

its sitting held on the 23rd September, 1954."

OPINIONS ON INDIAN ARMS
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ghumsur): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Paper No. IV containing opinions on the Indian Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1954, which was circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st August, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION

PRESENTATION OF SECOND REPORT

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): I beg to present the following Reports of the Estimates Committee:

- (i) Tenth Report on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.
- (ii) Eleventh Report on the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

- (i) PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
- (ii) EMPLOYEES STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that up to the time fixed for receiving nominations for the election of one Member to each of the Committees, namely the Committee on Public Accounts and the Employees State Insurance Corporation, only one nomination was received in respect of each of these Bodies. As there is only one candidate for the vacancy

in each of these Bodies, I declare **Shri R. Venkataraman** to be duly elected to the Committee on Public Accounts and **Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi** to the Employees State Insurance Corporation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on Absence of Members in its Fifth Report has recommended that leave of absence be granted to **Shri B. Shiva Rao**, **Shri S. C. Balakrishnan**, **Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya**, **Dr. Susilranjan Chatterjee**, **Shri V. Boovaraghasamy**, and **Shri Biren Dutt**, for the periods indicated in the Report.

Do I take it that the House is pleased to grant them leave?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Leave was granted.

Mr. Speaker: The Members concerned will be informed accordingly.

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."

I confess that while I am supposed to deal with this vast international scene, my mind at the present moment is gravely perturbed by the grievous news, to which you were pleased to make a reference sometime ago, about the railway disaster in Hyderabad.

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

That disaster, a domestic tragedy which we have to face, led me to think of the much vaster disaster that might engulf this world if by some misfortune we were led into the ways of war. Of course, there was no comparison between this disaster,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

big as it is, and the other terrible happenings that might take place all over the world if, unfortunately, the world was foolish enough to enter into war.

Now, it has become a custom for this House during every session to have a debate on foreign affairs. If I may venture to say so, it is a good custom and convention that we have developed, because, for the moment, it makes us think of the larger issues that confront the world and see our own problems in proper perspective. Naturally, we are most concerned with our own national problems. They affect us; we are thinking in terms of building up our country and most of our time is spent in considering them. That is as it should be. But even in order to gain a proper understanding of those problems of ours in the national sphere, we have to see them in this world context, in this context rather of a changing, disturbed, perplexed and, sometimes, tormented world. So I welcome these debates every session during this House. It so happens, however, that these debates often become rather a repetition of what was being said. Although facts, new facts, occur and the world changes and new situations arise, often the debate follows a set pattern.

Some hon. Members on the other side will, no doubt, repeat this time, as they have done before, why is India in the Commonwealth? There are some set phrases, set grooves of thought, set ideas which are not affected, whatever happens in the world. Well, I find it very difficult to deal with those closed minds which have learnt to repeat phrases without understanding them even. So, no doubt, that would be said with great force on the other side. Nothing will be said or considered as to what our being in the Commonwealth means, whether it has helped us in our larger policy of peace in the world or not, whether whatever broad policies we have pursued or we want other countries to pursue are helped by a certain

action of ours, a certain step we take or not. Because, after all, we may talk about individual policies, we may talk about even important subjects like Goa or the French Settlements in India. They are important for us, of course. Nevertheless, even those subjects have to be seen in the particular context of the world and of the policies we pursue in the world. If we lose sight of these broad policies, then we may be right, we may be wrong in the particular action we may take in a special matter. But it will be inter-related to the larger issues. The point I wish this House to consider is this, that today there is a great deal of inter-relation in all these matters which affect the world. We do not interfere or wish to interfere with what happens in Europe. And yet, one of the major issues before the world today is what happens to Germany and to German rearmament, one of the biggest issues which will affect the future of the world, not only of Europe but of Asia, of the world. We do not interfere with that, but we have to understand it. We have to have some views about it and we have to see things in the proper context, in the context of other things. Naturally, therefore, we have to consider this entire picture, although our sphere of action is limited, limited to some extent by geography, to some extent by our resources and by our capacity, because we do not wish to talk in a big way when we know we cannot act in a big way. Therefore, we try to keep our talk in line with our capacity for action. We talk, I hope, in a modest way, because the problems are big and it does not seem seemly to me to talk otherwise, though, certainly I would, with all respect, suggest to other countries too, but so far as we are concerned, certainly I hope we consider these difficult and intricate problems in all modesty and all diffidence. They are intricate, and nothing is easier and nothing is more wrong than to oversimplify them and to describe the problems in the world by a slogan or a phrase. They are difficult problems

for every country, whatever they may be.

A short while ago, a development took place, a big development took place, in the European scene when the Government of France refused to agree to certain terms of the European Defence Community. They refused to join it as they had been asked to. I am not going to consider that question; I do not consider myself entitled to go into that matter or express any opinion. That is for the Government of France and other Governments concerned to do. But what I wish to point out is this: that looking at the reality of the picture, the Government of France and the people of France had to face a terrible dilemma. What was the dilemma? Right or wrong, they are afraid. They are a brave people, a highly developed people, but certain fears surround them, fear, let us say, of this great colossus, the Soviet Union—whether it is justified or not is another matter. Another fear is of German rearmament. They have had experience of the armed might of Germany.

Now, what are we to do? (*Inter-ruption*). I am merely pointing out, not the rights and wrongs of these questions, but how we are apt to simplify a problem and express our opinion as to what this country should do and that country should do, not realising the intricacy, the complexity of that problem as it faced that country, that Government or those people. So I endeavour to approach these problems with a certain humility and modesty and not be over-eager to express my view or my Government's view about matters which are of no direct concern to us; indirectly, of course, they all concern us.

Recently, certain major developments have taken place, more especially in Asia. The House knows, of course, about the Geneva Conference resulting in certain agreements in regard to Indo-China.

