The House re-assembled at Four
of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Ram Subhag Singh to continue his speech.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Before the House rose for lunch I was pointing out how the foreign policy of this Government has done good to this country as well as to the entire world. However, there are some persons in certain countries like Malan, Salazar and Dulles who do not see eye to eye with our policy; they are suspicious about us and naturally so because they think that our policy has exposed their imperialism into its true colours, and there lies the greatness of the policy of this Government, for which I congratulate the Prime Minister and the Government of India.

I was also about to refer to the diplomatic battles in the United Nations and elsewhere which indicate that America and some of its satellite countries are trying to instigate a few of the Asian nations, as for instance, Nationalist China, South Korea and Pakistan, and to some extent Siam, to go against India and I had cited the instances of President Syngman Rhee's insistence on keeping Indian troops off the South Korean soil, and also Pakistan's voting against India on India's inclusion in the Korean Political Conference. However, these things are not going to do any great harm or injury to our policy except that they might feel satisfied in their destructive approach to world peace towards building which the Government of India have so largely contributed through the United Nations during the short span of our six years of freedom.

India's contribution to the U.N. and its various Committees have been quite apparent. The role played by her in the United Nations and elsewhere in making colonial people stand on their own feet is quite evident.

India took the lead in ensuring a solution of the Indonesian problem, which led to Indonesia's freedom. India took a similar stand in regard to solving the Korean problem. India's efforts in other spheres have also been very commendable, as for instance, in regard to Tunisia, Morocco and Kenya. In Egypt also India has tried to get a general agreement about the importance of respecting Egypt's sovereignty over the Canal area. All these efforts have been praiseworthy. India has also taken a laudable stand on the Chinese issue and has tried to get China admitted to the U.N. This policy of India has added credit to its foreign policy.

Nearer home, India's relations with her neighbours such as Burma, Nepal and Afghanistan have been exceedingly cordial and it is India's conciliatory and far-sighted policy which has yet prevented havocs being wrought on Pakistan. Here, I may say that I do not see any reason why Pakistan should be treated so generously on our Kashmir State territory. I would like to request the Prime Minister and the Government of India now to state it clearly that there will be no plebiscite unless and until the entire Kashmir is completely cleared of raiders, Pakistan spies and Pakistan forces. I would also request the Prime Minister to get our secular forces in Kashmir strengthened and try hard to consolidate the forces which live for democracy and secularism.

Besides, I think the policy followed by the Government of India in regard to racial issue has also been very consistent and courageous and the Government of India has always tried to eradicate racial discrimination throughout the world which Malan and others have tried to impose on this universe. Dulles, Salazar and Malan, the clergymen, want to convert the entire universe to their race, religion, political views and economic views and therein lies the greatness of our

foreign policy that it has exposed them all. All their nefarious ends have been completely exposed by the independent policy of India and this is why they want to humiliate India in every sphere in international gatherings. They are trying to blow their own wind and want that there should not be any man who could oppose them so far as racial discrimination, their imperialism, and their fascist mentality is concerned.

All this indicates that the policy followed by the Government of India is wise, and sound. It has increased India's international position and has enhanced her political reputation and importance, which are now being so powerfully felt throughout the world. And this is why I would like to urge upon this August House to accord its full support to the policy pursued by the Government of India.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): I wish to raise a point of order. Sir, this House has been having speakers from the men only. When we preside over the destinies of nations, how is it that the voice of women is not allowed to be heard here?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall come to the women.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I would also like to speak as representing the Scheduled Castes in this country.

مولانا مسعودی (جس و کشمیر)۔

جناب والا! سب سے پہلے میں آئریڈیل پرائم مڈسٹر کو آج صبح کی اس تقریر پر مبارکباد عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں جو ہندوستان کی خارجہ پالیسی کی وضاحت میں انہوں نے فرمائی۔ اور اس کی پوری پوری تائید کرتے ہوئے یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان کی جو خارجہ پالیسی ہے آج وہ نہ صرف دنیا کی

امن و امان کی ضامن کہلا سکتی ہے۔ بلکہ خود ہندوستان کی عزت اور اہمیت کو بھی دنیا کے سامنے روز بروز اگے لے جا رہی ہے کہونکہ وہ کسی وقتی مصالحت اور کسی وقتی مزاد کے ساتھ بدلتی ہوئی پالیسی نہیں ہے۔ بلکہ صداقت کے اصول پر مبنی ایک ایسی پالیسی ہے جو ہر حالت میں ایک چھٹی دہائی ہے۔ کوئی اس کے ساتھ اتفاق کرے یا نہ کرے۔ لیکن دوست اور دشمن۔ دشمن تو ہندوستان اپنا کسی کو کہتا ہی نہیں ہے۔ معافی اور متعاقب دونوں ہی اپنی جگہ آسانی کے ساتھ یہ سمجھ سکتا ہے کہ کس اقدام کے بارے میں ہندوستان ہماری تائید کریگا اور کس کے بارے میں ہماری مخالفت کریگا۔ یہ بجائے خود اتنی تھوس اور مضبوط چیز ہے جس پر ہندوستان جیسا ایک نیا آزاد شدہ ملک اپنی بلیادوں کو انتہائی مضبوط بنا سکتا ہے اور ایک مستحکم قدم اگے کو اتھا سکتا ہے۔ میں جنرل پالیسی کے بارے میں انہیں چند الفاظ سے اتفاق کرتے ہوئے جلد باتیں کشمیر کے بارے میں عرض کرونگا۔

کشمیر کا معاملہ اس حساب سے تو اندرونی معاملہ ہے، وہ ہندوستان کی اپنی اندرونی اہمیت کا سوال ہے۔ لیکن کشمیر کا سوال جس طرح اس وقت تک آخری فیصلہ کے لئے لٹک رہا ہے اس لحاظ سے کشمیر

[مولانا مسعودی]

میں ہونے والی ہر ایک بات ہمارے خارجی معاملات پر اثر ڈالتی ہے۔ اس لئے کشمیر میں ہونے والے واقعات کو خارجی معاملات سے الگ کر کے آسانی کے ساتھ نہیں دیکھا جا سکتا یہی وجہ ہے کہ خود پلڈت جی نے آج صبح فارین انٹیرز پر گفتگو کرتے ہوئے کشمیر کے بہت سے اندرونی معاملات کا بھی حوالہ دیا۔ کشمیر میں سب سے بدینائی چیز جو ہم سب کو ہر وقت اپنی آنکھوں کے سامنے رکھنی چاہئے وہ یہ ہے کہ کشمیر کے سوال کا آخری فیصلہ جب تک نہیں ہو جاتا اس وقت تک جو قدم بھی اٹھایا جائے اس میں یہ دیکھ لینا ضروری ہے کہ وہ قدم اٹھانے سے ہم کس حد تک اپنے گول نے قریب کئے اور کتنا اس سے دور ہو گئے اگر یہ کرائٹھون ہمارے سامنے نہ ہو۔ یہ کسوتی نہ ہو اور یہ میزبان نہ ہو تو پھر ہمارا خیال کشمیر کے بارے میں بہت فطرتاً راستہ پر ہو سکتا ہے۔ شہخ محمد عبداللہ کو برطرف کرنا اور اس کے بعد گرفتار کر لینے کا ایک واقعہ جو ابھی چھ ہفتہ پہلے پھس آیا ہے وہ واقعہ بھی حق رکھتا ہے کہ یہ ہاؤس اس پر غور کرتے ہوئے اس بلٹھی کرائٹھون کو اپنے سامنے رکھے کہ ان اقدام نے کس حد تک ہم کو اپنے گول کے قریب پہنچایا یا کتنی دور کر دیا۔ اگر

اس طریقے سے ہم اس سوال کو دیکھیں گے تو مجھے امید ہے کہ ہم اس کے بارے میں جو اگلے قدم اٹھائیں گے ان میں غلطی نہیں دکھائیں گے۔

پلڈت جی نے آج صبح اس سوال پر ارشاد فرماتے ہوئے ایک بہت بڑا الزامات کا تھیر جو لوگوں کی طرف سے لگایا گیا تھا اس کو اپنے خوبصورت الفاظ سے دور کیا ہے۔ جس کے لئے میں ہی نہیں بلکہ یورپ ملک کو پلڈت جی کا ممنون رہنا چاہئے۔ پچھلے چھ ہفتہ سے جتنے بیانات اور کہانیاں چاہے وہ کچھ باختیار آدمی اپنی طرف سے دے رہے تھے یا اخبارات اپنی رسچ کے مطابق شائع کر رہے تھے۔ ان میں ایک بے پلہاد بات یہ دکھائی دیتی تھی کہ گویا شہخ صاحب محمد عبداللہ اور امریکی گورنمنٹ کے دو مہمان ایک قسم کی سازش کے لئے کوئی سمجھوتا ایسا ہو چکا تھا کہ اگر جلدی سے شہخ محمد عبداللہ کو گرفتار نہ کر لیا جاتا تو ہندوستان اور پاکستان دونوں ملکہ دیکھتے رہ جاتے الحاق کے بارے میں اور ایک سہائی صبح نو دنیا جب جاگتی تو دیکھتی کہ کشمیر کا الحاق ہندوستان کے بدلے یا پاکستان کے بدلے واشنگٹن کے سلام ہو چکا ہے۔ اگر میں کوئی غلطی نہیں کرتا تو پچھلے تہڑہ مہلے کے اخبارات کو کوئی بھی آدمی

غیر جانبدارانہ طریقے سے دیکھے تو وہ ضرور اس نتیجے پر پہنچے گا - یہی چیزیں تھیں جنکو سامنے رکھ کر ہمارے ایک دوست، آج بولے بغیر نہیں رہ سکیے - انہوں نے اپنے بیان میں وہ باتوں کہیں جنکو میں ہی نہیں بلکہ ہمارے دوست کاسریڈ ہیرین مکرچی کو بھی آج صبح ایک حد تک ناراضگی کا اظہار کرنا پڑا - وہ بھی اس کو کسی صورت میں بلیو کرنے کے لئے تیار نہیں تھے - خیر یہ چیزیں تھیں - مگر ملک کو اور قوم کو پلڈت جی کا مسئلہ رہنا چاہئے کہ ان کی گاندھیانہ صداقت نے اس معاملہ کو صاف کر دیا کہ اس قسم کی کوئی چیز سامنے نہیں ہے - زیادہ سے زیادہ فہرملکی مداخلت جو اپنی ایک خاص شکل رکھتی ہے اور جس کے بارے میں پلڈت جی نے درست فرمایا کہ اس کے لئے سرینگر ہی مخصوص نہیں ہو سکتا - دہلی بھی اس کے لئے خالی نہیں رہ سکتی - وہاں بھی اس قسم کی داخلت ہوگی اور ہر جگہ ہوا کرتی ہے - لیکن جو شکل فی جارہی تھی اس سوال کو - وہ شکل حقیقتاً نہیں تھی - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ پلڈت جی نے یہ معاملہ صاف کر کے بہت سی آسانی اگلے قدم اٹھانے کے بارے میں ہم کو دی - پلڈت جی نے یہ ارشاد قطعاً درست ہے کہ شہج صاحب کافی حد تک جلد مہینو

سے ایک فرسٹریشن کا شکار ہو چکے تھے - اس سے کسی کو انکار نہیں - وہ فرسٹریشن کہاں سے آیا تھا - اس کا کوئی ایک سورس (SOURCE) نہیں بہت سے سورس ہو سکتے ہیں - لیکن یقیناً ایک سورس اس کا جن سنگھ اور پرجاپریشد کی تحریک تھی - اس تحریک کو ہم درست طور پر کہتے ہیں کہ یہ اتلی بیوی کونسی تحریک تھی جس سے ایک آدمی اتنا متاثر ہو جائے - اس کے بارے میں ہم یہ بھول جاتے ہیں کہ اگر وہ تحریک ۳۶ کروڑ ہندوستانوں کے مقابلہ میں دیکھ کر دیکھی جائے تو شاید وہ ہلکی پھلکی دکھائی دے - لیکن اس تحریک کو جب ایک لنگوی لولی - کٹی پھٹی - ریاست جسوں اور کشمیر کی طرف سے دیکھا جائے جس کا ایک طرح سے ابھی بھی تھسے حصے سے زیادہ علاقہ ریٹروں کے قبضہ میں ہے - تو اس مقابلہ میں یہ تحریک چھوٹی، تحریک نہیں تھی - اچھی خاصی تحریک تھی - اس کی اپنی جیلوں کی کل کپہیستی ۱۲ اور ۱۵ سو کے درمیان ہے اور سلگول جیل اور باقی سب جیل ملا کر کے - لیکن اس پر بھی اس کو وہاں اس سے کہیں زیادہ آدمی گرفتار کرنے پڑے تھے - اس کے ساتھ ہی جب اس تحریک کا سب سے بڑا ہیرو راوی کا پل پار کر کے ریاست میں داخل ہو جائے اور اس کے پیچھے اور لوگ

[لاہا مسعودی]

بھی جانا شروع کر دیں تو یقیناً وہ نلھی سی رہاست گھبرا اٹھے اور اس کے چلانے والے گھبرا اٹھیں تو ان کو اتنا معصوم نہیں سمجھنا چاہئے اور اتنی سزا اس کے لئے نہیں ہونی چاہئے جس طرح کا سلوک ان کے ساتھ کیا گیا ہے۔ خیر میں اس کی تفصیل میں نہیں جاتا۔

میں صرف یہی عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ پلڈت جی کا یہ ارشاد دوست ہے کہ شیخ صاحب ایک فرسٹیشن کا شکار تھے۔ اور یہ بھی ان کا جائزہ دوست ہے کہ جسوقت انہوں نے کچھ امور پر بات چیت کرنے کے لئے جولائی کے مہینے میں ان کو یہاں بلایا تو انہوں نے آنے میں ہچکچاہٹ کی۔ اس ہچکچاہٹ میں جتنی وجوہات ہوں ان میں سب سے بڑی ایک وجہ یہ تھی کہ ان دنوں مرحوم ڈاکٹر مکرچی کے نام سے اور ان کی ناگہانی اور افسوسناک موت کو ایک سببیت کر کے فرقہ پرست پارٹیاں یہاں جو شور مچا رہی تھیں ان کے پیٹھ نظر شیخ صاحب نے صاف کہا تھا کہ اگر میرے وہاں جانے پر کوئی پارٹی میرے سامنے کوئی مظاہرہ کریگی تو اس سے ہمارے مفاد کو ہندوستان میں بھی اور کشمیر میں بھی - دھکا لگے گا - اس لئے اگر ان مظاہروں کے وقت میں ان کے سامنے جانے میں اعتدال کریں تو کوئی

خبر نہیں ہے۔ اس کے علاوہ بھی کچھ وجوہات ہونگی جو ممکن ہے کہ انہوں نے اس وقت مرکز کو کدوے کی ہونگی - خیر یہ ایک حقیقت ہے کہ یہ غلطی بھی ان سے سرزد ہوئی کہ انہوں نے آنے میں ہچکچاہٹ کی۔ یہ بھی ایک صحیح امر ہے جیسا کہ پلڈت جی نے فرمایا کہ ہماری نیشنل کانفرس کی جو ہائی کمان تھی اس میں آپس میں اختلافات تھے۔ یہ اختلافات قسم قسم کے تھے۔ مگر اختلافات کے لئے شیخ صاحب اگلے ذمہ دار نہیں تھے ان کے لئے بہت ایک ساتھی بھی برابر کے ذمہ دار تھے اور ان ذمہ داروں میں، میں ایک معصوم جو آپ کے سامنے آہوا ہوا ہوں میں بھی اس میں پورا حصہ دار تھا۔ ہاں یقیناً میں شیخ صاحب سے اختلاف رکھتا تھا۔ خاص کر جہاں تک شیخ صاحب کا یہ مطالبہ تھا کہ ہم ایکسپشن کے جو دو آلٹرنیٹوس ہیں ان کے علاوہ تیسرے آلٹرنیٹو کو سامنے رکھنا چاہئے۔ اس کے بارے میں میں دعویٰ سے تو نہیں کہہ سکتا کہ میں سب سے زیادہ مخالف تھا۔ کیونکہ جیسا کہ میں نے ان پر کئی بار راضع کیا میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے درمیان اس وقت کشمیر کی جو پوزیشن ہے وہ پوزیشن سلہ ۴۶ کے کانگریس اور

لیگ کے سمجھوتے سے الگ نہیں ہے۔ یہ اس کا ایک حصہ ہے اور اس سمجھوتے کی رو سے ملک کی دو بڑی پارٹیاں ملک کو صرف دو ٹکڑوں میں تقسیم کرنے میں رضامند ہوئی ہیں۔ ان کو نہیں چار یا پانچ میں تقسیم کرنے یا آپ ان دو پارٹیوں یا دونوں ملکوں پاکستان اور ہندوستان کو الگ تھلگ چھوڑ کر ہم ایک دوسرے ملک کا نمبر لگائیں تو اس کا کسی کو اختیار نہیں۔

(گھلتی بجی)

جناب کہا مہرا رقت ختم ہو
کہا ہے ؟

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Two minutes please.