The first thing to remember about the Geneva Conference is this, that it was a conference to deal with Asian

affairs, Indo-China, Korea. In that conference, apart from the belligerents or parties directly concerned, no Asian country was present at the conference table, in regard to Indo-China. I am not complaining of that. I am merely pointing out the odd way in which things continue to be done. That is the conception that affairs of Asia are predominantly to be decided by other great countries whom we respect and honour. But, nevertheless, the fact is, this conception that the affairs of Asia could be decided or may be decided by other countries without much reference to Asia.

Now, you will see the reality of the picture. Because an artificial attempt was made or rather an attempt was made to deal with this question forgetting the reality of Asia and the countries of Asia, the reality crept into the picture. Although Asia was not present, although Asian countries, apart from the belligerents, were not present at Geneva, Asian opinion was always there for them to consider, Asian opinion, as represented by certain decisions or recommendations of the Colombo Conference, which, if I may remind this House, were largely based upon what was stated, what was suggested in this House early this year in regard to Indo-China. So, even in Geneva Asian opinion was there present—a shadow of it—and it had to be considered.

Now, Geneva ended with an agreement and the war that has been going on for 7½ years in Indo-China stopped. As we have often said, for the first time in many many years there was no national war in the world. A new atmosphere of concord, of relative peace was established in Indo-China. In Asia, tensions relaxed. Nobody was foolish enough to think that problems have been solved. Of course, no problem had been solved either in Indo-China, much less in Korea or elsewhere, but certain steps had been taken towards the solution of the problems, or, if you like, towards creating an atmosphere which would help in the solution of those problems. That was something and the whole

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

world, I believe, every country in the world heaved a deep sigh of relief that at last we were going at least towards some kind of peace.

Recently, another conference was held in Manila in the Philippines. We had been invited to that conference also but we expressed our inability to attend or participate in any way. Now, why was that so, because normally it is our desire to participate in conferences of our neighbour countries or in other countries and to understand other people's viewpoints and to put forward our own? Why did we not participate in the Manila Conference? Apart from every other reason, big or small—I should, probably, refer to some of them soon—it is obvious that our participation in the Manila Conference would have meant our giving up our basic policy of non-alignment. That is patent. Surely, we are not going to give up that basic policy, which we have followed for so many years, merely to participate in that conference.

Secondly, our going there would obviously have affected our position in Indo-China, as Chairman of the three Commissions there. We had gone there and we had been chosen by all parties for those responsible posts because we were thought to follow a certain policy. Now, if we change that policy and go behind that, our whole position in Indo-China would have changed. That would have been a very improper thing to do. That relates only to India joining this conference or not.

I have often wondered what was the special urge, the special drive towards having this Manila Conference and this South East Asia Treaty that emerged from it? What was the sudden fear that brought the countries together—there were some countries together. Was any aggression going to take place? Was the peace of South East Asia or the Pacific threatened suddenly? Why was that particular time chosen, just after the Geneva

Treaty? I have been unable to find the answer. Now, I understand that there are fears—I refer to the French fears on two sides—and their trying to balance which is the greater fear and how to deal with the situation. I can understand there are fears in Asian countries, in Australia, in New Zealand—may be in other countries roundabout—there are those fears. I do not deny them. It is no good denying the fact. But, how do we meet these fears, how do we get rid and how do we counteract them all or deal with the situation, so as to create more security?

Now, I put it to the House, has this Manila Treaty relaxed tensions in South-East Asia or increased them?

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Has it taken South-East Asia or any other part of the world more towards peace and security or has it not? I confess, I neither see any lessening of tension nor any advance towards peace. In fact, the reverse. The good atmosphere that was created by the Geneva agreements has, to some extent, been vitiated. Now, that is not a good thing. Has the Manila Treaty created any bulwark for peace and security? The Treaty, itself, as a matter of fact, does not go very far. Those who were of a certain notion, I presume previously, have expressed their opinion, if you like, in a more corporate way. It does not add to the strength of those countries, even increase the strength for their strength as such was there; it may develop a little more. So, positively, it has little contribution to make. Negatively, it has definitely added to the tensions and fears of the situation.

I do not suggest and it would be unrealistic for me to suggest that any country in South-East Asia or India should just live in a sense of, shall I say, false security. Nothing is going to happen and let us sing the song of peace and nothing will happen. I realise that responsible governments

and countries cannot merely behave in that manner. They have to take precautions for any eventuality, but, they should also, I suggest, fashion their policy so as to go in a certain direction and, if that is peace, in the direction of peace.

Now, another aspect of this SEATO or SEADO—Whatever it is called—is a curious thing. I can understand a number of countries coming together for their own defence and coming to some agreement and making an alliance. Now, this particular SEATO treaty, although the alliance or the agreement that emerges is not very strong so far as the military aspect is concerned, goes somewhat beyond those very countries. There is constant reference in that agreement or treaty to an area, an area not of the countries concerned, but of course, to an area beyond those countries which are parties to that treaty; an area which those countries themselves can designate: "this is also in our area". That, I submit, is a dangerous extension of this idea. I am not for the moment challenging or criticising the motives of those countries which were parties to this Manila Treaty. I do not know what their motives were and I presume their motives were to get a measure of security and I do not challenge that; but, I do submit that they have set about it in the wrong way. Now, they have mentioned this 'area', an area which is partly determinate and partly indeterminate; because the countries concerned can expand that area, if they so agree unanimously saying "this is also in our area", and if anything happens in that area—that is, even outside those particular countries or the treaty powers are concerned—they can take such steps as they feel like taking.

Our hon. Members may remember the old days—they appear to be old days—when Great Powers had spheres of influence in Asia and elsewhere—of course, the countries of Asia were too weak to do anything. The quarrel was between the Big Powers and they, therefore, sometimes, came to an agreement about

dividing the countries in spheres of influence. It seems to me, this particular Manila Treaty is looking dangerously in this direction of spheres of influence to be exercised by powerful countries; because, ultimately, it is the big and powerful countries that will decide and not the two or three weak and small Asian countries that may be allied to them.

Another fact I should like to mention is this: in this Treaty there is reference, of course, to aggression. One can understand that external aggression, but there is reference also to a fact or situation created within this area which might entitle them to intervene. Now, observe the words 'a fact or situation created in that area'. It is not external invasion. That is to say, some internal development in that area might entitle these countries to intervene. Does this not affect the whole conception of integrity, sovereignty and independence of the countries of this area? This SEATO Treaty, if you read it, a great part of it reads well. There are phrases about United Nations Charter, about their desire for peace, about their desire even to encourage self-government in colonial territories provided they are ready and competent to shoulder this heavy burden: all this is said and it reads well. But, I do feel—I have read it carefully—that the whole approach of this Manila Treaty is not only a wrong approach but a dangerous one from the point of view of any Asian country. I repeat that I realise the motives may be quite good. I repeat that countries in Asia as well as outside have certain fears and those fears may have justification. But, I say, the method of approach of this Treaty is a wrong approach and it is an approach which may antagonize a great part of Asia. Are you going to have peace in this way and security by creating more conflicts, more antagonisms and making people think that instead of bringing security you bring insecurity into that region?

Again, we have ventured to talk about an area of peace and we have

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

thought that, perhaps, one of the major areas of peace might be South-East Asia. Now, the Manila Treaty rather comes in the way of that area of peace. It takes up that very area which might be an area of peace and almost converts it into an area of potential war. So, all these facts, I find disturbing.

Some years back there was the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation created and when it first saw the light of day it was a defence organisation of certain countries associated in joint defence. I must say, at that time it seemed to me—well, I agree, not in any other matter—nothing but a justifiable reaction of certain countries who were afraid of certain developments to join together in defence. But, observe how this NATO developed. It developed geographically supposed to be the North Atlantic community, but it spread to the Mediterranean, to the coasts of Africa, Eastern Africa and to distant countries which have nothing to do with the Atlantic community. Internally too it began to extend itself. The various resolutions of the NATO powers, meeting from time to time, gradually extended its scope. When the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was first envisaged it was for defence, but gradually we find that it is supposed to cover the colonial possessions and all those powers also. How the maintenance and the continuation of the authority of those colonial powers over their dependent countries is a matter of defence of the North Atlantic community, is not quite clear to me. However, that idea extends itself and becomes a North Atlantic Treaty giving a protecting cover to the colonial domains of the powers concerned.

Recently, I hope this House will remember, a reference has been made by the Portuguese authorities that the North Atlantic Treaty covers Goa too in its wide scope. Now, we are not concerned and we are not bound down by any treaties to which we are not parties. We have stated that and

I am not quite sure if the North Atlantic Powers, or most of them, are quite happy about this assertion by the Portuguese Government that Goa is also their concern. What I wish to point out is this: how these treaties meant for a particular purpose might be understood gradually to extend their scope and nature and ultimately become something much bigger and wider than what people imagined them to be. Now, if the North Atlantic Treaty has managed to extend its scope to Goa, I wonder whether the South-East Asia Treaty will extend too. It starts at our doorstep; where will it go to?

These treaties, especially the South East Asia Treaty, take the shape of certain colonial Powers, of certain Powers not colonial in themselves but interested in colonialism and certain associated countries trying to decide or control the fate of this great area of South-East Asia. I think the world is too small now for any few countries, including the Asian countries to say that nobody else will interfere with us and that this area is our sole concern. I am perfectly prepared to admit that what happens in South-East Asia is also the concern of the rest of the world—not only of South-East Asia. But the rest of the world may be Europe or America or anybody and we have all to consult together; we cannot live in isolation. But I do submit that when decisions are made of vital significance excluding the views of the vital part of that very area, then there is something wrong in that procedure. I have said this about this South-East Asia Treaty Organisation because we have felt strongly about this. We have felt not that by itself this Treaty carries events far but the direction it takes is a dangerous direction; it is a direction which may not be obvious at the present moment to everybody but I have no doubt that, unless something is done to it, it will become more and more harmful to the interests of peace in South-East Asia and the world at large.

Now, I have said that there are dangers. People say: eminent statesmen have said in defence of this Treaty how can we trust the communist countries? How can we trust China or Russia? Others have said: how can we trust the other countries? Well, I suppose in the final analysis, no country can trust another country; or, if I may put it differently, no country should rely 100 per cent. on trust alone. It has to think of possible developments, changes in views and policies, etc. Governments change in democratic countries; in other countries too other forces may come up. Therefore, it is not a question of my trusting any of these big or small countries; but it is a question of our following a policy which is not only right in itself but which makes it more and more difficult progressively for the other country to break trust. We need not live in a fairy world where nothing wrong happens. Wrong does happen. But we can create an environment wherein it becomes a little more dangerous to the other party to break away from the pledges given. Surely, that is not only good morality but good commonsense.

I submit that all these statesmen, by all these SEATO and other treaties, create an atmosphere, the reverse kind of atmosphere. It is not a question of trust but creating an atmosphere so that the countries and the parties concerned have to keep in step and if they go out of step they suffer for it. According to the SEATO, you threaten them that if you do this and that, we shall take strong action. Now, this business of carrying on diplomacy by threats has not proved very successful in the past and it is not likely to prove successful in the future because you are immediately brought up to this. If something happens either you live up to your threat with whatever the result is—war, etc.—or you simply pipe down and do nothing which is bad after talking too loudly. So, this whole approach of threats does not help; it hinders; it creates a wrong atmosphere: it creates actually an atmosphere when the

other party need not live up to certain pledges given because you have broken them. Therefore, all this business—whether it is on the side of China or North Korea or North Viet-Nam, whatever it may be—has a certain result of putting fear in the other party and therefore, producing reactions of that type. And so also these alliances in this side.