مولانا مسعودی: میں جناب سے
پرارتھنا کروں گا کہ مجھے پانچ منٹ
اور بولنے دیا جائے۔

अप्यस्य महोदय : श्रीर भी कई लोग
बोलने को हैं।

مولانا مسعودی: اس کے پیسے
نظر دوسرے ملک کی کوئی وجوہات
سامنے نہیں آ سکتیں تا وقتیکہ خود
یہ دو ملک آپس میں متفق ہو کر
کوئی دوسرے ٹکڑے بنانے پر آمادہ
نہ ہو جائیں جو ظاہر ہے کہ ناممکن
ہے اور ناقابل عمل ہے۔ ایسی صورت میں
کشمر سنہ ۴۶ کے فیصلے کے مطابق
ہی ایک ملک سے یا دوسرے ملک
سے الحاق کر سکتا ہے۔ وہ آزاد
نہیں رہ سکتا۔ یہ وجہ تھی جس

کی وجہ سے میں بھی اس کے خلاف
تھا۔ اس اختلاف جس کے بارے
میں بہت کچھ کہا جا رہا ہے اس
کے مجرموں میں سے ایک میں
ہوں۔ لیکن اختلافات اس معاملے
پر نہیں تھے کہونکہ میں آپ کی
معلومات میں ایک چھوٹا سا اضافہ
کوونکا یہ کہہ کر نے کہ جہاں تک
یہ دوسری آئینہنگی ہے اس کے بارے
میں شیخ صاحب کا جو اسٹیٹمنٹ تھا
اس کی تائید کئی ایک اور دوست
بھی کر رہے تھے جن کے نام آج شاید
دنیا نہیں جانتی۔ اس میں اور
بھی لوگ شامل تھے اور یہی وجہ
نہی کہ وہ اس معاملے میں یہ
سمجھتے تھے کہ جہاں تک دوسری
آئینہنگی میں پیسے کر رہا ہوں اس
میں میں اکیلا نہیں ہوں اور ایسا
نہیں ہے کہ سوائے افضل بیگ کے اور
دوسرے کوئی ساتھ نہیں ہے۔ ان کے
علاوہ ہائی کمانڈ کے کچھ اور دوست
بھی ہیں جو یہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ
آئینہنگی کے طور پر اگر یہ چھوڑ
سامنے آئے تو کوئی حرج نہیں ہے۔

منسٹر آف ایجوکیشن اینڈ

ٹیکچرل ریسورسز اینڈ سائٹمنٹ

ریسرچ (مولانا آزاد): کہار کے
ہائی کمانڈ سے آپ کا مطلب ہے۔

مولانا مسعودی: نیشنل کانفرنس
کشمر کے ہائی کمانڈ سے مہرا مقصد ہے۔
دوسرے شیخ صاحب نے اس مطالبے

[مولانا مسعودی]

کو کہہی اس شکل میں تو ہمیں نہیں لگتا کہ میں ایسا کرنے والا ہوں اور میں یہ اعلان کرتا ہوں - کہ انہوں نے ہمیشہ یہ کہا کہ جب دو وزیراعظم ہندوستان اور پاکستان نے آپس میں بات چیت کریں اس وقت جہاں دو آئینہ نگار پہلے موجود ہیں دوسرے آئینہ نگار کی فہرستیں پر بھی فوراً کہا جائے - اس سے زیادہ اس کی اور کوئی حقیقت نہیں تھی - باقی اختلافات اس کے علاوہ تھے اور وہ شاید ابھی دنیا کے سامنے نہیں آئے ہیں اور نہ شاید آئیں گے - اختلافات وہاں تھے - لیکن ایک غلط فہمی میں دور کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ درست نہیں ہے کہ ورکنگ کمیٹی کی اکثریت نے کسی موقع پر بھی شیخ صاحب کے خلاف کوئی فیصلہ دیا تھا اور نہ یہ درست ہے کہ جنرل کونسل سے کہی کوئی فیصلہ مانگا گیا اور معلوم ہوا کہ اکثریت ان کے خلاف ہے اور نہ ہی یہ درست ہے کہ پارلیامینٹری پارٹی کی اکثریت ان کے خلاف تھی - بلکہ یہ تمام مرحلے آگے آنے والے تھے - ۹ اگست کو ان کی گرفتاری عمل میں آئی ہے اور ۲۹ کو انہوں نے ورکنگ کمیٹی کی ہتھک بٹائی ہوئی تھی اور ۵ اکتوبر کو اسمبلی کا اجلاس تھا جس کے مطابق ۳ اکتوبر کو کم از کم پارٹی کی ہتھک ہونے والی تھی -

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : शेख साहब के प्रप्रोजेक्ट को बकिंग कमीटी ने पास किया कि नहीं ।

مولانا مسعودی : ورکنگ کمیٹی میں یہ ہمیں نہیں ہوا - ورکنگ کمیٹی میں سے آئے چلے ہوئے آدمیوں کے سامنے یہ ہمیں ہوا اور انہوں نے اس پر ہونے کی مخالفت نہیں کی - کچھ بھی ہو جن حالات میں شیخ صاحب کی گرفتاری عمل میں آئی - میں باوجود ان کے ساتھ شدید اختلاف رکھنے کے یہ رائے رکھتا ہوں - کہ وہ غیر ضروری تھی اور میری تو رائے ہے کہ اس کے بغیر بھی حالات درست کئے جا سکتے تھے - اب بھی اگر از سر نو اس پر فوراً کہا جائے تو حالات درست کئے جا سکتے ہیں - میں اس موقع پر اس کے کالسنٹی ٹیوشنل پہلو اور اخلاقی پہلو اور باقی چیزوں کی طرف نہیں جاتا کیونکہ وہ وہاں کی مقامی بات ہے - اس عاؤس کا اس سے کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے - میں صرف یہی عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمیں اچھے اصلی گول کو سامنے رکھتے ہوئے ایک بات تو نہیں بھولنا چاہئے کہ کشمیر کا آخری فیصلہ ہم یا تو فوجی طاقت کے ذریعہ کر سکتے ہیں یا اخلاقی طاقت اور عوام کی طاقت کے ذریعہ اس کی رائے سے کہا جا سکتا ہے - فوجی طاقت کے بل پر کشمیر کے مسئلے کا فیصلہ کرنے کو جائز طور پر ہندوستان نے مسترد کیا ہوا ہے اور

جہاں تک دوسری طاقت کے ذریعہ فیصلہ کرنے کا سوال ہے اس کے لئے ہماری سب سے بڑی فورس نیشنل کانفرنس ہے اور نیشنل کانفرنس کے اندر اس قسم کا انتشار بہت ہی مضبوط ہے کیونکہ اس میں تو ہماری یہ جو نیشنل کانفرنس کی فوج ہے یہ آپس میں ہی لڑ رہی ہے اور اس میں ہمیں کسی ایک کی طرفداری اور دوسرے کی مخالفت کے جذبے (sentiment) سے کام نہیں کرنا چاہئے۔ بلکہ اس جذبے سے کام کرنا چاہئے کہ یہ جو ہماری عوامی فوج ہے اس کو ہمیں اکٹھا کرنا ہے اور ان سے کام لینا ہے۔ اس سلسلے میں میں خصوصیت کے ساتھ پلڈت جی کی ذات سے اپیل کرتا ہوں کہ ان کی ذات خود ان معاملات کو حل کرنے میں بہت کچھ کر سکتی ہے اور میں ان سے اپیل کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ اس طرف ضرور دھیان دیں۔

ایک اور چیز کا پلڈت جی نے حوالہ دیا کہ وہاں اس گرفتاری کے بعد جو واقعات پیش آئے ان کے بارے میں بہت کچھ مبالغہ آمیز خبریں پاکستان کے اور دوسرے ملکوں کے اخباروں میں چھپیں۔ یہ واقعی بد قسمتی کی چیز ہے۔ لیکن اس بارے میں جہاں میں متعلق ہوں پلڈت جی کے ساتھ کہ یہ مبالغہ آمیز چیزیں ان شہادتوں پر مبنی ہیں وہاں میں ان سے اس

بات کی بھی استدعا کرتا ہوں کہ ان واقعات کی تحقیقات بھی ضروری ہے۔ یہ ٹھیک ہے کہ جو کچھ چھپا ہے وہ غلط ہے۔ لیکن آخر کچھ نہ کچھ واقعات تو ہوئے ہی ہیں اور پلڈت جی کے ذاتی علم میں یہ بات ہے کہ جو کچھ وہاں کی استھمٹ گورنمنٹ نے اطلاعات بھیجیں اس میں اور پلڈت جی نے ذاتی ذرائع سے جو تحقیقات کرائی تھی ان دونوں میں کافی فرق پایا گیا۔

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must resume his seat. I cannot allow any more time.

مولانا مسعودی: ایسی حالات میں کوئی وجہ نہیں کہ حالات کی تحقیقات کرنے میں کوئی حرج ہو۔ ہر جگہ ایسے حالات پیش آتے ہیں۔ خالی سری نگر میں ہی گولیاں چلنے کے واقعات پیش آئے ہوں ایسا نہیں ہے۔ ہندوستان کے ہر حصہ میں ہوتے ہیں۔ اس لئے اس کی تحقیقات کر لینی چاہئے۔ جب تحقیقات ہو جاتی ہے تو مبالغہ بازی کرنے والوں کی زبان خود بخود بند ہو جاتی ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس وجہ سے بھی تحقیقات کرنے کی ضرورت ہے کہ جہاں ہمیں یہ فضر ہے کہ وہاں ہندوستانی ملتوی جو نہیں اس کو استعمال کرنے کی ضرورت نہیں پڑی لیکن یہ واقعہ ہے کہ سنٹرل ریزرو پولیس وہاں استعمال کرنی پڑی۔ اس لئے بھی یہ ضروری ہے کہ مرکز اس معاملہ کو دیکھے کہ واقعات کیا

[مولانا مسعودی]

ہمیں - پھر یہی نہیں تحقیقات کا
سب سے بڑا فائدہ یہ بھی ہے کہ اس
سے ایک ہیملنگ ٹچ ہو جاتا ہے -
اور پلڈت جی کی طرف سے کشمیر
کی عوام کے لئے یہ مرحوم بڑا ضروری
مرحوم ہے -

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. Order. order. The hon. Member has taken more than 25 minutes. I am afraid there are a number of applications here. I will not be able to give even ten minutes to hon. Members hereafter. The hon. Member will have now to take his seat.

مولانا مسعودی : جناب اجازت
دیں تو دو چار باتیں.....

उत्पादन ज़रूरत: में क्या करूँ ।

[English translation of the above
Speech]

Maulana Masuodi (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, I would first of all like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for the speech he delivered this morning in elucidation of the foreign policy of India. While lending my full support to it I would like to submit that the foreign policy of India is not only an evidence of World peace but it is also furthering the prestige and honour of India from day to day in the eyes of the whole world, as it has not been changing with timely circumstances and day to day interests but being based on the principle of truth has remained unaltered. People may agree with it or not; but friend and foe—India names none as her foe—can understand alike at their own places as to their steps which India would lend support to or oppose. This policy is so strong and well founded that a newly independent country like India can make her foundations very strong and take further a very stable step. With these few words of agreement with

the general policy, I would like to submit a few things about Kashmir.

Kashmir affair is an internal affair so far as it remains limited to the question of an internal state of India. But, since this question has been pending till now for a final decision, the incidents taking place in Kashmir have an effect on foreign affairs, and thus the situation cannot be studied in an easy way if the external affairs are set apart from it. This accounts for the fact that Panditji himself referred to many internal affairs of Kashmir in his Debate on foreign affairs this morning. The most essential thing to be kept in view regarding Kashmir is that so long as the Kashmir question is not finally settled, it should carefully and essentially be considered if any step taken in that direction takes us nearer the goal or far away from that. If this thing is not borne in mind or considered or made a criterion of, we shall be taking a wrong approach in solving this Kashmir question. The recent happening in Kashmir, i.e., deposing Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and arresting him, later which came off some weeks ago, claims a consideration of this House. In this consideration the House by keeping in view the fundamental criterion should consider if such steps carried us nearer our goal or far away from that, and by how much. If we study this question in the light of this criterion, I have full hopes that we will not be making a wrong approach in days to come.

In his Debate on this question this morning Panditji with his beautiful words answered all those allegations which had been heaped round by people, and for this act of his not only I but the whole country should be grateful to him. So many stories and statements appeared during the last six weeks in the papers. No matter if some authoritative people were contributing those out of their own accord or some papers published those in accordance with the re-

searches made by them. One baseless thing that was apparent throughout was as if some such negotiations for raising a plot had taken place between Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah and American Government that both India and Pakistan would have looked non-plussed if the Sheikh had not been arrested, and one fine morning the whole world would have seen that in place of acceding to India or Pakistan Kashmir joined hands with Washington. If I am not wrong, anybody with a dispassionate view will arrive at this very conclusion after a perusal of papers published during the last six weeks. These were the things which being kept in view by a friend of ours made him speak this morning. Not only I but our friend comrade Hiren Mukerjee also had to express to some extent indignation over what he said. He too is not prepared to believe it in any case. These were the things, however: Our country and nation should be grateful to Panditji as his Gandhian truth has cleared the whole matter so much so that nothing of the sort is left before us now. The most that can be said is that there might have been foreign intervention about which Panditji rightly said that that was not restricted to Srinagar only but had its play also in Delhi. May be, such an intervention would have been there and that does have its hand at every place. The shape given to this question, however, was not a real one. By clearing this issue, Panditji provided us, I believe, facilities in our would be step towards the solution of the question. Panditji has rightly said that Sheikh Sahib had to a large extent fallen victim to frustration for some months. Nobody denies this fact. There is no lonely source for the frustration he suffered from. There can be many a source, and surely Jan Sangh and Praja Parishad movement has been one of the sources of his frustration. Was the movement such a big one as to affect a man to this extent? The movement may appear flimsy if compared to the teeming population of 36 crores of Indians, but we should

not forget that it was no small a movement when compared to the crippled and truncated state of Jammu and Kashmir, more than third portion of which is still occupied by raiders. The total capacity of the two Central Jails and other Sub-Jails there is from twelve to fifteen hundred; but people more in number than this capacity had to be arrested. And if in such a State of affairs the biggest hero of this movement crossed the Ravi bridge and entered the State, and after him went other people, surely that small and tiny State got frightened. And if the administrators also got frightened, they should not have been accused and then punished in the way as they have been. I do not go into these details, however.

I only want to submit that Panditji has rightly said that Sheikh Sahib suffered from frustration, and hesitated in coming to Delhi when he (Panditji) called him for talks in July. One of the major reasons of his hesitation was that those days Communal parties in India were raising hue and cry in the name of the late Dr. Mookerjee and were exploiting his sad and sudden death; and keeping in view that situation Sheikh Sahib had clearly said that if any party demonstrated on his arrival in Delhi, our interests in India and Kashmir would get a set-back. So if at the time of demonstrations he hesitated to come, there was nothing objectionable. May be, there may have been other reasons as well which he might have conveyed to the Centre. This, however, is a truth that he made a mistake in hesitating to come to Delhi. This also is true, as Panditji said, that there were differences in our High Command. These differences were of various types, but Sheikh Sahib alone was not responsible for these differences. I, standing before you here, was also equally responsible, and surely I had difference with Sheikh Sahib, especially in so far as he demanded that we should have a third alternative for our accession to

[Maulana Masuodi]

other than either of the two known to us. I cannot claim to have opposed most to the third alternative, because, as I made it clear so many times before, I understand that the position of Kashmir between India and Pakistan is more or less the same as that of the compromise made by the Congress and the League in 1946. This is a part of that very compromise in accordance with which the two major parties of our country agreed to divide it into two parts. Nobody has a right to divide our country into three, four or five parts, or to raise slogans for some other country than the two, *viz.*, India and Pakistan by giving up alliance with these two parties.

(Time bell rings)

Maulana Masuodi: Is my time over, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Two minutes please.

Maulana Masuodi: Sir, I would request you to allow me five minutes more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are others also to speak.

Maulana Masuodi: Keeping this basic principle in view, the alternative for some other country does not come up unless the two countries after a mutual agreement are prepared to divide this country into some more parts, which, evident as it is impossible and impracticable. In such a position Kashmir can according to the decision taken in 1946 accede to either of these two countries. She cannot remain independent. This is why I also opposed the third alternative. The much talked of differences hold me also as one of the accused. There were no differences, however, on this issue because—here I may add to your information—other colleagues, perhaps not known to world, also supported the stand of Sheikh Sahib regarding the other alternative. There were other peo-

ple with him and this was the reason why he thought that he was not alone in putting forth the third alternative; and he felt that many more colleagues of High Command besides Afzal Beg were with him who thought that suggesting the third alternative would not be objectionable.

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): Which High Command are you referring to?

Maulana Masuodi: I mean the High Command of Kashmir National Conference. Secondly, Sheikh Sahib never presented this demand in a shape that he was about to do that or made an announcement to that effect. He always said that when two Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan would meet and discuss the two alternatives, the feasibility of the third one also might be considered. There was nothing more of facts, besides, in that suggestion. Apart from this there were other differences, which did not disclose themselves to outer world nor would perhaps be disclosed. Differences there were no doubt, but I want to remove a misunderstanding which prevails here. It is not correct that the majority of the working committee decided at any time against Sheikh Sahib, nor is it correct that a decision was asked for from the General Council which disclosed that majority was against him. This, too, is not correct that the majority in Parliamentary Party was against him. These problems were nevertheless to come up in the days to come. He was arrested on 9th August. He had called a meeting of the working committee on 29th and the Assembly Session was to come off on 5th October, which meant that at least a party meeting would take place on 4th October.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Did the working committee pass the proposal of Sheikh Sahib, or not?

Maulana Masuodi: The proposal was not put up before the Working Committee. It was put up before the eight men selected from the Working Committee and they did not oppose it. Whatever the situation, I believe, the arrest of Sheikh Sahib made in these circumstances was absolutely unnecessary although I had differences with him. I am of the opinion that the situation could be improved without taking such a step. Even now if the whole matter is reconsidered, the situation can be improved. I am at the moment not going into the Constitutional, moral and other aspects of the problem because that is a local affair of Kashmir with which this House is not concerned. I only want to submit that while keeping in view our goal, we should not forget that the Kashmir question can finally be solved by either military force or moral and peoples' force with reference to their will. Deciding the issue by military force has long back been annulled by India, and so far as the question of solving this issue by moral and other forces is concerned, our biggest force there is National Conference for which it is so very harmful and disastrous to have such differences as the members of our National Conference would be by pitting against one another; and in this state of affairs we should not be swayed by the sentiments of favouring one and despising the other. We should all the same work with the sentiment that this peoples' force in National Conference is to be mustered and put to work. In this connection I appeal in particular to Panditji because his person can do a lot in solving these matters. I would like to appeal to him that he may pay his attention in this direction.

Referring to the incidents which took place after the Sheikh's arrest, Panditji said, the newspapers in Pakistan and other countries had given the news in an exaggerated manner. This is really unfortunate. Whereas I agree with Panditji with regard to this that hyperboled news

were based on mischief, I would request him that it is equally obligatory to investigate into the incidents. Quite true that the news published regarding those incidents are baseless, but some happening have after all taken place there. It is in the personal knowledge of Panditji that there is much difference between the reports sent by the State Government of that place and the investigation reports of his personal sources.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must resume his seat. I cannot allow any more time.

Maulana Masuodi: There is no harm in making investigation into the situation. Such things do take place everywhere. Firing cases take place in every part of India, leave alone Kashmir. The investigation should be made and once the investigation is complete, the mouths of those who hyperboled get closed automatically. I believe, the investigation is but necessary due to the fact that the Indian military which was there was not made use of, and we are proud of it; but it is a fact that the Central Reserve Police was to be used. The investigation is essential also for the reason that the Centre may have a clear purview of the incidents. Not only this, the biggest advantage of the investigation is that it gives a healing touch, more so when it is obligatory on Panditji to apply the healing balm to the masses of Kashmir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. Order, order. The hon. Member has taken more than 25 minutes. I am afraid there are a number of applications here. I will not be able to give even ten minutes to hon. Members hereafter. The hon. Member will have now to take his seat.

Maulana Masuodi: Sir, If you permit me, some two or three points....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What can I do?

Col. Zaidi (Hardoi Distt.—North-West cum Farrukhabad Distt.—East cum Shahjahanpur Distt.—South): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in the beginning of the speech, the Prime Minister referred to the mental attitude clouding the judgment of some countries today. They believe that you are either with them or against them. There is a sort of fanatical fervour. This reminds me of a sentence in an article written by Mrs. Roosevelt sometime ago. She said: "Communism is like God. You are either for God or against God."

Well, Sir, it pains some of us to see that some of our friends and comrades who are rightly filled with righteous wrath over wrongs done to humanity, take a very one-sided view of things. We on this side of the House condemn evil wherever it may exist. But it is hardly fair to talk of evil only in one quarter and to exonerate and completely overlook things that may happen in some other quarters. One of our friends said: "Let us not be contaminated by our contacts with the imperialists". He exhorted the Prime Minister to come forward as a true champion of the peoples. We entirely agree with this most excellent proposal. The Prime Minister should come forward as the champion of downtrodden humanity everywhere.

Sbri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West): He is already there.

Col. Zaidi: Of course, he is. I am agreeing with our friends who say that, and we certainly condemn this contamination by our contacts with the imperialists, but who are the imperialists?

An Hon. Member: Old and new ones.

Col. Zaidi: Let us condemn imperialism wherever it exists. There is a country, a very great country, a

very fine country in many respects, which has absorbed three small Baltic countries and made them in every way a part of its own system. It has brought under its control a number of other free countries including a very progressive and a very democratic country like Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, there is the record of a country like England. We have no reasons to condone all the sins committed by England, because we have personal experience and it is not necessary to have very long memories. Only till yesterday we were a subject race, we were ruled by England, but the fact remains—let us not be unfair—that England has done something unparalleled in the history of modern times, that is, England withdrew from India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon without an armed conflict. And I wonder, Sir, if an example like this will ever be set—anyhow the likelihood is very dim—in the near future by the U.S.S.R.

I am like most of my countrymen and like Members on this side, neither for Russia nor against Russia, neither for England nor against England, neither for America nor against America. We try to be fair-minded, to be friendly to everybody, but we also want to condemn imperialism and colonialism and oppression wherever it may exist, and we are tired of listening in session after session to this tirade against the Anglo-American bloc implying that our Government and our people are tied to the apron strings of the Anglo-American bloc. And who are the people who say this?—who have given much less proof of being the champions of the downtrodden than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India. Certainly condemn American imperialism or British imperialism wherever you feel justified in doing so, but do not try to create an impression that our Government is in any way trying to work as something subservient to either the Commonwealth or America.

Not only our friend Prof. Mukerjee, but even our distinguished friend Mr. Kripalani.....

An Hon. Member: Acharya.

Col. Zaidi:.....Acharyaji talked against our remaining in the Commonwealth. I want to be quite clear about it. What have we against this membership of the Commonwealth? After all, you cannot live in complete isolation. The Commonwealth may be full of devils, but the devil you know is better than the devil you don't. We have had two centuries of connection with the British people. We have imbibed a lot of their ideas. Our political institutions, our Parliamentary system, a good deal of our Constitution have their roots in British institutions. Our Army, our strategy, our way of thinking in many ways, in many directions, is similar to that of the British people, and I say that without any sense of shame or inferiority. You could not over two hundred years help imbibing a lot which is British, to take something which is good and wholesome and of value in the British institutions. And that is why we have a certain attachment to the British people. There is a lot in common and now that we are free we wish to forget the past, and we are great enough and big enough—certainly our Government and our Prime Minister are big enough and great enough—to forget the past and extend the hand of friendship to the countries in the Commonwealth.

Acharya Kripalani: Including South Africa?

Col. Zaidi: I am fully conscious that the Commonwealth contains South Africa. Though England has done things in Kenya and Malaya—I have not the slightest hesitation in mentioning this—we do not approve of those. We shall raise our voice of protest strongly against this, and I assure the House that the Prime Minister must have, in his own dignified, quiet way, done everything possible to give expression to the

disapproval of India regarding these matters.

Shri M. P. Mishra: He has done it in this House.

Col. Zaidi: But if you are going to give up membership of the Commonwealth where we are absolutely free, where we can go our own way and have dealings with the Commonwealth countries when we want to and take counsel with them if we are so inclined; well, if we condemn the membership of the Commonwealth simply because there is South Africa there, or there are the episodes of Kenya and Malaya, then what about the U.N.O.?

Why does Russia sit side by side with U.S.A. in the UNO? And, for the matter of that, both India and South Africa are members of the United Nations. Shall we give up our membership of the United Nations simply because South Africa is also a member? Nothing of the sort. For these reasons, I feel that to throw a lot of blame on the Prime Minister for his weakness for the Commonwealth is very uncharitable and wholly unjustified.

Moreover, I feel—I may be wrong—that since our independence, Great Britain has tried to respect Indian opinions so far as Asia is concerned, and as far as possible, to adjust her own policies out of respect for Indian views. For instance, take the question of Korea. Take the question of the admission of China to UNO. I remember that time I happened to be in England in 1950 when our Government was criticised for striking a note of warning about the 38th parallel. Even in London, what we said was the subject of criticism, but within a few months what India said was dittoed by England. Then, so far as the recognition of the People's Republic of China is concerned, and so far as her membership of the United Nations is concerned England has endorsed Indian opinion in the matter. (*Time bell rings*). And in these various ways there are good

[Col. Zaidi]

grounds for keeping up our membership of the Commonwealth. My time is up and so I resume my seat.

Pandit Fotedar (Jammu and Kashmir): In fact I had no idea to anticipate in the debate on the foreign policy of India. But the time I came, I found my learned friend, **Maulana Masuodi**, saying certain things on Kashmir. I feel that a stage has come, when it is no use beating about the bush and keeping things up your sleeves, when the fate of great Empires and countries is involved on the issue of Kashmir. With all the reverence that I have for my friend, **Maulana Sahib**, against whom I stand up today not in a spirit of animosity, but only with the idea of clearing certain points, which he has put in a manner, which is bound to create a certain amount of confusion and suspicion. No doubt, the activities of certain organisations here in India and in the Jammu Province did influence the opinion of the people in Kashmir, but outright to place the responsibility of a certain idea which may have been sedulously gaining ground in the mind of **Sheikh Sahib** himself since a long time, on them, is not correct.

So far as the question of independence is concerned, I think it is not quite a fresh idea, or a recent development in **Sheikh Sahib** so far as I know. I belong to Kashmir and Kashmir, I always feel and I do feel even today, is an integral part of India. As such, I can speak things in an authoritative manner when compared to many other friends here who do not belong to Kashmir. So far back as 1948, **Sheikh Sahib** did give a slogan of independence. It was not in the year 1953, it was in the year 1948 that he took into confidence certain foreign press correspondents and told them that independence was the only solution for Kashmir. At that time, **Sardar Patel** was living and **Sheikh Abdullah** was summoned over here. Then my

friends, may be remembering he said that he was thinking aloud. This was the time when **Loy Henderson** was in Kashmir, along with his wife. In the year 1952 when the **Ranbirsinghpura** speech was made, by **Sheikh Sahib**, there was no **Jan Sangh**; at that time there were no activities by the **Praja Parishad**, much less the **Jan Sangh** against Kashmir Government. Yet there was that much-maligned statement made at a public meeting which was covered by **Press Trust of India** and subsequently by other papers and about which even the idol of the people, the great leader of the country, **Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru**, had to speak in a public meeting that he was not feeling happy. Then also the working of **Sheikh Abdulla's** mind regarding the future political status of Kashmir was quite visible and could not escape detection.

I do not belong to the Working Committee of the National Conference, but I do know things and learn things from the members of the Working Committee. On that authority, as also on what I have learnt directly from **Sheikh Sahib** on the eve of my departure from Kashmir to attend the present session of the Parliament, I lay this before the House for information and guidance. I had a long talk with him about Kashmir for about two and a half hours and finally he told me that there was no solution for the Kashmir question, except independence, that those parts of Jammu which are inhabited mostly by Hindus, and **Ladakh**, should go to India and the parts held by Pakistan at the present moment should remain with Pakistan, the rest to be converted, after the wreckage, of the State into an independent territory, to be recognised both by India and by Pakistan. Not only that; he said that since both these countries were getting a slice, both should subsidise what remained of the State—the independent Kashmir Valley—so that we could develop Kashmir from within.

Well, this was the talk I had with him. I don't suppose I have much time at my disposal to describe the entire narrative here, although it is very much necessary. The idea of independence was gaining ground in the mind of Sheikh Abdullah since a long long time. And here my friend, Maulana Sahib—with all deference to him—said that it was the Jan Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Praja Parishad which influenced the decision of Sheikh Sahib. I do not absolve them of their share of responsibility, but all the same, I feel, and I say it with a sense of responsibility, that such events alone, did not constitute any basic reason in Sheikh Sahib's mind to drift into the channel of independence. In fact, the Jan Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Praja Parishad do not form India and Sheikh Abdullah had no reason to mount the stage and condemn the whole of the Indian nation and the Indian Republic, to speak things against the whole of India and to compare Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru with Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee. He said in the Working Committee and the Workers meeting that there was no difference between Pandit Nehru and Shyama Prasad Mookerjee. This was an unkindest cut and the height of ungratitude. That was the state of affairs in the Workers' meeting, where I heard Sheikh Sahib speaking things against India and the people, as also the workers being roused against India, I used to put this question to myself:—after all what India had done to deserve this denunciation? Did India go as an aggressor to Kashmir? India came to Kashmir when Pakistan was the aggressor; India on the invitation of the people came to defend the independence, the life, property and chastity of womanhood in Kashmir against Pakistan's aggression. Did he, Sheikh Abdullah, not say, that there was no power on earth which can separate Kashmir from India and that independence was impolitic and impracticable? Therefore, what has India done? India never interfered.

The greatest charge I can lay at the door of India today is that India never cared to interfere with the internal administration of Kashmir. India said that she had gone there at the invitation of the people and if the people asked India to leave Kashmir, India would not take even a single minute to leave the country.

The second thing is this. Here my friend said that no decision was taken. But, is it not a fact that after having found himself in a minority in the Working Committee, in the administration and the Cabinet, as also in the Constituent Assembly he rushed on to the stage? Was it not negation of democracy, and political tyranny, to talk to the people that things cannot be decided in closed rooms? He called the Working Committee a closed room; he called his own Cabinet a room. Cabinet members are the chosen representatives of the people. Cabinet members were selected from among the members of the Constituent Assembly, which Sheikh Sahib always termed as the sovereign authority in the land. Was it a room? If that is a room, then I think our Parliament is also a room. For every purpose then, we shall have to run to 36 crores of people. He said, all these things I think to divert the attention of the masses from acute economic distress and maladministration in the country. I felt sad and surprised to see that the great leader of the country for whom I have great reverence, should have degenerated into communal channels and repudiate the time-honoured stand of the National Conference of which he was the Head. Perhaps the idea was to help and strengthen certain elements in Pakistan and in foreign countries while negotiations regarding the future of Kashmir were going on. I am not concerned with all that at the present moment. My friend Maulana Sahib said about himself that he was against Pakistan and the idea of independence. He was against Pakistan and he was against independence—I knew it very well as he used to talk to me then.

[Pandit Fotedar]

while he was leading a sort of a movement against Sheikh Abdulla's misconceived stand within the remarks of the National Conference. He was a leader of a movement which was bound to bring about the downfall and the collapse of Sheikh Abdulla's undemocratic and dictatorial edifice. When the edifice has fallen, he was responsible for all this and now he should not have any reason to feel unhappy over it. I do not want to take the time of the House. I want to say only this thing, Sir, that it is really unhappy that such things should have happened in Kashmir. But, I may say that the leadership which has come to power with Bakshi Gulam Mohammad at its head did not save only Kashmir from disaster, it saved the whole of Pakistan and the whole of the republic of India from a great disaster which would have overtaken them. So, I feel that we should really be grateful to that leadership and also Maulana Saheb for taking an authoritative stand against Sheikh Abdulla's stand, a stand rejected by the National Conference times without number.

Now, it is said that we should understand something about the actual and basic position. There cannot be one person in the world who can influence the decision of the teeming millions. It is the age-long ideology of the people and an organisation which counts. In the year 1947, it was not one person or a coterie of friends, but, in fact, the entire mass of the Kashmiris who wanted to go to India and not to Pakistan, and who influenced by their time honoured political, professions and faith, fought Pakistani raiders. It is not correct to say that only one person or a coterie of people can deliver the goods. That will be to reduce the people to automatons, to make them something like machine in the present age of democracy. Then the question of ascertaining the will of the people, becomes a sinning mockery I say that in the year 1947, there was no doubt that Sheikh Saheb

and his friends, the Maulana Saheb, Bakshi Saheb and others did a very great thing in the history of Kashmir. At the present moment, to say that because the Jan Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Parishad indulged in communal activities, therefore, such a thing happened, is not correct. Are Jan Sangh and the Hindu Maha Sabha the whole of India? India consists of 36 crores of people. If Sheikh Abdulla was responsible before 30 lakhs of people, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and his Government are responsible before 36 crores of people. Did not this Government of India endorse the activities of the Kashmir Government, unreservedly when the movement was going on in Jammu? Did not Panditji say that it was a most mischievous and pernicious movement? Did he not say that if he would have been there as the Head of Administration he would have taken stern measures against this mischievous and pernicious movement? Did not the Government of India and the Indian Parliament and the whole congress back Sheikh Abdulla for five years? Is it not manufacturing an excuse now, for the realisation of some sinister objective to say that the Jan Sangh and Praja Parishad did certain things and all these things happened and therefore a *volte-face*?

My friend Maulana Saheb said that a Commission of Enquiry should be appointed, to enquire into the recent happenings in Kashmir. Maulana Saheb is the General Secretary of the National Conference. It is the National Conference Government that is functioning in Kashmir. Why does he not ask his own Government, his own party to do that? If at all there is any truth in the stories of atrocities—I feel that besides what is being said, many things must have happened because it was a tremendous upheaval—all the same the astounding things said in the Pakistan Press and in the foreign Press are only to cater to their own nefarious political

ends. I think these are all mendacious inventions which deserve not even the dignity of a formal denial. The people of Kashmir want good Government which was denied to them all these six years. On matters pertaining to the future political set-up of Kashmir, they have energetically expressed themselves in 1947, against odd danger to life and religious appeal.