The House will see how many countries in the world are getting more and more entangled in these alliances. There are a series of alliances of the Soviet Union, the People's Government of China, North Korea and some other countries. On the other side, if I may mention some, there is of course the North Atlantic Treaty, then the ANZUS—Australia, New Zealand and the United States; and there is the United States Treaty with South Korea, with Formosa—they are secret treaties presumably—and then there is this South East Asia Treaty—all these curious circles of alliances overlapping with some common factors. There is—it is not an alliance exactly—but there is the military friendship between the United States and Pakistan. Some of them are supposed to have common reservoirs and common pools. It is presumed that great countries involved in these alliances are cautious, wise and restrained and that they will not act in a hurry. But some of those with whom they are associated are neither cautious nor wise and they are all the time—as we know in the Far East—threatening—to War and all that. Now, as it is, one of these uncautious and unwise participants of these groups of alliances takes a rash step—it is quite conceivable in the world—and suppose one step leads to another and a big country which is roped in, though not liking that step, will be dragged in with the result that something happens. So all the circles of alliances are built one way or the other and because one big country is being dragged in, another big country is being dragged in. The whole approach that has been carried on for

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

the last few years has been fundamentally—if I may say so with exceeding respect to those countries—not a system which produces peace or security. I do not mean to suggest that countries should just live within themselves in the hope that nothing will happen; I do not say that. Let all countries—if they want to—be as strong as they like; let them even have understandings—even some alliances. But this whole system as it is going is trying to envelope every part of the world.

1 P.M.

Remember we have still got—I do not know what the developments might be—MEDO somewhere in the background. We may have sometime or the other some Far Eastern States Association. The whole conception is one which is no doubt meant to frighten the opposite party just as the conception on the side of the opposite party and the alliances are meant—may be—to frighten the other party. But, in effect, all this is producing such a tremendous entanglement that all clear thinking and clear action become more and more terrible. As I said, the evil deed of one country may drag in other countries. So, gradually, we are getting into a stranger realm, which reminds me of my early reading of *Alice in Wonderland* or even more so *Alice*, through the looking glass, getting all things upside down. We talk of peace and always prepare for war; we talk of security and take steps which inevitably bring insecurity; we talk of freedom and liberation and we come in the way of freedom and liberation of colonial territories. So, this trend seems to me to be unhappy. Again, I repeat that we must recognise the need to do something, not merely to wait till we are all swallowed by evil forces or other developments which we do not like. What can we do about it? I submit that we can do something about it and the way is to deal not amongst yourselves, because you are together, but to deal with the opposite parties. There are two

parties, and if both the parties face each other today, keep apart and merely threaten each other and combine with their own groups against the other, then obviously it is no way. It is only when the two deal with each other, as they did to a certain extent in Geneva, that you settle the problem. I do not say that settles the problem finally, but there is no other way, because remember the basic thing today, that we have always to keep in mind is that in the opinion of every intelligent person in any part of the world, war has been ruled out as a method to attain a certain objective. War is no good today. War is too dangerous, because the first thing it does is to put an end to your objective itself and put an end to you. If you rule out war as a method of solving problems, you must have some other way of solving them. It is no good taking steps which lead to war. Therefore, the only other step—I do not say it will solve the problem that way—is the way of peaceful negotiation and approach. It may take time, but it is better than war or even cold war. In Geneva, this was tried and it has led to certain satisfactory results. It did not go too far, nevertheless there are results. If these methods are adopted to the solution of the problems that face us in the world, you create a certain atmosphere, a better one, and you tie down the countries which may want to do mischief. They may still make mischief. If you think that communist countries are up to mischief, what is the best way of dealing with them? It is not by threatening them “unless you are prepared to go this way”. The best way is ultimately to talk to them, to talk to any opponent of yours, and if it is in the interests of both parties, some agreement will be arrived at. The House knows about the five principles which were included in the joint statement that we issued here when Prime Minister Chou En-lai came here. I do not think anyone present can possibly take exception to these five principles or any of them. What were they? They

were recognition of territorial integrity and sovereignty and independence, non-aggression, non-interference, mutual respect, etc. Can anyone take exception to that? And yet people have taken exception to it. On what grounds? Oh! they say "How can you believe that this will be acted upon?" Of course, if you cannot believe in anything, there is no fun in talking or writing and the only thing left is to live in isolation or to fight and subdue the other party—there is no other way. It is not a question of believing the other party's word; it is a question of creating conditions where the other party cannot break its word, or if I may say so, where it finds it difficult to break its word. Maybe the other party breaks its word and it is likely to find itself in a much worse quandary. Those conditions are created by the joint statement that was made both in India and in Rangoon and if those five principles are repeated by the various countries of the world in their relations to each other, they do create an atmosphere. That does not mean that all the forces of aggression and interference and mischief in various countries have been ended. Of course not; they are there, but it does mean that you make it slightly more difficult for them to function and you encourage the other forces, and that is the way for human relationship whether of the individual or of the bigger groups.

I submit that here is a question of South-East Asia. Obviously, the countries round about, especially like China, are very much concerned. Obviously, the way to have security there is to deal with China and the various other countries there and not sit down there, get angry about something that might happen and then take action afterwards.