श्री जी० जी० बेशपांडे (गुना): ✓

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भारत के प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को बधाई देने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। प्रथम समय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने एक स्वस्थप्रद वास्तववाद का प्रदर्शन यहां किया है, रोबस्ट रीयलिज्म का। मैंने उन के बहुत भाषण सुने, लेकिन कभी भी उन के हृदय को यह प्रतीति नहीं हुआ करती थी कि पृथ्वी पर शांति नहीं रहेगी और युद्ध होगा। प्रथम बार पंडित जी ने यह माना है कि इस की आशा करने के पश्चात् और शान्ति पाठ गाने के पश्चात् भी दुनिया में शायद युद्ध होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस के पश्चात् कम से कम उन्होंने जो यहां आश्वासन दिया है कि परदेशी राजसत्ता, फ्रांस की और पुर्तगाल की जो हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर है और उपनिवेशवाद के जो यहां स्मारक हैं, लास्ट वैस्टिजैज आफ कालोनियलिज्म, यह जो हिन्दुस्तान में बाक़ी हैं, उन को समाप्त करने के लिये पहले से बलशाली नीति का अनुसरण करेंगे, हम इस की आशा करते हैं। हमारे माननीय नेता श्री आचार्य कृपलानी जी कहते हैं कि इसी प्रकार का आश्वासन पूर्वा में भी पंडित जी ने दिया था, लेकिन यह आश्वासन आश्वासन ही चलता रहा। अभी तक कुछ काम हुआ नहीं। लेकिन मुझे आज उन के शब्दों में कुछ ज्यादा आशा प्रतीत हुई। शायद एक दो साल के पश्चात् मैं भी आचार्य जी के समान निराशावादी बनूँ।

अफ्रीका में और बाक़ी देशों में भारतियों की जो परिस्थिति हो रही है, उसके विरुद्ध भी पंडित जी ने पहले से मजबूत क्रम उठाने का यहां जो आश्वासन दिया है, इसके लिये उनको बधाई देते हुये मैं आगे देखता रहूंगा कि इस प्रकार की मजबूत नीति कहां तक पंडित जी चलाते हैं। लेकिन मैं यह आशा करता था कि इस राजनीतिक भाषण में वह धर्म नीति नहीं लाते। लेकिन राजनीति में धर्म नीति लाने की आदत उन में नयी पैदा हो गयी है और इसी के कारण आज राजनीति में धर्म का भी उन्होंने उल्लेख किया।

डा० राम लुभग सिंह: वह दूसरी बात थी।

श्री जी० जी० बेशपांडे: दूसरी बात क्यों न हो, धर्म का उल्लेख किया है।

5 P. M.

आगे चलकर उनके भाषण के लिये मैं उनको बधाई देता हूँ, परन्तु बाक़ी वस्तुओं के बारे में मेरे हृदय में सन्तोष की भावना नहीं है और मेरी राय में भारतवर्ष की जो परराष्ट्र नीति है, वह असफल रही है। आपकी डाइनेमिक न्यूट्रलिटी या क्या कहें यह जो शब्द प्रयोग है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। मैं तो इसको sterile vascillation समझता हूँ और इससे कोई फ़ायदा हुआ है, मैं ऐसा नहीं समझता कि हमको इससे कोई फ़ायदा पहुंचा है और मेरी राय में तो भारत की वैदेशिक नीति उन्नतिशील राष्ट्रीय स्वार्थ इनलाइटेंड सेल्फ़ इंटेरेस्ट के आधार पर आधारित होनी चाहिये भारत की वैदेशिक नीति इसी आधार पर आधारित होनी चाहिये थी। कोरिया, इण्डो-नीशिया और मलाया तथा बर्मा आदि के बारे में, भारत द्वारा अपनायी गयी नीति के बारे में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का अभिनन्दन

[श्री बी० वी० देशपांडे]

किया जा रहा है और दुनिया में आपकी बड़ी प्रशंसा और कीर्ति हो रही है और इस कीर्ति पर श्रीमती विजयलक्ष्मी पंडित का जनरल असेम्बली के लिये सभापति चुन लिया जाना कलई का काम दे रहा है। पंडित जी ने भारत की वैदेशिक नीति पर प्रकाश डालते हुये बहुत बार कहा है कि "ours is a mature nation" हिन्दुस्तान बहुत बयोवृद्ध देश है, शाब्दिक ज्ञान और विद्वत्ता में हो सकता है कि भारत महान् और वयो-बद्ध देश हो, लेकिन जहां तक कर्मक्षेत्र का सम्बन्ध है, मैं उसके इस दावे को मानने को तयार नहीं हूँ। हां जहां तक लम्बी लम्बी बातें और प्रस्ताव करने का सम्बन्ध है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि हमारा देश बहुत बड़ा चढ़ा हुआ है और इस दृष्टि से आप भले ही उसको मेम्बर नेशन कह सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज जिस तरह विश्व चल रहा है, उसमें केवल शाब्दिक महानता और पांडित्य से काम नहीं चलता है, कोई भी देश जब तक उसके पास पर्याप्त सैन्य बल नहीं है, वह संसार के रंगमंच पर प्रभावशाली नहीं हो सकता। किसी देश की महत्ता और प्रभाव उसके सैनिक बल से आंका जाता है और इस सम्बन्ध में मनुस्मृति में दिया हुआ है :

दण्डस्य हि भयात् सर्वं

जगद्भोमाय कल्पते ।

जब कि पंडित जी ने स्वयं यह स्वीकार किया है कि भविष्य में युद्ध की सम्भावना से एकदम इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता, और जब कि हर स्वतन्त्र देश अपना अधिक से अधिक ध्यान अपने सैन्य बल पर अपने रक्षार्थ के हेतु दे रहा है, हम देखते हैं कि हमारे देश में पंचवर्षीय योजना और अनेक दूसरी योजनायें हो रही हैं और हज़ारों और करोड़ों

योजनायें आप इस देश में कर रहे हैं जब कि विश्व में युद्ध के बादल अभी तक दूर नहीं हुये हैं; मेरी समझ में तो बिल्कुल नहीं आता कि आखिर इस डाइनेमिक न्यूट्रैलिटी से क्या बनने वाला है ? आज आप देखते हैं कि कोरिया में क्या हो रहा है, इण्डोनेशिया में क्या हो रहा है, मलाया में क्या हो रहा है चाईना को रेकगनाइज किया जाता है या नहीं, इन सब बातों में आप व्यर्थ में क्यों फंसते हैं, मसल मशाहूर है काजी जी दुबले क्यों शहर के अन्देशे से। हमारी इन सब व्यर्थ की माथा पच्छियों के बावजूद हम देख रहे हैं कि हिन्दुस्तानियों पर सब जगह खुलम किया जा रहा है और हम जो दुनिया भर के मामलों की चौधराहट अपने ऊपर ले रहे हैं उससे हमारा किसी तरह का कोई लाभ नहीं हो रहा है, हां केवल शाब्दिक वाहवाही हमारी ज़रूर हो रही है और इससे हम यह निष्कर्ष निकालते हैं कि भारत का विश्व के रंगमंच पर एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है हमारे शासक दुनिया में तक्ररीर करने लगे और उपदेश देने लगे हैं कि आइसोलेशन में हम नहीं रह सकते, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि आइसोलेशन एक अलग चीज है और हमें तो उचित है कि दुनिया में आज जो मामले उठ रहे हैं उनमें अपना इंटलीजेंट इंटररेस्ट देकर अपने देश को संगठित और मजबूत करते रहें रक्षा की दृष्टि से, यह नीति अगर भारत अपनाये तो कल्याणकारी होगी हमारे ऊपर यह बोध अक्सर लगाया जाता है कि हम तो व्यर्थ में हर एक से झगड़ा करने को कहते हैं, लेकिन यह बोध मड़ना सर्वथा हमारे साथ अन्याय करना है। हां हम सत्य बात ज़रूर बतलाते हैं और सत्य हमेशा अप्रिय हुआ करता है और यह ठीक ही कहा गया है :

अप्रियस्य च पथ्यस्य वक्ता श्रोतापि दुर्लभः ।

भारत ने जो हाल में नीति बर्ती है, उसका असर यह हुआ है कि कभी तो उसने अमेरिका को नाराज किया है तो कभी रूस को । बेगिंग बाऊल लेकर तो भारत अमेरिका के पास चला है, खाने के लिये अनाज की उससे सहायता चाहता है और यह सब होते हुये भी तटस्थता का दम भरता है, मेरी समझ में तो यह सब कुछ आता नहीं और मरा यह सब समझना सम्भव भी नहीं है क्यों कि मैं आपकी तरह ऐसा मेच्योर नहीं बना हूँ, और मैं आप को बतला दूँ कि इस तरह अपने को एक फ़ाल्स इत्यूनजन में रखने से आपका काम चलने वाला नहीं है । आपका दुनिया के पक्षों में दखल देने का परिणाम यह हुआ है कि आपने रूस को भी नाराज किया है और अमेरिका को भी नाराज किया है और मैं ऐसा मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि भारत ने क्यूँकि सत्य का पथ पकड़ा है, इसलिये ये देश इससे नाराज हुये हैं । हमारे देश के शासक और नेता तो इंग्लैंड के और कामन-वेल्थ के पिछलग्गू हैं और जब इंग्लैंड इनसे यह चाहता है कि रूस को नाराज करो तब ये रूस को नाराज कर देते हैं और जब चीन को मान्यता देने के बारे में इंग्लैंड की इच्छा होती है कि अमेरिका का विरोध किया जाय, तब ये अमेरिका से लड़ाई कर लेते हैं, इनकी कोई निश्चित नीति नहीं है, वह केवल औक्सिलेशन पर बेस्ड (आधारित) हैं ।

Some Hon. Members: Question.

जी जी० जी० देशपांडे : मैंने भारत सरकार की वैदेशिक नीति की ऐसी सुन्दर व्याख्या की है, उसके लिये जो सदन में प्रशंसा हो रही है, उसके लिये मैं धन्यवाद

देता हूँ । मुझ से पूछा गया कि भारत के इंग्लैंड के कामनवेल्थ में रहने से उसका क्या नुकसान होता है, मैं आपको बतलाता हूँ, इंग्लैंड ने आपसे कहा कि चीन को मान्यता प्रदान करने के लिये भारत प्रयत्न करे, वोटिंग के वक्त इंग्लैंड ने तो वोट नहीं दिया और हमको वोट देने के लिये लगाया और हमारे ऐसा करने पर हमारी शाब्दिक तारीफ़ उसने कर दी कि भारत विश्व की समस्याओं को सुलझाने में महत्वपूर्ण योग दे रहा है और हम इस शाब्दिक प्रशंसा से फूले नहीं समाते और अपने को बहुत बड़ा समझने लगे हैं, लेकिन वास्तविकता यह है कि आप इंग्लैंड के पीछे जगन्नाथ के रथ के समान बंधे हुये घसीटते हुये चले जा रहे हैं और वह जहाँ आपको चाहता है लिये चला जा रहा है और उसी का नतीजा है कि अमेरिका भी आपके खिलाफ़ है और रूस भी आपके खिलाफ़ है ।

इतना वैदेशिक नीति पर बोलने के पश्चात् अब मैं थोड़ा काश्मीर समस्या पर सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ । यहां पर यह कहा गया है कि अगर हम यू० एन० ओ० से निकल आयेंगे तो हम आइसोलेशन में पड़ जायेंगे और यह भारत के लिये हितकर नहीं होगा, मैं कहता हूँ कि आखिर आइसोलेशन से भारत को इतना डर क्यों हो रहा है कि कहीं अन्धरे में आइसोलेशन में कोई उस पर चोट न कर दे, इस डर के मारे वह यू० एन० ओ० में शामिल है, आखिर शान्ति से अकेले में उसको अपना काम करने में भय क्यों प्रतीत हो रहा है, क्या उसे अपनी शक्ति और सामर्थ्य में विश्वास नहीं है । यू० एन० ओ० का पिछले पांच छै बर्षों में भारत ने और पंडित जी ने काफ़ी अनुभव प्राप्त किया है और स्वयं पंडित जी ने अपने एक वक्तव्य में कहा है कि हमें अपने

[श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे]

आपसी झगड़ों को सुलझाने के लिये यू० एन० ओ० के फ़ोरेन इंटर-फ़ियरेंस की जरूरत नहीं, हम सीधे पाकिस्तान से इस बारे में बातचीत करेंगे, मेरी तो उनकी पालिसी और बात कुछ समझ में आती नहीं है, पंडित जी को यू० एन० ओ० में काश्मीर का मामला ले जाने के लिये किसने कहा था, मुझे तो मालूम नहीं, वह काश्मीर के प्रश्न को स्वयं यू० एन० ओ० में ले गये और अब इतना समय बीत जाने के बाद कहते हैं कि फ़ोरेन इंटरफ़ियरेंस नहीं होना चाहिये, इस पर जब उनसे कहा जाता है कि यू० एन० ओ० से निकल आओ और काश्मीर का प्रश्न सुरक्षा परिषद् से लौटा लो, तो वह कहते हैं कि यह सम्भव नहीं और हमारा यू० एन० ओ० से निकलना बुद्धिमानी नहीं है और वह उस संस्था में बना रहना चाहते हैं और अभी हाल में जो श्रीमती पंडित को जनरल असेम्बली का सभापति चुना गया है, वह समाचार बहुत आनन्ददायक है, लेकिन मुझे तो डर मालूम पड़ता है कि यह इस लिये न किया गया हो जिससे भारत यू० एन० ओ० से बाहर न आ सके। मेरा तो मत है कि यू० एन० ओ० की काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में जो अब तक नीति रही है उसको देखते हुये भारत को सुरक्षा परिषद् से काश्मीर का मामला वापिस लौटा लेना चाहिये और मैं श्री कृपलानी जी से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ कि काश्मीर की समस्या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्या नहीं है, यह भारत का अपना घरेलू मामला है, काश्मीर भारत का अविभाज्य अंग है और काश्मीर के अन्दर जनमत कराया जाय या न कराया जाय यह सर्वथा भारत की इच्छा पर निर्भर है और मैं तो यहां तक मानता हूँ कि काश्मीर के मामले को लेकर भारत और पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्रियों की आपस में मिलने और बातचीत करने की

भी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी, क्योंकि आज से पांच छह वर्ष पहले हम सुरक्षा परिषद् के पास यह शिकायत ले कर गये थे कि काश्मीर हमारा अंग है और पाकिस्तान न हमारे देश के एक अंग पर आक्रमण किया है, इसलिये उसको ऐसा करने से रोका जाय, लेकिन आज हम पाकिस्तान के साथ मिलकर काश्मीर और जनमत के बारे में बातचीत करते हैं कि वहां यह सब किस प्रकार होना चाहिये और पंडित जी जो कहते हैं कि काश्मीर के भाग्य का निबटारा स्वतन्त्र जनमत से होगा, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह किसी भी राजनैतिक विचारधारा की दृष्टि से समर्थनीय नहीं है। लेकिन अगर थोड़ी देर के लिये दलील के लिये यह मान भी लूँ कि पंडित जी ने काश्मीर के लोगों को यह आवासन दिया है कि अनुकूल वातावरण होने पर जनमत द्वारा फ़ैसला किया जायगा और हम उन को जबरदस्ती फ़ौज और सैन्यबल से अपने साथ नहीं रखना चाहते ह, परन्तु हमारे विधान के अन्दर जिस प्रकार का विधान हमने बनाया है उस विधान में किसी की भाग जाने की सहूलियत नहीं है, हिन्दू कोड बिल अभी तक पास नहीं हुआ है, और तलाक़ का अधिकार अभी किसी को प्राप्त नहीं है, ऐसी अवस्था में काश्मीर का हमसे जुदा होने का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता है।

It is an indissoluble union of different States. Accession of Jammu & Kashmir is completely legal and final.

✓ जम्मू और काश्मीर का भारत के साथ मिलना एकदम पूर्ण और वैधानिक है। यह ठीक है कि हम काश्मीर के लोगों को जबरदस्ती अपने साथ नहीं मिलाये रखना चाहते, लेकिन इसमें बाहर का दखल हमें

बर्दाश्त नहीं, यह हमारी अपनी धरें लूँ।
समस्या है और सन् १९४७ से लेकर १९४९ तक हमने देख लिया कि वहाँ की जनता हमारे साथ अपना भाग्य जोड़ना चाहती है और पहले तो उसने हमारे साथ तीन विषयों में अपने को मिलाया और आगे चलकर वहाँ की विधान परिषद् ने भारत के साथ किये गये जुलाई समझौते को स्वीकार किया, इतना सब हो जाने पर आज हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री श्री मुहम्मद अली के साथ मिल कर काश्मीर में ओवरऑल प्लेबिसाइट कराने का निश्चय करना, मेरी समझ में हमारा जो विधान है, उसकी मूलभूत कल्पना के विरुद्ध है, और इस कारण मैं समझता हूँ कि जनमत कराने की बात त्याग देनी चाहिये।

प्लेबिसाइट होने के समय जिस सम्प्रदायवाद के खिलाफ आप बोलते हैं, रिलिजन प्लस पालिटिक्स इज इक्वल टू कम्यूनलिज्म, यह जो इक्वेशन आप ने सवेरे बताया, यह बताया कि वहाँ कम्यूनल पैशन निर्माण होगा और उस के कारण जनता की सम्मति सम्भवता असम्भव हो जायगा। इसके लिये मैं प्रधान मंत्री से प्रार्थना करूँगा सर्व सम्मति का जो आप ने निर्णय किया है उस को छोड़ दीजिये और यह कीजिये कि काश्मीर और जम्मू की स्टेट है वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ तीन ही सब्जेक्ट्स के लिये नहीं, बल्कि पूरे सब्जेक्ट्स के लिये मिला लीजिये। इस के करने से मैं समझता हूँ कि काश्मीर का प्रश्न सदा के लिये खतम हो जायगा और पाकिस्तान का वार हिस्टीरिया जो है उस को खतम करने का रास्ता दूसरा है इसके लिये काश्मीर में हस्तक्षेप करने की इजाजत उन्हें न दी जाय।

Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan (Dindigul): It always amazes me that every
441 P. S. D.

time the hon. Prime Minister makes a statement on foreign policy, the tirade that comes from the opposition.— I am particularly surprised that such tirade of saying that he is being contaminated all the time by the powers which still have imperialistic mentality. I think those who make those attacks should know better; if they have read all the speeches that our Prime Minister has made and has been making for so many years, they would certainly not say that he has been contaminated by any imperialistic powers. He has always stood for democracy; he has always stood for the people of the world and he has always stood for the peace of the world. If he had any tendency towards imperialism, I am quite sure he would not have said in such strong language what he feels with regard to the peace of the world and what he feels with regard to those countries which bring about war. And in spite of all the very strong and fearless statements he makes every time when foreign policy is discussed in this House, we hear that our Government, led by the Prime Minister, is going more and more towards imperialism. It always surprises me, Sir, to hear that. But I am not here now for standing up for our Prime Minister. He does not need any of us to stand up for him. The world stands up for him. Today I feel that our foreign policy has got a very high place in the international field, and I am very happy indeed that this fact has been demonstrated by the election of Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit to the Presidentship of that august body, the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization. I do not think anything could have shown more strongly than that action as to what the world and the United Nations, as a very representative body, feel towards our foreign policy. I feel very proud that India has a place as the President of the United Nations General Assembly and I suppose, being a woman, I feel more so, because it is a woman of India that is occupying that place. I am not one of those people who feel that if any honour that is done to the country we should even think whether it is a man

[Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan]

or a woman who gets that honour. Of course, I should be happy, just as for the lady who now occupies it, if it had been a man who was elected to that place. As I said before, we have got our little failings in these matters and as a human being and as a woman of India I do feel a special pride in seeing that she has been elected.

Sir, the Prime Minister today has more clearly than ever before told us exactly what the foreign policy of the Government of India is. I very heartily congratulate him and raise my voice with the voice of the several Members of this House as well as the people of this country who I am sure feel that his policy is the right one and that what he is doing in the realm of foreign policy of this country is the right one for our country. It is not linking ourselves with this power or that power. We are standing independently, but at the same time we are not standing on a platform of isolation. He has told us that today no country can afford to stand on any kind of isolated platform. Now that the nations have come nearer together, and the world has become very small it is time we all worked together and worked together for the peace of the world and for the goodwill between the peoples of different nations.

I shall not be taking up much time of the House, because I know there are a great many speakers waiting for their turn. I once more congratulate our Prime Minister for giving us a clear picture of the foreign policy of the Government of India and I am quite sure that India's prestige will go higher and higher among the nations and that India will play a very big part in bringing about not only the peace of the world but real goodwill towards one nation and another. With these few words, Sir, I conclude my speech.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): I wish the present international situation was as simple as it appears at first sight on its surface. In that case, there

would have been no reason for any one of us here to worry. But we know that things are not like that. Very often it happens that what we see on the surface, is only a partial manifestation of what is going on behind the scene. And that is why a great responsibility rests on us. We have to think what to speak, when to speak and when not to speak, and what weight to attach to anything. After all, the foreign policy of our country is essentially an expression of the national policy of our country and that is why we cannot afford to take it lightly.

At this stage, first of all, my mind flies to Korea where our brave soldiers are interpreting the foreign policy, the national policy, of our country with their action. Their work is very hard. Perhaps this is one of the most rare opportunities of international assignment which has befallen the lot of a soldier, but our people there are handling the situation in such a way that they have become the subject of great admiration from every part of the world. At this stage, from our side, perhaps in the language of our Minister of Defence Organisation, Mr. Tyagi, we may send them a small signal, 'shabash'—to our people working there.

Well, Sir, we cannot expect to have the same success on every front of our foreign policy. There are bound to be obstacles on our way, but bravery lies in facing those obstacles. The greater the obstacles the greater the bravery in facing them. As an example, let us take Kashmir. We have been discussing it for quite a long time. I know my limitations. I will not indulge in the internal matters. Today we are discussing only the foreign policy and therefore I will deal with only that aspect of the matter which is connected with international situation. A good deal of discussion has taken place about intrigues, foreign intrigues, intrigues of some powers and some individuals. Of course every one of us is against such intrigue and we will go to any extent to fight it, to expose it and to destroy it. There is no doubt

about it. But, Sir, that is one thing. Sometimes it is better one should wait until a proper opportunity comes, the proper moment comes when we should disclose these things so that we can have the full benefit of the situation. If we have enough evidence, then also we should keep our balance because our foreign policy has a very high standard and we must always try to maintain this standard.

In this connection, what we can do today is to analyse the situation correctly, see some facts in their true perspective so that we may be able to find out a way and form a correct policy about the matter. What are those facts? I will throw some light on them. A good deal of information not only in our country but in foreign countries also is spreading on this subject. Near about Gilgit or in the neighbouring areas some strong bases are being made. It is a well-known fact.

Well, if it is true, it is very dangerous for us, indeed, and we will see how we can counteract it. As you know, Sir, Gilgit Agency has been a part of Kashmir, until this so-called Azad Kashmir, who are aggressors, unauthorised occupants of that territory, came there. These people know it fairly well that they cannot stay in this region very long. They neither have moral support nor physical strength to stay there very long. This is their weakness, and realising this weakness they are trying to sell something which does not belong to them at all. They are taking support of some foreign powers only for that reason. That shows their weakness once more. Therefore we have also to think about it and it should be the aim of our foreign policy to find out ways how we can get back Gilgit and the neighbouring areas of Azad Kashmir for Kashmir, because it belongs to Kashmir. Once this thing is removed a great obstacle will be removed in our relations with Pakistan.

Here, Sir, I would like to mention one very important point, and that is this. Near Gilgit there is a region where mostly Pathans live, or more exactly speaking this is a territory of

the Pakhtoons. That territory stretches right from Chitral to the borders of Baluchistan, from the Khyber Pass to the Indus River. About seven million people live there, in that territory. They are mostly Pakhtoons and they have always been fighting for their freedom. During the British regime also intermittently they fought for their independence, with guns in their hands. When our country was about to be partitioned there was a voice from these territories to form a new State and that was the State of Pakhtoons. But Pakistan succeeded very cleverly in misleading some of the tribal people residing in those areas and showing them the way to Kashmir for invasion. After the Kashmir valley was cleared of the invaders the Pathans realised their mistake, as to how they have been deceived by Pakistan, and they agitated more and more for the formation of their new State—with greater zeal and greater force and with greater vigour. It is this force, this vigour, which Pakistan once more intends to convert into what they call their new *jihad* on Kashmir, so that the ambitions of the Pathans for the formation of an independent State of Pakhtoonistan is frustrated.

Sir, what do we see here? This is an internal revolt, a problem of Pakistan, which it is diverting on somebody, a peace-loving neighbour, and creating disturbances there. Well, we have to go a little deeper into the subject and then we will find that Pakistan has no right today to speak about plebiscite. Perhaps, there are few people who have seen a plebiscite. I daresay, I have studied plebiscite in 1935 in the Saar. There are certain prerequisites, necessary for that plebiscite. Without those prerequisites, plebiscite has no meaning at all. Only the other day I have received letters from my former colleagues in Central Europe who have been diplomats, and they say they are amazed and astonished at the audacity on the part of Pakistan to talk of plebiscite at this stage when it is occupying forcibly territories of Kashmir for which it has no right at all. Therefore, Sir, it is a demand, I

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

think, of the whole country, not only of our country but of every civilised country of the world that so long as Pakistan has any force in hand in Azad Kashmir, as they call it, which is temporarily occupied territory of Kashmir, they have no right to talk about a plebiscite at all. That should not be conceded. It is not worth considering at all.

Well, Sir, once we make an aim of our foreign policy, we have to find out ways how to carry it through. There are not only violent ways. We have not branded our country either on the side of the Western bloc or the Eastern bloc. Therefore, we have every right to expect support from all the neutral countries of the world. We should isolate Pakistan in this sphere and there is no reason why all the countries of the world will not come to our support in this just cause. The more we work on this solution the more chances of success we will have.

Sir, there is another point, and that is, during the last three or four months Central Europe has changed quite a good deal: the burning points have changed quite a good deal. Today, Berlin, Germany and Eastern Europe attract more attention than any other places. There are tendencies that this concentration of political conflict in these areas will go on increasing. What effect has it on European politics? It is, that Germany has become a greater factor than France. What has it to do with us? It is this, that France and Portugal in the post-war period used to put forward an argument that they must retain their colonies, and if they do not retain their colonies they would not be able to do anything against the onslaught of the Eastern bloc. Today this pretence has gone since the last two or three months. There are signs that everywhere in the world people are demanding that these people should vacate their colonies because it has become a handicap even for the Western bloc in order to fight the Eastern. Therefore, Sir, we

have to utilise this opportunity and see that such pressure on France and Portugal goes on increasing. We have to see, to it that such pressure increases and they leave our soil as early as possible. These foreign pockets on our soil can no more be tolerated by the citizens of India and must be liquidated at the earliest possible time. This is another aim of our foreign policy.

So, taking an overall view of the international affairs, we find that on the whole we have been faring not badly, we have been doing well, we have to work, we have to work harder indeed and we have to make our foreign policy clearer: in clear terms we have to speak to all concerned. We are proceeding rightly and we are on the right track. There is no doubt about it.

✓ I take this opportunity of congratulating the chief architect of our foreign policy, our Prime Minister, and strongly recommend to this House to support all the measures taken by our Government in connection with the international situation.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I am thankful to you, Sir, for the opportunity given to me to speak, but I wish to express with deep regret that whenever I have had to speak, I have had to fight it out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My whole difficulty was that I was not able to divide India's foreign policy between men and women.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Do not distinguish between men and women.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member been returned from a ladies' constituency?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Yes. Actually my voters were mostly ladies.

There cannot be two opinions with regard to the foreign policy of India, because it is the national policy that decides the security and peace of the Nation. The foreign policy that had hitherto been followed had created in the world such an opinion that India

had become the global dove with a fresh branch of olive flying right round the world carrying the message of peace, harmony and security. She has risen before the eyes of the world to such a stature that her voice counts today for deciding the self-determination of the smaller and weaker nations, against the strength of imperialism, the threat of weapons and of manslaughter fall flat before her moral stature. The Prime Minister, Sir, this morning had been referring to the Asian question. Foreign policy is such a wide and comprehensive subject that it is not an easy thing for me within the time at my disposal to traverse the length and breadth of the subject. Therefore, I shall confine myself to one aspect of the foreign policy, namely the Asian countries and their unity.

We have arrived, Sir, at a psychological moment in the history of nations when the Orient and the Occident are at the helm of international affairs, competing for leadership. The growth of anti-racial feeling and the attempt of the West to dominate over the East which had created such suspicion, prejudice and animosity, to resist and resent the permanent domination of the West over the East. The British Commonwealth of Nations, Sir, is a new international experiment, a feat of British diplomacy to maintain and foster their position in the East. It is clear, Sir, from the history of the world that this domination of the West over the East is not due to any inheritable or understandable position, but is the result of the common place re-adjustment of ages. So much so, nation after nation rise and fall in the history of humanity. Time had arrived in the normal course of the history of humanity for India to take a definite stand in the East and Middle East. The era of western ascendancy is fading and the birth of a new age has emerged with the birth of the young Indian Republic. We have a destiny to fulfil to lead the East and the Middle East and inaugurate the re-birth and development of that age which had had its day and had disappeared into the dim distance of that

olden and golden age. Time and oblivion in whose mystic and eternal caverns are treasured up the mighty deeds of individuals and nations, are the unwritten history of the human race to be revealed through the cyclic evolutions or transmigrations of nations. We have to link up the past and illuminate Asia to fulfil her normal role of destiny. I crave the indulgence of the House to traverse with me through a few pages of history in order to justify our position, our leadership of Asia and the Middle East. Sir, our Oriental heritage is not of recent origin. On the other hand, the Occidental or Western domination is of a recent origin. Our—Oriental heritage can be traced back to the dawn of history to the Sumerian culture, with advanced political, economic and ecclesiastical institutions, followed by...

An Hon. Member: We can't follow this.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: If you can't understand history, then you will have to go home and study history.

It was followed by the solidarity of the Egyptians with their immortal and extravagant architecture, still followed by the remarkable civilisation of Babylon with their great contribution to medicine, astronomy and the codification of laws, followed by Persia, the largest political unit in Pre-Roman days and then followed by the Vedic age in India and the Far Eastern civilisation of the East. It is on this historical cultural and moral background of civilisation that the young Republic of India is born.

Some of the great religious reformers were born in the East and India had been the paradise of the gods. Asoka was an ascetic and Akbar was practically a Hindu. The present leader of the majority party maintains the balance of religions by his secular ideal. Why I suggest the leadership of Asia by India is that the European domination is of a recent origin. When Asoka was building his pillars, Europe was inhabited by rude and unlettered people and they were in con-

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

stant fear of being invaded by eastern races. European civilisation began with the discovery of Mosaic law.

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: (Ibrahimpattanam): Has all this any bearing on the Resolution moved by the Prime Minister, Sir?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I am trying to explain the domination of the East over the West and I need not be dictated by the hon. Member what I should speak.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): On a point of order, Sir. Is it right that my hon. friend should shout in order to drown the voice of my hon. friend who raised the point of order?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: The time has come when we should lead Asia and the Asian countries against western domination. The Middle East consists of an area twice as big as Europe and a population as big as that of the U.K. with half a dozen countries and a hundred political parties. The huge oilfields of the Middle East are being exploited by the Anglo-American and the Dutch interests. And it is to our interest that these foreigners do not create trouble in the Middle East so as to endanger our position and the unity of Asia. It will not be out of place at this juncture to invite the attention of the House to the problem of peace in Asia. Asian unity is disturbed by activities of war and intrigue, formerly in Korea, and now in Malaya, Indo-China, Kashmir and Palestine. The American crusade for liberation in Korea by bombing peaceful citizens has already come to an end. Reactionary and corrupt forces like Chiang Kai Shek and the French puppet were put up in order to destroy peace and democracy. These facts stand before us to take a definite stand with regard to the middle East, and it is my request to the Leader of the majority party to seriously consider the question of Middle East so that we may form an Asian unity. The time has come when a nation's superiority is determined, not by atom bombs and battleships but by schools, libraries, hospitals and the morality of a nation.

Hence I appeal to the Prime Minister to take the leadership of the Asian countries and unite them in a single Federation against the war-mongers of the world, for the sake of Asian and world peace.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Sir, the House would forgive me for narrating a personal incident. It was about three years ago. A public meeting of distinguished citizens took place and the speaker was on his legs. Just at that time there was a ruffling of the winds and the earth actually shook for a minute. The glasses on the walls were jolting. The entire audience got frightened out of their lives and they seemed to want and jump out for shelter in the green grass. But the Speaker went on. He did not know what was happening. And even if he knew what was happening, he was not going to be cowed down by anything. That speaker was happening, he was not going to be cowed down by anything. That speaker was the Prime Minister of India. The meeting was at Hotel Imperial in New Delhi.

And in that character, our Prime Minister manifested his fearlessness. I use the word 'fearlessness' because the big nations of the world are gripped with fear today. American is gripped with fear because Russia is strong. And Russia is equally gripped with fear. But we, Indians are neither armed with hydrogen bombs nor with atom bombs. We are not gripped with fear. That is due to the leadership of a man who has faced dungeons and prison-walls.

Today nations and individuals have to be fearless. Otherwise we have no future. The ex-President of the USA, Mr. Hoover narrated the fear overwhelming the Americans in 1952, when the New Yorkers indulged in bomb protection exercises. A fear complex ran over the American nation, said he!

Walter Lipmann, their great commentator said: "A mood of quiet desperation has taken hold of great masses of our people. They have come to feel that they and their children are no longer free people. They see themselves at the disposal of a huge un-

directed government buffeted about by senseless forces. We are shaken and badly unnerved. Is it really because we think that Russia is so powerful and that we are so helpless? I am sure it is not. We are afraid of something else. In this century one war has led to another. We have never been able to prevent the war that was coming."

As against this the German Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer, said this month after his election victory. "The most vital, immediate task confronting the Western world was to convince Russia that she was not threatened, to remove the fear of attack, persuade Moscow to alter its policy and offer peaceful economic assistance."

We have a fear complex in two different camps! We have today lost the human touch, the healer of all wrongs. The late Franklin Roosevelt passed away and with him his great policy of good neighbourly relationship also passed away. It was Stalin who paid this great tribute to Roosevelt:

"President Roosevelt has died but his cause must live on. We shall support President Truman with all our forces and with all our will."

At the San Francisco Conference, it was said that three Japanese mandated islands were taken over by America. America took over these mandated territories and said that the U. N. shall not send out their inspectors there, and thus even subverted the principles of the Charter. What they declared in theory, they did not do in practice.

Again, going back to Roosevelt, I shall cite an instance to show what faith he had in Stalin. In 1943 he wrote to Churchill:

"I know you will not mind my being brutally frank when I tell you that I think I can personally handle Stalin better than either you or your Foreign Office or my State Department. Stalin hates the guts of all your top people. He thinks he likes me better, and I hope he will continue to do so."

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair].