Take another thing. One of the basic things that emerged out of the Geneva settlement was that Laos and Cambodia were to be, what is now called, the South-East Asia pattern of countries—this phrase is gradually coming in—in other words, should be countries not aligned to any group, or

to use a word which I do not like, 'neutral' countries. That was the basis of the agreement of Geneva, because on the one hand, the other Governments concerned, whether it was the French or whatever Governments on this side, were very much concerned at the prospect of Laos and Cambodia being absorbed or interfered with in any way by China and on the other hand, China was very much concerned that Laos and Cambodia should not be made bases of action against China, whether it is atom bombing or any other bombing. What was the possible way out? Obviously, the only way out was that Laos and Cambodia should not allow themselves to be used by either party against the other; that is, in a sense, neutral and that was the basis of the Geneva agreement. There was something added to it which was objected to, but basically, the agreement was that Laos and Cambodia must be considered as neutral States, and neither party should use them against the other, I am not quite sure in my mind that this SEATO agreement does not to some extent, go against that basic approach of the Geneva conference, because they have brought Laos and Cambodia in that area, to which I referred. There are these difficulties that have arisen, and I wanted to put them to the House because I feel that in spite of the advance made in Indo-China peace, we live in very dangerous times. On the east coast of China, recently there has been fighting on a fairly big scale in the Island of Quemoy and actually the mainland of China has been shelled and bombarded. But nobody knows when a petty incident might not grow into a big thing. It is an odd thing to think of. The island of Quemoy is, I believe, only a few miles from the mainland. Quemoy is supposed to be essential, presumably, to the security of Formosa and the security of other countries. Presumably it has something to do with the security of China itself,—it is right there at its doorstep. So, this kind of thing is going on. That is why I say that any action of the Government of Formosa or the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Government of South Korea might result in dragging in these Big Powers and these big circles of alliances may be all dragged in and war would result.

Now we may not be in the war. We have no intention to be pushed into any war and the only fighting we propose to do is if anybody threatens India. But let us be clear about it that if war occurs, it would be a terrible disaster for the whole world, including us, because the whole conception of war has changed.

Now the United Nations are meeting in New York. And the United Nations have, normally, a very big agenda; because nothing is ever taken out of its agenda, the agenda grows. But oddly enough the agenda seldom contains the major issues that concern the world. Whatever it may be, whether it is the Far East of Asia or Germany, these are not there. Naturally they govern people's minds there; they affect their decisions.

In regard to the United Nations, this House knows that we have stood for the People's Government of China being represented there. Recently the United Nations have passed a resolution that this matter will not be considered for a year or so. I have long been convinced of the fact that a great part of our present-day difficulties,—certainly in the Far East, but I would like to go farther and say in the world—is due to this extraordinary shutting of one's eyes to the fact of China. Here is a great country and it is totally immaterial whether you like it or dislike it. Here is a great country and the United Nations, or some countries of the United Nations, refuse to recognise that it is there. The result is that all kinds of conflicts arise. I am convinced in my mind that there would have been no Korean War if the People's Government of China had been in the United Nations—it is only guess-work—because people could have dealt with China across the table. It

adds to the complexities and difficulties of the world problems.

Remember this: that it is not a question of the admission of China to the United Nations. China is one of the founder-members of the United Nations. It is merely a question of who represents China. This fact is not adequately realised. It is not a question really of the Security Council, or anybody else deciding, as they have to decide, of new countries coming in. China is not a new country. It is a founder-member of the United Nations. It is really a question, if you like, of credentials,—who represents China, a straight forward question. And it surprises me and amazes me, how this straight forward question has been twisted round and made the cause of infinite troubles. There would be no settlement in the Far East, or South-East Asia till this major fact of the People's Government of China is recognised. I say one of the biggest factors towards ensuring security in South-East Asia and in the Far East is the recognition of China by those countries and China coming into the United Nations. There would be far greater assurance of security that way than through your South-East Asia Treaty Organisation, or the rest.

If China comes in, apart from the fact that you deal with China face to face at the United Nations and elsewhere, China assumes certain responsibilities in the United Nations. Today it is a very odd position. Sometimes the United Nations passes resolutions directing the People's Government of China to do this or that. The response from China is: "Well, you do not recognise us; we are not there; we are not a part of it; how can we recognise your directions?" which is an understandable response. Instead of adding to the responsibility and laying down ways of co-operation, you shut the door of co-operation and add to the irresponsible behaviour of nations in this way, and call it secu-

city. There is something fundamentally wrong about it. The result inevitably is that the influence of the United Nations lessens as it must. I do not want it to lessen, because, whatever it may be, it is one of our biggest hopes of peace in the world.

May I refer to one other matter? Among the causes of fear among the Asian countries or countries of South-East Asia, of this great country China, has been large Chinese populations in these countries. In some countries like Malaya, a very difficult problem arises. Now, all of us here, are I believe, in favour of Malayan independence. True, but remember this that the problem in Malaya is not an easy one. It is difficult, because oddly enough, in Malaya the people of Malaya are in a minority. That raises difficulties and confusion. Nobody is in a majority singly considered; the Chinese are in great numbers; the Indians may be 10 per cent. or 15 per cent. whatever it is. Now the indigenous people of Malaya are not at all keen on something happening which might give power to non-Malayans there. I am merely pointing out the difficulties which we have to understand. It is no good our thinking in terms of pure logic without facts. What I am saying is this. Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, Indo-China, Thailand, have large Chinese communities which rather frighten them. In the old days and up till now the Government of China did not recognise the right of any Chinese person to divest himself of Chinese nationality and a very peculiar situation was created. Sometimes there was some kind of dual nationality. That also was a factor in making the position of the Chinese communities in all these South Asian countries very embarrassing to that country. They did not know, just as a vast number of foreigners would, and when the foreigners of a country are almost fifty per cent. it creates difficulties.

An interesting development is taking place, and reference has been made to it recently both by the Prime Minister of China, Mr. Chou En-lai

and the Chairman of the Republic, Chairman Mao Tse Tung. The development is they say that they are going to consider Chinese communities living outside, well, not in the old way, but they will have to choose, those communities will have to choose either becoming nationals of the country they are living in, and if they do so then they are cut off completely from China, they have nothing to do with it, or retaining Chinese nationality and in that even they must not interfere in the internal affairs of the other country. That, I think, is a helpful move which will remove some of the difficulties and apprehensions in these South East Asia countries.

Let us take another matter. Let us be frank about it. Most of these countries are afraid, not of what Governments do officially, but what they might do *sub rosa* through the activities of the Communist Party in those countries. And the fact of the matter is one of the serious difficulties that have arisen in international affairs is that previously one country was against another; you knew where you were; there might be some people in your country, a handful who might sympathise with the other; two nations came into conflict. Now we have this new development that in national groups there are, what I might call if you like, international groups who oppose the national group and who psychologically, emotionally, intellectually if you like, are tied up with another nation's national group. That creates difficulties. In fact that is one of the essential difficulties of the situation. I am not discussing Communism, its theory and practice. I am merely pointing out the essential difficulty of the situation of all these countries. And if there was such a thing as the Communist Party in a country, that is a national Communist Party, that is a party which had nothing to do with another country, that is a different matter. It has got a certain policy, economic, political, whatever it is. It is one of various parties. The difficulty comes in because that party in your country is,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

as I said, intellectually, mentally and otherwise tied up with other groups in other countries. And the other country might well utilise that for its own advantage. That is the fear that comes to all these South-East Asia countries, whether it is Burma or Thailand or any other country; with the result, unfortunately, that problems, economic and other problems which could be considered by themselves get tied up with these extraneous issues, and different types of reactions are created. Therefore, I think that just as in the old days there was the Comintern, that international Communist organisation which was wound up some time during the last war, then later the Cominform which was, I suppose, something of the old type in different garb, I think that these organisations and the activities that flow from that idea have caused a good deal of apprehension and disturbance in various countries and nations. And now, as a reaction to this we have other forms of international interferences in national affairs growing up in various countries, not in that ideological way, but in a practical, governmental, *sub rosa* way. It is extraordinary how this kind of thing is growing in most countries, not on one side but in every side.

So we have, if you want peace in the world to come to grips with this problem, not by threats, not by having these treaties of military alliance and the like, but by coming to grips and coming face to face. Because if once you recognise, as I believe it is recognised the world over, what I said, that war is no solution of this—the two major protagonists are too powerful to be dismissed one by the other—if you have no war, then you have to co-exist, you have to understand, you have to restrain and you have to deal with each other. And the question of co-existence comes in. If you reject co-existence the alternative is war and mutual destruction.

Now I shall refer briefly—very briefly because I have taken up a lot

of the time of the House—to certain other problems, notably Ceylon, Pondicherry and Goa.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): And Pakistan.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: And Pakistan? I have nothing to say about Pakistan except to say—that I wish it well.

About Ceylon, hon. Members will be aware that in the course of another ten days or so the Prime Minister of Ceylon accompanied by some other Ministers is coming here to Delhi. The suggestion came from the Prime Minister of Ceylon that he wished to have talks with us, and naturally we said: you are welcome to come, we shall have these talks with you. I would not like to say much on this subject, except that I confess that I have been much distressed at developments in Ceylon and at the way the hopes that had been raised, of some satisfactory solution being found, well, have not been realised. And the question of a large number of persons who for all practical purposes are becoming Stateless, continues unsolved.

About the French Settlements, for the last two weeks or so, representatives of the French Government and representatives of the Government of India have been having consultations, discussions, and have made much progress in these consultations. They have been discussing all kinds of details too, apart from major issues. I hope that in the course of some days, or may be a week or two, these will be finalised and I hope that before the end of another month or so, we shall be able to take some formal steps. I should have liked to take the House into confidence more. But, it is a little difficult when we are discussing these matters with each other, to go into these details. But, I am happy that this difficult and intricate matter is being settled. Because however small in size Pondicherry and the rest of the places may be, big

nations, proud nations are involved. There is the pride and interest of India involved in not having any foreign territories in India. There is the pride of France involved, not to do anything which makes that pride suffer. We do not want that to suffer. France is a great nation. Whatever we want to do, we want to do in friendship and co-operation with France, so that whatever action we decide upon should, instead of straining our relations, make them better. We have chosen this way and I am very happy that this way is likely to yield substantial results.

We tried to choose this way in regard to the Portuguese possessions also. But, unfortunately, it has led to no result and what the Portuguese Government has done, in recent months especially, does not make the prospect hopeful so far as they are concerned. We are determined, however, to solve this problem by peaceful methods and we are convinced that we are going to solve this by peaceful methods.

Hon. Members have often expressed some, shall I say, dissatisfaction at our not encouraging Indian nationals who are not Goans, Indian non-Goan nationals, from entering these territories in large numbers. There is no, if I may say so, high principle involved in this that Indian nationals will not go there. The Indian nationals have every right to go there. It is not on high principle that we have done that, but for a variety of reasons. We did not think it desirable to encourage them, because, if we encouraged them, the aspect of Goans' struggle would be eclipsed, the aspect that it is essentially a struggle of Goans whether in Goa or outside, would be eclipsed. It would be said that non-Goan Indian nationals are doing it in spite of and against their wishes. We wish to make it clear to the world that it is Goans whether outside or inside Goa who want this association with India and to get out of Portuguese association. I think that gradually the world is beginning to realise that.

443 LSD.

In Goa itself, of course, it is a hundred per cent. police state. There is no question of meeting or anybody expressing any opinion. Papers cannot go, opinions cannot go from outside and the slightest expression of opinion in the mildest way against the Portuguese Government means long-term imprisonment, exile and all that, whatever your position. Even so, inside Goa, so far as we know, quite considerable numbers of persons have been arrested for some kind of *satyagraha* or otherwise. Outside Goa, in Bombay city, more especially, as the House must know, there is a large body of Goans, many of them occupying high positions in professions and in various occupations. It has been most encouraging how all these Goans, who are not, if I may remind the House, normally politically-minded, who are not politicians, who have not taken part in any agitation, professors, doctors and other people, on this occasion, in the last month or more, have come out—many of them may I also say, persons who have received honours from the Portuguese Government in the past—and stood for this freedom of Goa and its association with India. So that, we are moving forward; perhaps not as fast as Members would like, but certainly and surely in a particular direction. There are also, of course, certain economic steps that we have taken.