It is this sort of human touch that has vanished between leaders of nations. Fear complex is gripping the nations of the world. It was said that in 1940 the United States of America had about 500 bases in the world—the permanent operational bases, temporary operational bases, and the emergency operational bases. Today, India is unarmed. We are a great nation and, as the Prime Minister has said, we are a mature people. Not one of the foot-holds or foreign pockets in India shall become a base. And if ever it becomes a base then this Government—if not this Government—the Indian National Congress which put forward the struggle for the freedom of the country in the past shall pour its men and money and machines into these pockets and liberate them. Perhaps the Government cannot do anything on account of their various commitments, but the Indian National Congress should take up the matter; forgetting the past and remembering the future, take the lead and put its men and money and machines into this movement to liberate Goa and Pondicherry so that we may capture them for the people of this land.

I will refer to the point about China. You will remember, Sir, the late U.N. Secretary-General said just before the Korean war started that world problems could not be solved without China taking its place in the U. N. China is the crux of the problem, China is everything; it is the be-all and end-all of the international problem today. It is better that we realise this once for all. Whatever our prejudices for or against Communism may be, Russia, China and India are three slices of territory full of human beings, once over-run by poverty, misery and feudalism. Today they are all psychologically one. And whether you like it or not, whatever the Anglo-American powers do, if there is an attack through the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb, on any one of these three global parts, that attack will be felt in all the three countries in the sense that they cannot

[Shri Joachim Alva]

be separated from on another. I say with all the sense of responsibility that China, a huge land,—that China was able to withstand the Japanese invasion because of its hugeness, that China must be protected against all invaders, against bases meant against its security. China must take its place on the oblong or round table to which the hon. Prime Minister referred to in dignified terms this morning. China must take its place in the family of nations. May I, Sir, refer to what Thomas Dewey once the Republican presidential candidate wrote, after he visited Formosa, in his book called *Journey to the Far East*. He said, "Whatever its defects, the army in Formosa which is the largest army in the Pacific, is on the side of freedom in the event of a third World war." When great and distinguished men in the public life of America come and say that Formosa is on the side of freedom, it is time for us on this side of Asia, which has half of the people of the world, to know what is this freedom that Formosa poses on behalf of the world's freedom-loving population? Tomorrow world-shaking events may stir up our land also. Though democratic forces are installed here under a democratic leader, reactionary forces, communal forces, foreign agents and even perhaps some reactionary Princes may foregather in our foreign pockets legitimate in Goa or Pondicherry and declare that theirs is the legitimate, Government of India and that they shall fight the Government installed in Delhi. These are the dangers of the policy that have been evolved around Formosa, the policy of pitting one nation against another in Asia. Britain, perhaps, has taken a sensible and fair-minded view. Because of her vast business commitments in Hongkong, Britain has taken a more realistic view. We, Sir, will have to take the view that just as Formosa is the freedom spot for America, Goa and Pondicherry may become the reactionary spots against the forces of freedom in our land. We shall have to gather all our resources because the countries of

the East have been shaken up to their foundations. Iran has been shaken up; Egypt has been shaken up. The great national leaders of Egypt under valient General Naguib have declared that foreigners are fishing in troubled waters there, against Egyptain independence.

One word, Sir, about Morocco, Algeria, Tunis and Libya. Take Libya. In December 1951, Libya was made independent. By the back-door, Libya, has been made to give a foothold, a base for Britain. With one hand they give freedom; with the other they say, "We want a base and give it to us for 20 years. Here, Britain quit India; but Britain quit India after dividing India. We will have to see that freedom is guaranteed to all western peoples. We, today, are busy with our own affairs. But we cannot afford to allow these five countries, Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Libya and Egypt and the other portions of Africa to be under the iron heel of the foreigners, who are so ruthless in putting down the nationalist aspirations in the year of grace 1953, though it was in the last Century they took over Morocco and Algeria and Tunis in the name of freedom and securing safety for these people.

Two minutes more, Sir, and I will sit down. I should like to refer to one point: that is about Malaya and Egypt. Malaya, as you know, is the highest dollar earner in the British Commonwealth. On account of rubber, Malaya earns more dollars than all the other parts of the British Empire put together. So, we can understand the desperate efforts of the British to keep the Malayan people suppressed. Though today, we have our own commitments here, we cannot forget the hour of our peril; we cannot forget the hour of our distress in days gone by. We cannot forget that Egypt had been a captive in the hands of Britain for the sake of India. Egypt perhaps deserves cent. per cent. moral and other kind of help in this hour of her trouble against the foreigners. We shall have

to grant the fullest measure of help to Egypt in her hour of trial; moral and perhaps physical help one day.

I will say only one word, Sir, and I hope you will permit me. Today, a new disease has come over the East: I mean birth control and other campaigns. Their home was in America; their home was in the West. In a sense they fear that our populations will grow so high. Today, the smallest country, with a few laboratory assistants, can destroy any other country through germ warfare. We have to take care about these campaigns coming out from the West in the guise of social service, which will destroy and lessen our populations and finally our powers of resistance to aggression and exploitation.

Our foreign policy has been the best under the circumstances. We possess no arms; we possess no hydrogen bombs or atomic weapons. We shall have to possess that ingredient, fearlessness, fearlessness to look to the East or West, so that we can keep our country strong and also offer every kind of moral and even physical aid to all the countries in distress.

Mr. Chairman: Swami Ramananda Tirtha.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury rose—

Mr. Chairman: Any point of order?

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: Some reference has been made to me; I must have an opportunity to tell the House my.....

Mr. Chairman: I have already called Swami Ramanand Tirtha.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Gulberga): Sir, I was listening to the speech of Shri H. N. Mukerjee with rapt attention. At the same time, it was a rather pleasant sight to see him clapping in approbation and appreciation of the exposition of the foreign policy of India by our Prime Minister. I do not know whether his approbation was partially inspired by the speeches of Malenkor or whether it

441 P. S. D.

was genuine. All the same, I was happy to see the Communist party of India, which has, in time and out of time, criticised bitterly the foreign policy of this country, giving its partial assent and greatly appreciating the basic correctness of our foreign policy.

The foreign policy of this country was dubbed as neutral, and a friend here has dubbed it as dynamic neutrality. I do not know what more conviction any one could carry to any independent person than what the Prime Minister of India has said this morning in this august House. The policy that India has pursued has left its indelible impress upon the events of the world. If, today, the world listens to India, it is because of the basic correctness of our foreign policy. It is very difficult to understand the mentality of those who want India to be tagged on to this bloc or that. If India stands independent as a self-respecting nation, people are there in this country who would perhaps feel unhappy. I do not know why India should feel shy of her foreign policy. If we do not toe the line of Soviet Russia or if we do not follow the footsteps of the U.S.A., we are dubbed as neutral. I should say with all the conviction at my command that the policy which India is pursuing, and has pursued in the past, has been basically correct and that is why it has been ever growing and evolving on right lines. If today Shri H. N. Mukerjee expresses approbation, it is this correctness basically of our policy that has made him, though it may be under force of circumstances, applaud this international policy of India.

My honoured and revered friend Acharya Kripalani had to say certain things and in his own way he wanted to make certain suggestions.

6 P.M.

He failed to understand, as he put it, whether our policy in regard to Kashmir was a part of the international policy or an internal matter. I do not know what logic has forced

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

him to believe in the manner in which he has expressed himself. Kashmir is an internal problem as well as an international problem, and when we speak and think about Kashmir, we have to remember that we are committed to certain basic principles. We have agreed, whether a section of this House or a section of the Indian population likes it or not, that it is the people of Kashmir who will decide ultimately their own future, and having agreed to that proposition, it is no use complaining against the approach which the Prime Minister of India has made to this problem. The accession of Kashmir to India, though completely legal, is still subject to the will of the people of Kashmir to be expressed in the form of a plebiscite and if we stick to that basic policy, we have to steer through very difficult times. I should impress upon this House, Sir, that India has agreed to an internal autonomy of Kashmir. It is no use again to complain that Kashmir should merge completely with India, unless, of course, the people of Kashmir so desire. I think we should be very clear in our minds about that.

It is a painful duty for me to say something about my esteemed friend Sheikh Abdulla. I do not know what made him think of the independence of the Kashmir valley. I fail to understand how a person of his stature could ever be persuaded to believe in that monstrous idea, if I am allowed to say so. The independence of a small valley has no meaning in relation to powerful nations which are surrounding that small beautiful spot. And therefore, if he is wrong we have to say that he is wrong, and I hope the changes that are taking place over his own State will make him realise the mistake which he has committed, and even behind the bars he will be given an opportunity to say that there is no other choice for Kashmir except to accede to India or Pakistan, there is no third course; and I think when the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of Pakistan have agreed to

leave the question, the ultimate decision of the accession of Kashmir either to India or Pakistan, to the will of the people, Sheikh Abdulla should have no justification now in thinking that Kashmir valley can be an independent country.

The foreign policy as enunciated today has evoked appreciation from all sides of this House. Even critics have appreciated it, and it is gratifying to note that greater and greater appreciation is dawning upon the whole world. Sir, I wholeheartedly support the Resolution.

Shri T. Subrahmanyam: This morning it was a matter for gratification to see that appreciation and encomiums were coming from the various groups sitting opposite. The leader of the Praja-Socialist Party said he was in complete agreement with the basic principles of our foreign policy, and the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party said that he was gratified to see that India had made a great contribution to the cause of peace in the East. But when we went into details and the criticisms that came later on from them, we found that there was complete disagreement, and the criticisms came from completely and diametrically opposite points of view. One hon. Member suggested that the enslaved nations of the world were hungering for freedom and liberty, were waiting for India to champion their cause and that we should go out to help them. Another hon. Member said regarding the same matter that we were devoting too much attention and energy on championing the cause of freedom of these other peoples distant from us and that we are completely ignoring solving our internal domestic problems like hunger, starvation, unemployment and other things. And then, Sir, with regard to another issue also, a major problem, there was diametrically opposite criticism. One hon. Member suggested that we should choose our allies. Another hon. Member said: "Yes, we should choose our allies", but the Deputy Leader of the

Communist Party said that the complexion of the imperialist forces cannot be changed and contamination with these forces must be ended, and then he said: "Let us choose our allies". And then there was hon. Member Mr. Frank Anthony who said: "The threat to India's security comes from the Communist forces and we must choose our allies", i.e., England and America. We see what diametrically opposite advice is coming from various groups. And then another hon. Member said that we have done nothing for disarmament, that we are starving nation-building departments of our country and we are spending too much on increasing our military might. But another hon. Member of the opposite side said that the world understands only one argument, that is "dandam" and it will be to our peril if we neglect our military might and strength and we must do everything to increase our military force and strength. Therefore, this was how the criticism went on, but the truth is that as our Prime Minister was pleased to state this morning, we have tried to serve some great principles and some ideals. We have tried to serve the cause of freedom, of liberty, equality in every part of the globe, but there is an order of priorities. We cannot afford to give the same emphasis and devote all our energies to solve these problems in various parts of the globe and we must also remember that imperialism and enslavement of one people by another are not confined to one particular part of the globe. We see them in many parts of the world. We cannot afford to enter into hostilities and get into all manner of conflicts with these powers just because we have to champion the cause of freedom. Then, it is not one of the rules of the democratic game or of championing the cause of freedom that we should get into these complications and conflicts and hostilities which may ultimately lead us to self-destruction. Our resources, our internal strength and our fundamental geographical and historical factors determine our foreign policy, and there is an order

of priorities and we cannot ignore this order of priorities. Our fundamental historical and geographical factors do determine our foreign policy. And then, Sir, we have adopted a mission of peace. This love of peace is in our blood. It is in our history, in our heritage, in our civilisation, that has been handed over to us by our saints and seers of the past ages and down all these ages it has come to us. And the Father of our Nation handed this great legacy to us. In foreign affairs and in the forums of international affairs, our representatives have tried to create a co-operative and friendly climate. There has been no pretension about it. There has been no untruth about it. But we have been misunderstood sometimes. For instance, in America some critics feel that Washington is the centre of this globe. Not only that. Every other country must adopt that viewpoint and chalk out its policies accordingly. It is an impossible proposition. Washington has got its own geographical and historical factors, and for them Formosa and the Chinese mainland may be the same thing. But for us, with 2,000 miles of border with China and 450 or 500 millions of people living as our neighbours with long historical contacts, we cannot afford to treat China and Formosa as one thing and we cannot put them on the same level.

Then, Sir, my hon. friend, the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party, was saying that the complexion of these imperialist powers could not be changed; we must choose our allies. Sir, the complexion of these imperialist powers can be changed. It has been changed in our own lifetime. We have found that it can be changed and there can be no greater demonstration or proof of it than the fact that we have realised our freedom by a friendly and peaceful approach and secured freedom from the most powerful imperialist power in the world.

Then, Sir, we really want to pursue this policy to create this friendly and co-operative atmosphere. My hon. friend, Mr. Mukerjee, said that we

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam]

should not allow ourselves to be used as tools, as brokers and as go-betweens between Egypt and England. If we divest this expression of all these phrases, what is it that we are doing? We are trying to effect a reconciliation between England and Egypt. It is a laudable object. It is consistent with our policy and if we succeed in that, we would have solved a major difficulty in the Middle East. And it is a thing which we have to pursue, Sir. It is a very laudable and praise-worthy object; there is nothing to be ashamed of in trying to effect a reconciliation and promote friendliness between Egypt and England.

Then, with regard to disarmament, one hon. friend said that we are starving our nation-building departments; we are ignoring the solution of the problems of hunger, unemployment, starvation, poverty and all these things. He said we are doing nothing to solve these problems. Another hon. Member said that if we fail to pay attention to our rearmament, we do so at our peril. But the fact, Sir, is that this question of disarmament is a simple thing, but it is also a difficult thing. It is a simple thing if all the States of the world agree to adopt the sovereignty of the United Nations and have representatives of all the other powers empowered to prohibit the manufacture of arms by the various Governments. But because the States are unwilling to divest themselves of their sovereignty, each big State is trying to stockpile atom and hydrogen bombs. So far as we are concerned, we cannot act as if disarmament has already been realised. Neither can we try to create a stockpile of hydrogen and atom bombs. Sir, the expenditure involved in the making of an atom bomb or a hydrogen bomb could be utilised for constructing a major irrigation project in our country, and we are more interested in constructing these major irrigation projects.

Then, Sir, with regard to Korea, we have been pursuing a policy of peace.

It is perfectly consistent with the mission of peace which is our great heritage from the time of Asoka. We adopted the Asoka Chakra as our symbol, and the spirit behind it is that we go out to foreign countries as messengers of peace. Our officers and men today who are in Korea, are working out that mission of peace. We did not go there on a shooting war. We have gone there to establish peace. And 'Shantinagar' is the place where our armed forces are to work out the rehabilitation arrangements. Let us hope they will succeed. If they succeed, they would have helped Korea to solve a major problem and lay the foundations for permanent peace, and in the years to come, this 'Shantinagar' will be a place of pilgrimage.

(Time bell rings)

Finally, Sir, it augurs well for our country—I should say for the whole world—that a member of this House has been elected as President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. She said that she would serve the purposes of the United Nations and the cause of peace in this world. I am confident, Sir, that while she is the President, the cause of peace will be effectively served.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the House is thankful to the Leader of the House for having provided us with an opportunity to discuss foreign affairs, the ambit and magnitude of which has increased and which cannot be dealt with sufficiently in the course of one day's debate.

Before I consider one of the important topics that he has dealt with, I should like to make a reference to a small matter which has missed the attention of many hon. Members. The external publicity that our foreign affairs is receiving in different parts of the world, particularly in the Middle East and South East Asia, is pretty poor. We ought to remember the value of the old adage that good deeds do not by themselves shine in a naughty

world, and in a fierce world where many non-official agencies have been subsidised, particularly by countries like France and the United Kingdom, we ought also to take stock of the situation and try to improve our external publicity services.

If I do not have the time this evening, Mr. Chairman, to deal with all the topics that have been covered by the Prime Minister, it is not because I do not think them to be important, because I think that there is one issue which bulks much in importance which ought to be considered at great length. I refer to the problem of Indo-Pakistan relations and I should like to consider it at some length, Mr. Chairman, because it is a matter of some importance. The Leader of the House, in the course of his speech, pointed out that there was a great deal of propaganda in the Pakistan Press criticising us and maligning our motives. Now, while I agree that the Pakistan Press has maligning many motives of our statesmen, I must however point out that today—on this occasion, at any rate—maligning has not had any effect on the general public in Pakistan or in India. In fact, in recent times, Mr. Chairman, one can say without any fear of contradiction, that there has been an increasing sanity in both the countries and it is this very increasing sanity that has been not a little responsible for a more rational approach to this question. The great economies of these two countries are complementary in character and their best minds have realised that if together they act in harmony, they certainly can make a visible impression, and today the consciousness of this fact has penetrated the mass mind and, as a result of it, there is today a much brighter hope of better relations between the two neighbours being achieved. I have always held the view that the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India should meet and discuss and decide these issues and today the time seems to be particularly propitious for very many of these tangled issues being resolved

peacefully and amicably in the interest of both countries.

In the context of these matters, I should like to refer to the Kashmir issue. Now, Sir, on Kashmir it is possible to adopt an attitude of extreme legalism or, as I would say, an attitude of extreme hostility, depending upon the ideological approach which we adopt. Now for a very long time we have committed ourselves definitely to the proposition that so far as Kashmir is concerned, we are in favour of a plebiscite, a plebiscite which is to take place under conditions which are fair and impartial. I could not understand the controversy that took place over the appointment of the Plebiscite Administrator, Admiral Nimitz. Some of the comments that have appeared elsewhere have seemed to me particularly—if I could use a strong word—jaundiced in character. Admiral Nimitz, after all, was not formally appointed and inducted into office by the Jammu and Kashmir Government. It is some years since Admiral Nimitz was appointed as the Plebiscite Administrator. But a more important factor which has to be borne in mind is that if the Plebiscite Administrator's *bona fides* are doubted by one of the important parties, it would not be worth his while being a Plebiscite Administrator.