One thing I should like to say. On another occasion, I said something about some talks or negotiations which the old Hyderabad authorities had with the Portuguese. (*An hon. Member*: In the Council of States.) I am afraid that a few sentences I used there have neither been well reported in the Press, nor bring out correctly what the facts were. I should like to state more precisely what the exact facts were. I did not state them that there was any official negotiation between the Portuguese Government and the old Hyderabad Government. This was sometime before Independence, in 1945 or 1946. About that time, through other intermediaries there were talks about some

[Shri Jawaharla Nehru]

kind of joint control of the port and other facilities in Goa: not of the transfer of Goa as such. My whole point in making this reference was that the Portuguese were willing at that stage to discuss various matters concerning the internal administration of the port and others even with the then State of Hyderabad in early 1946. I believe, at that time, the Government of India of the day, that is, before any of us were in the picture, were kept informed too by the Government of Hyderabad. It is nothing very secret and we have looked up our old files. Nothing much happened, it is true, because other developments took place in India and elsewhere. My whole point was that they were prepared to have some talks then. The line that they have taken up recently is practically that there were no talks of any kind about Goa.

The House will remember, there has been some correspondence. The Portuguese authorities asked for some international observers to go there. We agreed immediately. We said, let us talk as to what their functions should be and who they should be. In answer, they said, no. They wanted to lay down previously before they appointed. We have plenty of correspondence that has been published and the result is that that matter has ended. We are prepared. We said, come and talk to us. Observe, all that we have asked is, come and talk as to what the functions of the international observers should be and how they should be chosen. They refused to come even then. Because, the fact is, once they talk, they cannot very well adhere to the action they have taken, because it is absolutely unreasonable. Therefore, they refused. There is going to be, I take it, no observation of any kind. The deadlock continues. It does not exactly continue in that way because other things are happening which inevitably, will put an end to Portuguese administration in Goa.

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."

I have received notice of a number of amendments. I would like hon. Members to indicate to me what amendments they would like to press. I will call them one after another.

Shri Jethalal Joshi (Madhya Saurashtra): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto endorses the foreign policy of the Government of India but, in view of the political developments in Pakistan and the Portuguese territory in India, is of the opinion that the Government should mobilise the country for unity and self-defence to meet any danger and thereby create an atmosphere of 'strength at home' along with 'prestige abroad'."

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves of all the steps taken by Government."

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that it is necessary to restate

the fundamentals from which the postulates of our foreign policy stem, so that differences within and misunderstandings abroad may be removed and the contribution we are making towards lessening of world tensions and promotion of world peace may be effective."

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—South-East): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that although in many respects our foreign policy has contributed to the securing of world peace and easing of international tension, yet it has some serious drawbacks which are not only contrary to the interests of world peace but positively prejudicial to our national interest and humiliating to our national dignity and honour. In particular, the House fully endorses the five principles embodied in the Chou-Nehru Declaration but strongly resents and disapproves of the policy of banning participation of Non-Goan Indians in the struggle for liberation of the Portuguese enclaves at the intervention of Britain, the continued tie-up with the British Commonwealth, the failure to secure the removal of all the United States personnel from the U.N. Observers Team in Kashmir and weakness otherwise shown in favour of imperialist war-mongers."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Reghura-
ramaiah. Absent.

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the

opinion that the Government of India should immediately declare that it does not recognise the sovereignty of any foreign nation in any of the foreign possessions in India."

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that the policy of neutrality followed by Government has completely failed and the Government of India should follow a definite foreign policy which would not isolate this country in world politics."

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto recommends to the Government of India that—

(i) the problem of Jammu and Kashmir should be settled forthwith; and

(ii) the question of Goa should be settled without international interference and the territory of Portuguese India merged with the Indian Union."

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves of the policy fully."

Shri S. N. Dass (Darbhanga—Central): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the

[Shri S. N. Dass]

following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves of the policy and further recommends that Government should take all possible steps in collaboration with other States concerned to thwart all moves to bring any part of Asia under cold war waves from wherever they might come."

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves of the foreign policy of Government which has not only enhanced India's prestige abroad, but has also promoted the cause of world peace by easing tension among nations and by propagating, *inter alia*, the idea of peaceful co-existence and of respect for each other's territorial integrity."

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves of that policy, but is of the opinion that, while the system of collective security sponsored by the Western Powers is not conducive to the easing of international tension and the maintenance of peace, the concept of co-existence enunciated by the Communist Powers does not enthuse anybody."

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that—

(a) Government has completely failed in its foreign policy by pursuing a policy of unnecessary interference in China, Indo-China and Korea affairs and thereby antagonising Powers which would have been helpful to us;

(b) the Government of India has done great harm to the cause of liberation of Portuguese possessions in India by involving itself in negotiations for international observers and placing a ban on the entry of non-violent *satyagrahis* in the Portuguese Indian territories;

(c) Government is persisting in its policy of weakness towards Pakistan resulting in danger to the interests of Hindu minorities in Pakistan and even threat to India's integrity; and

(d) Government has failed to take proper cognisance of threat to India's integrity by the Pak-American military alliance and has failed to make sufficient defence preparations to meet the threat."

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar—North): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto unequivocally endorses the foreign policy of India and puts on record its very high appreciation for the very able and sagacious manner in which

our Prime Minister has successfully developed and handled our foreign policy. This House is further of the opinion that our Prime Minister is succeeding in mobilising world-opinion against war and in favour of peace."

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad Distt.—North): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government in relation thereto fully approves of the policy."

Shri Thimmaiah (Kolar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the foreign policy of Government."

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the said policy and all the steps taken by Government in pursuance thereof."