I should like, however, to point out that the more important issues that are facing us are the preliminary issues that have to be taken into account, the issues that have divided the countries. It is on these issues that we ought to concentrate our attention before there can be any such thing as plebiscite or appointment of a plebiscite administrator.

A certain amount of argument was indulged in as to whether we should have a regional plebiscite or an overall plebiscite. Now it is quite possible to argue that we should have a regional plebiscite because that, according to some, would ensure Jammu being transferred to India. But the argument against the regional

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

plebiscite is that unless we think in terms of an overall plebiscite we might perhaps be prejudging the issue so far as Kashmir is concerned.

I should also like to point out that so far as the plebiscite is concerned the two statesmen have agreed that they would take into account the wishes of those areas which are contiguous to the neighbouring states. The plebiscite is to take place not only over the Indian-occupied Kashmir but over the whole of Kashmir including Azad Kashmir. Would it ever be sensible, if, for instance, Azad Kashmir votes for Pakistan, that Azad Kashmir should be transferred to India forcibly? I do not think the two statesmen have ever envisaged a similar thing in case of Jammu. Should the plebiscite ever take place, I venture to think, the area which has voted predominantly in favour of India would be transferred to India. I am only mentioning these facts to show that it is quite possible to misunderstand the many aspects of a very ticklish question. But apart from all these questions the major issue that we have to consider is how far are we going to work seriously for solving many of these problems that are dividing both the countries. I venture to suggest that the difficult and rather ticklish problems that are dividing the two countries can certainly be solved at ministerial level. It has been a great advantage to us that the two Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan should have agreed to have these questions settled on ministerial level because that itself would avoid a great deal of complication.

People have been saying that the dispute should be withdrawn from U.N.O. but how is it possible to withdraw the dispute from the U.N.O. if we do not make an attempt to come together and solve the problems amongst ourselves? I hold the view that the meeting between the two Prime Ministers and another meeting that would take place could settle all these issues and would be of manifest

importance. It would undoubtedly help to get all these issues solved between ourselves without having any of the other forces or influences being brought to bear on the Kashmir question.

Kashmir, as the Prime Minister pointed out this morning, occupies a particularly strategic position. Exactly because it occupies a strategic position other forces and other powers have attempted to invade and have attempted also to put some kind of indirect influence over the Kashmir territory. It is from that point of view, more than from anything else, that we should get together, the two neighbours who are primarily interested in Kashmir should solve most of these questions and have the issue determined by a plebiscite.

The argument that is put forward is that the plebiscite should be taken up now because Kashmir has acceded to India. Legalistically speaking, that argument is correct but it ignores a vital fact viz. that from the beginning we have given an undertaking that we certainly respect the will and the wishes of the people of Kashmir. I venture to suggest that if this question is solved in a statesmanlike and resourceful way by the two statesmen it would be possible for us to have a much better appreciation of the problems in Kashmir and there would be a much better appreciation of our standpoint that has been taken. I do think, Sir, that this is one of the main issues that we have before us for solution so far as Kashmir is concerned.

I think it has been the recognised policy of the Government of India that in all dealings, in all negotiations with Pakistan the representatives of the Kashmir Government will be there to participate in the discussions that take place. I think that is a salutary principle to observe because so far as the holding of the plebiscite is concerned, the major portion of responsibility of creating fair condition would devolve on the Kashmir Gov-

ernment. The other conditions that we have to satisfy before a plebiscite is held are things which have to be gone into at a great length and have to be solved with a great deal of firmness.

I venture to suggest that so far as the Indo-Pakistan problem is concerned we should try to get many of these tangled issues solved as quickly as possible so that it might be possible to build up a sounder economy and create a better understanding between the two neighbours who ought to be together and who together can play a noble and vital part in evolving a new leadership for Asia and South East Asia.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, hon. Members of this House have dealt with what I said so gently and so generously that I feel somewhat embarrassed. There have been certainly some loud and very very strident voices laying stress on some petty matter here and there, but generally speaking, hon. Members have accepted and approved of all the basic policies, aims and objects that we endeavour to pursue. Now, that is naturally very heartening, although it is sometimes said that if there is some kind of general unanimity one might very well doubt as to the validity of that unanimous opinion.

I need not, therefore, say much about these basic matters except to venture to put before the House that every single problem that we have to face—whether it is in the context, let us say, of the foreign establishments in India or of Indians overseas or anything else,—is to be viewed today in this big context of the world and of the major problems of the world. I have repeated this perhaps too often, but I do wish to lay stress on this fact. Some might imagine that each problem can be separated and isolated and dealt with in compartments. In the world of today it cannot be done. Every little thing that happens anywhere has its reactions elsewhere.

I suppose the two major problems, territorially speaking, of the world,

today are the future of Germany and the future of the Far East. They are the two big problems, roundabout which gather together all these questions of future war or peace. All other problems are secondary; all other problems can be settled or can be disposed of and they do not give rise to these major issues of war or peace in the world.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now, we are not directly connected with the problems of Germany or of Europe. We are in a sense not directly connected with the problems of Korea, but we are somewhat connected partly because we are nearer to them in many ways, and partly because problems of Asia have a way of acting and interacting among the nations of Asia. But whether we are directly connected or not, well, the fact remains, let us say, that something that happens in Germany or that might happen there is going to have worldwide repercussions. We are interested, we are connected in that way. Of course, we can do nothing about it—maybe, if some questions come up in the United Nations we may express our opinion. Then again, those two problems are connected very much with the question of rearmament. Now, it would be perhaps not becoming for me to express opinions about other countries—what they want to do or what they do not want to do. But it is rather odd that while, on the one hand, people in the world talk about disarmament, at the same time people also talk and indulge in rearmament. I think Acharya Kripalani said something about our not laying stress on disarmament. I am sorry if in the course of my previous speech I did not say anything about it. But the fact is that of course we do lay stress upon it; all along we have been laying stress upon it. It is of vital significance. It is, in fact, the other side of the picture. That is, once you lessen tension in the world, once people gradually, step by step, go towards some peaceful settlement, then you create an atmosphere for

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

✓ disarmament. Otherwise, talking of disarmament does not mean very much,—just as some ardent and enthusiastic people talk about world government, world federal government ✓ and the like. Now, I suppose there are many members here, certainly I am one of them who believe in that ideal very much more. Believing in it, yet, it seems to me at the present moment a very unreal thing to talk ✓ about. While on the one hand talk and prepare for war and these conflicts and tensions, on the other to talk about world government does not seem to fit in,—although it is a right ideal, I have no doubt at all. Perhaps it is good to talk about it so as to prepare people's minds. Anyhow, disarmament is most important, more important than ever before that is more important since the coming into the picture of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb. In fact, if by any manner of means, it could be laid down that the atomic and the hydrogen bombs are not going to be used anyhow, that itself would bring tremendous relief to the world, although I believe there are plenty of other weapons now unknown to those people which are almost equally bad and destructive. So, you cannot deal with any question, whether it is the Korean question or the German question or the disarmament question, almost any question, without dealing with the whole lot. You cannot separate them. And, therefore, if this House has to think about a particular question in relation to which we are deeply interested, we cannot isolate it from the rest. That is the difficulty.

The world has grown—it is an obvious thing which has often been said—so close together by various developments that both the power of doing good and the power of doing evil have increased tremendously. We are all the time sitting almost at each other's doorsteps, each country's doorsteps. There is no question of isolating one and getting about the other—it is there. And we have to choose ultimately between world co-operation

and world disaster. There is hardly any middle way left for any country or any of us.

Now, the United Nations was an earnest attempt to find a way towards some measure of world co-operation. If you read the Charter of the United Nations I think you will be impressed by its noble phraseology. I have no doubt that the fathers of the United Nations meant very well indeed. I have no doubt also that what they did then was perhaps the best they could do in the circumstances. We often criticize the United Nations—what it has done or not done,—but the United Nations Organization merely reflects the state of affairs in the world. It is not the fault of the organization or the charter, it is a fault of us, that is, individual countries and the states of the world, which is reflected in it. If it is not reflected, then it becomes something unreal, not in touch with what is happening.

There is some talk about the revision of the United Nations Charter. All kinds of proposals are coming in. Some I believe are good; some I think are not good. Some can proceed from that rather unreal point of view, of having some kind of broad document which does not take into consideration various obvious facts in the world. Facts, I said; here are the facts: that very few countries dominate the world today by virtue of their military or financial or other strength. It is a fact. It is no good telling those two or three powerful countries, whatever they may be, that you should abide by the majority votes of 20, 30 or 40 countries, little countries spread out all over the world. It is odd enough, as I mentioned this morning, for a question in regard to India's inclusion in this Political Conference to be decided by the votes of very estimable countries in Central America and South America. In terms of population, there is an enormous difference. In terms of territory or population, there is an enormous difference between those voting on one side and

those voting on the other. So you cannot have some kind of paper constitution, a democratic constitution for the United Nations because that ignores the facts of today. You cannot ignore that. That is why when the United Nations started, the fathers of the United Nations tried to make some provision for that. It was perhaps not a happy provision, but it was an inevitable provision at that time. Well, I am not going into this question of changes in the United Nations Charter which would come up in 1955, normally speaking.

But there is this basic question before us as to whether the United Nations, well, is a United Nations or is not—is it something else?—whether it is an organization which offers scope to every independent country to come into it, or whether it is a selective organization of nations representing some particular viewpoint, and closing its doors to countries not representing that viewpoint or having some different viewpoint. That is an important thing, because there is no doubt at all that when the United Nations were formed, it was intended to include all the independent nations of the world—there may be some doubt whether a nation is fully independent or not, but it is a different matter—because there is a tendency today to make the United Nations not an organization of all the nations of the world but of selective nations however eminent they may be. Now, if that happens, of course, that puts an end to the basic conception which underlay the whole idea of the United Nations. It becomes a group; it may be a powerful group; it may be a big group; it may be a 90 per cent. group; but it is a group. It represents not the entire world in a sense—though it would be unfortunate if that development takes place, because inevitably others that are left out form their separate groups, and then you have two United Nations, call them what you like.

Now, I wish just to deal with another matter, if I may repeat what I said. The basic fact is that when you

have, as you have today, power concentrated in a few nations, a very powerful country,—looking at it quite objectively,—has no great difficulty in coercing or influencing to the point of coercion a very weak country. When you have two, three or four powerful countries which cannot see each other what is going to happen? War may happen. It is an attempt at coercion, by violent means. Whether it is a good thing or not that is another matter.

We have arrived at a stage when it is patent that power is so equally divided, or at any rate it is not so unevenly divided, between the most powerful countries. I am not thinking in terms of ideologies and views, but am simply presenting the situation objectively. When power is not too unevenly divided, then you cannot coerce either by threat of war, or indeed by war itself. The result is that either you go in for the gamble of war with its inevitable and tremendous destruction, or you come to the conclusion that it is folly to destroy everything, destroy even what you are trying to get: you get nothing out of it.

In fact, if I may say so with all respect, every intelligent person can see today that war has ceased to be a successful instrument of policy in the big sense of the word. Of course, you may have war, it may be thrust upon you—it is a different matter. But generally speaking, it is not a successful or an effective means of policy, as it may have been in the past.

Therefore, the only alternative is to seek ways other than war. How can one do that? Well, first of all try not to interfere with each other, that is, live and let live. Since your interference is not going to lead to getting what you want, the obvious way of discretion is not to do something which leads you nowhere at all, except to large-scale destruction. It does not lead you to what you want to get. That means that one must accept the world as it is, and not interfere with each other, whether ideologically, militarily or otherwise. There may be petty conflicts, there may be all that,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

but in the major sense one accepts things as they are.

Now, is the world prepared to accept that position, in view of two very powerful nations, blocs, which look at each other with extreme suspicion and fear? I do not know. But I think there is a growing body of opinion, certainly in Europe.—I leave out Asia, because Asia is to a large extent outside that picture of conflict,—which is the centre of conflict, to live and let live, not to take these risks of war, etc.

We talk of great blocs of nations and all that. There is no doubt that where there are large associations, there are also differences of opinion among them, differences of approach in this direction or that, political, economic and others. So, let us not think of solid, integrated blocs here.

So, we get to this position that by any intelligent approach there is no virtue left in continuing these major conflicts. Now, for the moment, the current issue is the dominant issue in the sense that if it is solved, undoubtedly it would mean a lessening of tension all over the world. Even as the signing of the Armistice brought a lessening of tension, the actual conclusion of some kind of a settlement in the Far East would go a tremendous way and would encourage the forces of peace in the world. On the other hand if that breaks down, if no Political Conference takes place, obviously tension all over the world increases, not only in the Far East, but in Europe and elsewhere too. These are the dominating features of today. Behind them, of course, lie other matters, economic, trade, etc., whether you want to divide up this world into separate compartments not dealing with each other, not trading with each other, and so on and so forth.

Again, you will find in Europe, a very strong tendency in most countries of Europe, desiring a relaxation of these barriers, desiring trade between even countries which do not agree

with each other on other matters. I have no doubt that if there was such trade it would help in lessening this tension. I venture to put this particular aspect before the House again so that we might consider our other problems in the light of this.

Now, a few questions were put to me. Practically speaking the major point which was stressed by some hon. Members opposite was an old theme. In fact, many old themes were repeated today, but the major one was our continued association with the Commonwealth. I confess to a feeling of surprise at this constant reiteration of an empty theme—of something which may be, of course, talked about in language of eloquence and passion, but something which has no content. I say, I want to see the content in it: I want them to tell me the content: I was waiting and waiting to hear the content of it—but nothing; only as the hon. Member, Prof. Mukerjee said, 'contamination'—let us not be contaminated. I am afraid this is an old Hindu caste outlook coming in this business of untouchability! I said this morning that the terrible thing is that we are getting back in world politics.—not we in India, but all over the world,—this bigoted religious frame of mind without some of the saving graces of religion, and you see this business of untouchability, this business of not meeting, not talking. I am blaming any one country,—it is fairly widespread on every side. Now, this is not only a wrong approach, it is an approach which puts an end to the right approach, that is the approach to seek for a settlement. Obviously, if you treat the other as an untouchable, as something that contaminates, then obviously there is no settlement, you remain apart. You may have conflict, or if you subsist apart from each other you may do so for some time.

Now, take this business of this Commonwealth association, again. I should like to know, I repeat, what we have done, or what we have refrained from doing which we ought to have done, because of this Commonwealth associa-

tion^A I should like to know, because ✓
 that is the test, surely. There is no
 other test, except your likes and dis-
 likes: you do not want to be with
 them. This contamination business is
 another matter. That is no argument, ✓
 and if at all that is a wrong argument
 put forward. There are countries in
 the world which have been associated
 in the past greatly, and in the present
 somewhat also, with these old imperia-
 lisms and colonial domains, etc. Un-
 doubtedly so. There are countries in
 the present which have expansionist
 tendencies. I am not blaming them.
 Great power brings in expansionist
 tendencies, wherever it may be, what-
 ever ideology pursued by the country
 may be,—tendency to influence, ten-
 dency to bring round, tendency practi-
 cally to coerce other countries and
 come into line with them. That every
 day happens all over the place in the
 name of peace. What is that? Call it
 by any name you like. Therefore, I
 should like to know which of them—
 which of us—is free from blame. Are
 we blameless in all our actions? We
 talk about Indo-Pakistan relations
 and I have myself often criticised
 what had happened in Pakistan and
 what had happened in India, in the
 last few years. I have very often re-
 minded the House that we are open
 to blame and I am not able to say
 that we are blameless in regard to
 Indo-Pakistan relations. If we were
 completely blameless, then no amount
 of blame on the part of Pakistan would
 come in the way. That may be a
 theoretical proposition, but I think it
 is fundamentally true that ultimately
 if you are completely in the right, you
 will win through. But nobody ever is
 100 per cent. in the right—that is a
 different matter. I say that this busi-
 ness of trying to consider ourselves
 as pinnacles of virtue and others bad
 and not to be contacted with, is not
 either good politics or good sense. It
 has no real meaning. They come into
 contact with each other—the countries
 of the world in the United Nations.
 They smile and laugh with each other
 whatever they may say in their public
 speeches there. They come into con-

tact in their various chancelleries else-
 where—our Ambassadors are con-
 stantly doing, and rightly doing so.
 There is no other way to get on in
 this world. Therefore, let us not talk
 about this.

Also, if we constantly think in terms
 of the past, that is also not good. We
 never catch up with the present and
 never prepare for the future. If we
 are continuously thinking, let us say,
 what the British did in India was bad,
 it will produce complex in us and
 produce complex in other countries.
 Fortunately, I think it is an extra-
 ordinary thing that we have more or
 less got over that complex in India
 because of the manner of solving this
 problem with England. Of course,
 memories may remain, but it has been
 a major event for ages that this pro-
 blem has been solved so as not to
 leave any complex behind. So, every-
 body knows about Britain's imperia-
 lism in the past and the relics of it
 today. Other imperialism everybody
 knows; also of other countries today
 which are expansionist, which are
 even sitting on the heads of imperia-
 list countries of today. So, how are
 we do deal with it? Not by retiring
 into purdah ourselves, but we have
 to deal with those countries and deal
 with them not in an unrealistic way,
 not cursing everybody for the evils
 they did. I try to avoid this as far as
 I can. We ought to avoid mere de-
 nouncing and criticism of other coun-
 tries for their internal deeds just
 because we don't like them. We should
 avoid that on the whole. Sometimes
 those internal happenings may affect
 the human race—that is a different
 matter. Suppose there are some ques-
 tions in Africa. I have no desire, from
 a variety of points of view, to criticise
 any of the happenings in East Africa
 or North Africa which are not the
 concern of India, politically speaking,
 but there are two things that induce
 me to say something about this. One
 is the tradition of the last at least two
 generations in India. We have grown
 up, all of us, in certain traditions—
 anti-Imperialist, anti-communal, anti-
 racial domination and having grown

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

up in them one cannot easily submit to these things, but one should restrain oneself realising that constant talking and denouncing does no good to that part of our training. The other fact is that there are some things, if I may say so, which raise the question or the extent to which racial discrimination has proceeded in various parts of Africa and that raises a human problem of the utmost magnitude. When such human problems arise, then it is wrong to be silent. Therefore, we may have to say something—we may do it in a restrained way—because it is a sign of your strength and your mode of judgment. If you refer to these things in a restrained manner, it goes further instead of merely shouting about it, which is no indication of strength at any time.

So, coming back to this question of the Commonwealth and looking back over these 5 or 6 years, and especially during the last nearly 3½ years, that is to say, since we became a Republic, I have not a shadow of a doubt in my mind that our association with the Commonwealth has helped us and helped the causes for which we stand. I have no doubt in my mind. That does not mean that I approve of everything that happens in the Commonwealth. Obviously I am entirely opposed to everything that is happening in the Union of South Africa, but that does not affect my being in the Commonwealth. Am I to leave the United Nations because I don't like some countries thereof? I seek as many spheres of co-operation as possible. For instance, India functions in the Arab-Asian group. There is nothing to bind us to it. We function and go our way. We function with every individual country to the east of India in a very friendly way. Nobody talks about that. We function in the Commonwealth with complete freedom to do what we choose. How does this affect our freedom, I want to know. In fact, I think that our entry into the Commonwealth has enabled India to play a more vigorous role in our affairs and to advance the causes we

stand for than we might otherwise have done. I do not want to put it at a high level; we must talk and think in modest ways. Undoubtedly we do play a role in the world today. That role is all the greater because we work in various associations of nations, whether it is the Arab-Asian, whether it is the Commonwealth, and so on.

Shri Mukerjee read various statements and various articles from newspapers and from periodicals. It is an extraordinary thing, because certain of the periodicals that he does not approve of have said in praise of me, not from their point of view, nor yours and not mine. That in itself must prove that he had gone wrong. He also read from 'The Economist' where something was said about General Smuts and me. It may be he is thinking all that is right. Are we to know our actions and our policies by quotations from such periodicals and newspapers?

7 P.M.

One thing rather surprised me. Shri Mukerjee read from an answer that the Colonial Secretary of the United Kingdom laid in the House of Commons of the British Parliament. When some reference was made, a question was put about what I had said here in India—it was I think at a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee in Agra. I had said something about events in Africa. I did not mention any particular question of Africa, but I had expressed myself in fairly vigorous language about these happenings in Africa. And the question being asked, the Colonial Secretary gave the reply which, I think, Professor Mukerjee read out. The question was:

So-and-so "asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what representations Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have made to the Government of India regarding recent official public statements by leading Ministers which have led to an increase in the unrest and racial tension existing in Eastern Africa.

MR. LYTTTELTON: I assume that my hon. friend is referring to recent speeches by Mr. Nehru, in which occurred certain remarks about conditions in Africa. Mr. Nehru has been left in no doubt that Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom categorically reject these remarks in relation to the territories in Africa for which Her Majesty's Government are responsible, and deplore their possible effects on public opinion."

Now, if I may say a few words about this, I do not quite know what he means when the Right Honourable Gentleman says that he categorically rejects my remarks. I make the remarks, not he. They are an expression of my opinion. He might say he does not agree with them. It is open to him to say that. If I say a fact he might say it is not true according to him. But I do not understand when he says he rejects it.

Secondly, I should like to draw Professor Mukerjee's attention to this fact that this mere question and answer and what preceded it, that is in regard to what I said, might bring some light to him as to our position in the British Commonwealth. It might show to him how we function without fear or being forced into any direction against our own.

Thirdly, I would say this that just as the Right Honourable Mr. Lyttelton said that "Mr. Nehru has been left in no doubt that Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom categorically reject", may I say that Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has been left in no doubt as to how we feel about this matter. And there the matter rests.

We feel very strongly about them and we feel about them in spite of the fact that we do not wish, on account of international decorum and procedure, to interfere in other countries' internal affairs. Because, if that is done, then international affairs would gradually become a bear-garden. To some extent of course they do approach that condition. Even though

one does not object to things, there are some things one does, one cannot suppress. And in such matters we have expressed our opinion freely and frankly, not offensively or aggressively but freely and frankly. But I have no doubt in my mind that in expressing these opinions we represent not only, of course, the vast majority of the people of India but the vast majority of other peoples in Asia and, if I may say so, a very large number of people in England also.

So when hon. Members consider the question of the Commonwealth let them look at this. Does our association with the Commonwealth prevent us from doing anything which we want to do or which we ought to do? Does it make us do something which we do not want to do? I may leave out minor considerations; in the balance, has it helped the cause of peace in the world or not? I say definitely that it has helped—to what extent, of course, is a different matter. But it has helped. If we have been influenced by others occasionally, we have also influenced others very greatly. And that is what you can see in a variety of ways, how the voice of India, the opinion of India counts.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You were very helpful regarding the recruitment of Gurkhas. And that was the statement made by Mr. Nutting, Under Secretary of State.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not quite know. Mr. Nutting is no doubt a courteous gentleman who uses the proper diplomatic language unlike the hon. Member opposite. We were helpful in what? We informed the British Government that we cannot permit the continuation of any Gurkha recruitment on Indian soil. Well, this was, naturally, rather not very agreeable to them. It upset some of their plans. We said: we are very sorry, but this cannot go on. Then they told us, agreed;—they mentioned something about their applying to the Nepal Government. We said: certainly, you can do, it is between you and the Nepal Government, we do not come

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

✓ into the picture. They asked us whether a part of our agreement—the agreement in regard to transit of people in civilian attire—was going to be affected or not. We looked into the matter, and from every point of view we found that we could not, it would not be proper for us to, upset that agreement. All people in civilian attire, ✓ normally they can go. That is the measure of the help—apart from the fact that it was an agreement entered into in 1946, that is to say, before the change-over in India and all that. But it was a subsisting agreement. That is the measure of the help we have given. If Mr. Nutting has referred to it in courteous language, I do not know what inference Professor Mukerjee draws as to how we go about recruiting further or what we do about it.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram put some questions about the U.N. Observers in Kashmir: what are the duties of the U.N. Observers? Well, I am replying to this question without the book. I do not exactly know, but I think more or less I am correct in saying their duties are to look after the Cease-Fire Line. Then, why have they their headquarters in Srinagar? Obviously because Srinagar is a pleasanter place to live in than the Cease-Fire line. Whether they behave or misbehave there, is another matter. But, you can hardly ask persons to live always in an imaginary line in a wilderness or to put up an office there. But, it is true that in the past while on the one hand we deprecated any wholesale charges being thrown about,—it is not right that we do so,—in individual cases we have had to take note of objectionable activities. I am not talking of recent past; I am talking of the last 2 or 3 years. We have protested, reported and taken action. We have declared some observers *persona non grata*. They have been withdrawn. All this has happened in ones and twos in the past. But, because of that, I would not be justified in saying that all of them are like that. One has to, and certainly when I speak with some

responsibility I have to, weigh my words. I know of course, that in Srinagar or in Kashmir there are people—I am not talking of U.N. Observers; there are others—whose activities are highly suspicious. They may not be actionable as such. Sometimes, they are. Then, we take action. We do not publish all these things to the wide world. But, if any such information comes, if it comes to Kashmir Government, they will take action, and if it comes to us, we will take action. We shall do so. But, allowing ourselves to run away with the idea of some kind of wide-spread scare, I think, will not be desirable and will not lead us to understand the situation. We will imagine that some mysterious persons are creating all the difficulties.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram then put me the question, how far the Cease-Fire line is from Gulmarg. It was not quite clear to me, unless he meant it in relation to Sheikh Abdullah going to Gulmarg. I cannot give the exact distance. It is not far from Gulmarg; may be a few miles.

Some Hon. Members: Five or six miles.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be. Personally, I can tell him that I am quite sure in my mind that Sheikh Abdullah did not go to Gulmarg with any such scheme about the Cease-Fire line or crossing it. He went to Gulmarg, as he often did, for the weekend.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The point I made was: was it a fact that there were certain foreign elements there and Sheikh Abdullah met them on the night of the 8th?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not to my knowledge. I have no idea.

Then, Prof. Mukerjee laid great stress on our Red Cross units that was returning from Korea not being allowed to land in Penang, Malaya. I have the greatest respect for Prof.

Mukerjee. But, sometimes his facts are weak.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I quoted Major S. K. Banerjee who was reported in the papers as having said what I said.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Hereafter I will collect facts from the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is perfectly true that they were not allowed to land there. Nobody was allowed to land from any other ship because there was quarantine in Penang at that time. It had nothing to do with any other reason. It was quarantine period. If they were prepared to stay there long enough, they would have been allowed to land. They could not afford to do that. There was absolutely no question of discrimination or where they were coming from or whether they were Indians or others. The reason he gives is extraordinary: that because Indians and others had been carrying on a brave fight in Malaya, somehow, the landing of these people would have made a difference. I do not see how the argument follows. There is no doubt that in this case it was a sheer case of quarantine. That is why they were not allowed to land.

Dr. Syed Mahmud made a suggestion and I think it was vaguely supported by one or two others, about my convening a conference of Asian and African nations. This kind of thing is often suggested. But, it is not quite clear to me what people mean by it. One functions either in a governmental capacity, as the Government of India or as the Prime Minister of India or Foreign Minister, doing some such thing or approaching other Governments, or one functions in some kind of non-official capacity, inviting leaders of other countries. It is, of course, difficult to function in a non-official capacity when one is the Prime Minister or a Minister. Some years back, we had an Asian Conference here in Delhi: in 1947. That Conference was convened by us before any

of us were in the Government, as non-officials. When it took place we were in the Government. We had invited non-official organisations as well as Governments on a strictly non-political basis, on a cultural basis; because, otherwise, most people did not want to come. That went off successfully. There was another Conference convened by me on a special basis; the Indonesian Conference, at a particular moment when the Netherlands Government had started their second campaign in Indonesia. That was in January, 1949. It was a very special case and a very special position had been created. Even in the Indonesian Conference, which was very special, some countries of Asia did not come. Why did they not come? They sympathised, but, they did not wish to get entangled in these political problems. People do not seem to realise that if we had a conference of this kind, we would embarrass greatly every country that we invited. Some may overcome the embarrassment and come. Others will certainly not come. Not because they would not like to confer with us, but because of the embarrassment caused to them. Because, what does it mean? This kind of conference meets together to consider the world situation and issues challenges to various countries that this must be done and this must not be done. It is not an easy matter to do that this way. Normally a country functions in the diplomatic way. We send a *de marche* or *aide memoire* formally or informally to other countries and express our views. They send their reply. There are various informalities and formalities in dealing with other countries. This is not normally done: one country calling a public conference to condemn another country. People seem to get mixed up between the agitational aspect of the question and the governmental approach aspect of the question. I know this aspect is getting mixed up, because, all kinds of conferences take place, sometimes with right objectives too like peace.—Peace Congresses and the like where the agitational aspect and the governmental aspect get hopelessly mixed

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

up. I am not going into the merits of it. This business of calling for a conference is not the way Governments function. They don't. It may be the function of some small weak Governments who do not count. It does not matter what they say, this way or that way. Where a country values its opinion, it speaks with some dignity. This is not the way to speak in a dignified manner.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram put me a question and suddenly threw article 352 of the Constitution at me in relation to Kashmir.

I suppose it was some kind of a rhetorical question asking me if any one in Kashmir had invoked, or anybody has invoked—we here or anybody—the emergency provisions of the Constitution. Well, the answer, of course, is "No". Nobody did. Article 352 was not invoked. There is no question, in fact, of invoking it, and we have not interfered in that way at all in any sense. But, I should like to make clear, absolutely clear, that at no time during these last eight weeks in Kashmir has the Indian Army participated in the slightest; not a single member of the Indian forces in Kashmir has participated. Of course, it is true that, they are there both in the cease-fire line and round about in some cantonments, but I should like to make clear one thing: it is true that some of our Central Reserve Police Force, some of our Police forces, had been there, and they have been there, some of them, previously, because the Police force of the Jammu and Kashmir State are very small in number, relatively small considering everything and therefore, some of our Police was sent to them, and has been lent to them from time to time. In regard to our Army, some misapprehension has occasionally arisen because some years back we gave to them or sold to them some surplus uniforms we had here, and they were used for their Militia. So, they put on some of our old military surplus uniform, and maybe, sometimes, those

who do not know might mistake them for Indian Army uniforms.

Finally, after all, we come back to this, that in spite of the greatness and power of nations, they all seem to suffer from fear, fear of encirclement, fear of attack, fear of infiltration, all kinds of fears, fear of the Atomic and Hydrogen bomb on the other side; and unless one gets rid of that fear, any scheme of things that we draw up is not likely to give effect. I think I can say with some measure of confidence that in spite of our lack of strength in most ways that count in a country—we are, of course, nowhere in the military race; financially we are a poor country, and all that,—that we are not afraid of any country round about. Changes have taken place in the North East with China there. We sometimes have trouble with Pakistan and all that, and people seem to think, if you read some books or articles written in other countries, that because of these changes we must live in continuous apprehension and fear of something happening. Well, we don't. What is more, we are less afraid than the other great countries; and we are not afraid, partly because we have absolutely no designs on any other country; we are absolutely determined also to protect our frontiers from any incursion, invasion etc., however, wherever it might take place. Otherwise, we are not interested really, except in a humanitarian or a human way, what happens elsewhere. Anyhow, long ago when we functioned in our struggle for freedom without arms or anything, in some measure we imbibed the lesson of the Master not to be afraid, and so we carry on without fear to the best of our ability.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Out of the various amendments that have been moved, I have received a letter that the Opposition would like to divide on Amendment No. 18 dropping items (i) and (iii). I shall now put the amendment omitting these items to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“but regrets that it has failed to create conditions favourable for a just and democratic solution of the Kashmir issue outside the U.N.O.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same the House approves of this policy.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same, this House regrets that—

(i) in view of the fact that India and Pakistan have agreed to negotiate direct over the question of Jammu and Kashmir, effective steps have not been taken by the Government to curb the harmful activities of the U.N.O. observers in the State, and to secure their withdrawal from the territory of India;

(ii) even after the statement of Mr. John Foster Dulles about the price India had to pay for her neutral foreign policy, namely, deprivation of membership of the Political Conference on Korea, Indian troops have been put at the disposal of the U.N.O. for custodian tasks in Korea:

(iii) in view of the declared attitude of the U.S.A. towards this country, the Government have not dissociated themselves from the activities of the U.N.O. ; and

(iv) the Government have not taken effective steps to restore freedom to the people of foreign settlements in India by securing their merger with this country.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having taken into consideration the same, this House approves of the policy.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same, the House is of opinion that the policy pursued by Government will further the cause of peace and settle the question of Kashmir without resorting to violence.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

“and having considered the same, this House regrets—

(1) that foreign policy is being conducted on party considerations and is partisan in character;

(2) that it has succeeded to solve some problems of other nations but failed to solve our own;

(3) that it has attracted attention of all nations but failed to gain their real friendship.

(4) that it has failed to evolve a definite and consistent policy for Asia;

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

- (5) that it has led to misunderstanding rather than understanding of India;
- (6) that it has been tolerating pockets of colonialism in India; and
- (7) that it has failed to get the full confidence of the House of the People."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House regrets that the Government of India have not taken effective steps to mitigate the sufferings of Indian nationals residing in Ceylon, Malaya and South Africa."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House accords full support to the policy, and the steps taken in pursuance thereof."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House regrets that the motion does not underline India's special interest in a settlement being arrived at at the forthcoming political conference in respect of Korea and that the motion contains no specific condemnation of the policies being pursued by the British Colonial Office in Africa and by the Malan Government in South Africa."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, regrets that Government is not yet following a consistent and positive policy of peace, freedom and well-being of all peoples which is threatened by the Anglo-American policies particularly in Asia and Africa".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House endorses and approves the policy, noting with profound satisfaction the global recognition accorded to India's efforts in the cause of peace by the election of Shrimati Vijayalakshmi to the presidency of the current United Nations General Assembly."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy of non-violence pursued by India can alone solve the world problems."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy adopted by the Government of India, namely, that of non-violence, of non-

attachment with any particular group and of advocating and furthering the cause of weaker nations endeavouring to attain full freedom, can alone conduce to world peace, create friendly relations among the nations and bring happiness to their masses."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having done so this House approves of the said policy."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy pursued by the Prime Minister with regard to international matters is the only policy which can lead to lasting peace in the world and congratulates the Prime Minister on the

success of his efforts to ease international tension."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the Motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the foreign policy of the Government is neither neutral nor dynamic."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendments are also barred.

The question is:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration, and having considered the same the House approves of this policy."

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday the 18th September, 1953.