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy pursued by the Government of India in relation thereto, fully approves of the policy, which has

succeeded in complete cessation of war in all parts of the world and especially brought about the cease-fire in Indo-China."

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto regrets:

(a) that in spite of professions of neutrality between two power blocs and allegiance to the idea of enduring international peace the Government has entered into serious economic and military entanglements with the United States of America and Great Britain, which will ultimately force India into war or to serve as the war-base of belligerent powers;

(b) that Government has not only not taken any steps to rid the country of Commonwealth commitments, but has taken steps to integrate the defence of India with the defence of British empire more closely than ever before;

(c) that by its policy in Indo-China it has lent support to a patch-up compromise which has only prolonged the life of French colonialism in that country, instead of stopping cold-war tension in the South East Asian region;

(d) that it has completely failed to build such peripheral defensive and mutual-aid alliances which would broad-base and strengthen the security of India against aggression; and

(e) that it has failed to uphold the dignity and honour of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon, South Africa and British colonies in general, including British Guiana, or to take any single effective step in the matter of

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

liquidating foreign pockets from Indian soil."

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the foreign policy of Government and urges that Government take suitable steps to propound and propagate the five principles enunciated by the Prime Ministers of India and China."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Raghuramaiah. Hon. Member must pay some attention to the proceedings of the House.

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali): I am not moving.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both the original motion as well as the amendments will now be taken up for consideration. Shri Asoka Mehta.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): I was a little surprised and pained when I noted that the Prime Minister thought it proper to begin his speech this morning by casting remarks against these benches. I do not propose to reply to him in that tone. I am anxious to take this opportunity to make a constructive contribution to this very important subject.

The basic premise of the Government's foreign policy—that of creating an area of peace and striving to enlarge it—has received national endorsement. As against the policy of increasing and widening consolidation of their respective blocs that the principal Powers have pursued, India has favoured and worked for the loosening of bonds, easing of tensions, encouragement of fluidity. When thaw sets in, the risks of cold war recede. Some years back, the powers thought in terms of cold or hot war alone. That today they think

in terms of cold war and its unfreeze is the measure of change that has occurred and the better understanding achieved, of India's aims and efforts. The policy of distension, to anglicise a French or an Italian word, necessitates not just non-involvement in bloc politics, but a confident, dynamic approach that loosens the bonds of bloc-solidarity that have been forged. The policy of fostering fluidity, further demands close understanding with our neighbouring countries, and the emergence of a common outlook, shared by us all, that is averse to consolidation and rigidities. That of the five Colombo countries, four kept away from the SEATO deliberations is a matter of no small gratification. It is a measure of the wisdom of the policy of non-involvement that the camp of peace is not just confined to the uncommitted countries of South and South-East Asia, but that its pressure is being felt, and welcomed, by some of the very constituents of the rival power blocs. The joint work and community of outlook of some Asian countries have enabled them to achieve better understanding with London and with Peking, and further,—and that is undoubtedly more interesting—to improve the relations between London and Peking *inter se*. To the extent the rigid contours of yesterday are relaxed and blurred, the prospects of peace are strengthened.

While our Government has been justified in seeking closer understanding with China, despite her military and political alliance with the Soviet Union, and with Great Britain, despite the Anglo-American treaties, it is necessary to extend a similar attitude to other committed powers, like Pakistan and Japan. If the United Nations is incomplete without the People's Republic of China—and that view is endorsed by all of us—it would be similarly truncated by the absence of Japan. It is amazing to find a lack of well-thought-out policy towards Japan. Free India, while abhorring all imperialism, was, surely,

never at war with Japan. It is strange that we sought peace only in the wake of San Francisco Treaty, and since then have failed to support Japan's claim for a proper position in the comity of nations and to work for closer understanding and economic co-ordination between Japan and the free countries of Asia. We cannot be a partisan of China against Japan. Our legitimate role is to be the reconciler. It is interesting to find the Secretary-General of the ruling Liberal Party of Japan declaring publicly that the U.S. foreign policy is a failure and that Japan would prefer to follow the British line. The situation in Japan is thus ripe for change, for a shift. The socialist forces there have a clearer appreciation of Indian policy. It should not be difficult to tilt the shift further, and get Japan closer to the policies of India, Burma and Indonesia.

Our country played no small part in hastening the freedom of Indonesia and has thereby drawn her firmly in our orbit of friendship. It is our duty to.....

Shri Kanavade Patil: I am on a point of order—whether an hon. Member who knows how to make very efficient speeches can read from his notes?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Those who raise a point of order must know the rules and regulations of the House. They must sit down. There is no point of order in this. The hon. Member can speak very well. He is referring to his notes.

Shri Kanavade Patil: He is reading from the notes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is reading from the notes, is it? I rule against him. Very well. There is no point of order.

Shri Asoka Mehta: It is our duty to help in a similar way Laos and Cambodia to consolidate their freedom and thereby extend and strengthen the arena of concord and co-operation. I am glad that Burma has established

diplomatic relations with Laos and Cambodia.

In the pursuit of our chosen policy, fresh dangers are emerging and our future success will depend upon our capacity to ward them off. "Asia for Asians" is an appealing, yet unwise, slogan. I cannot do better than quote here the words of caution sent to me from his sick bed in Vienna by our respected friend, Acharya Narendra Deva:

"Faint echoes of new ways have just reached me from India. It is the new slogan of Asia for Asians. I do not know whether it is just in the air, or has already begun to gather force, to take a concrete shape. It seems that Chou-En-Lai's visit has given birth to this new slogan. The cry will make a tremendous appeal to Asians throughout the continent, but we should try to understand it in all its bearings before we actually adopt it. To me it is fraught with great dangers, and if you feel like me, you should warn our countrymen while there is still time. India has lived long in isolation, and it will be foolish to shut ourselves once again, within the narrow confines of the old continent. The contrast of East against West is the creation of the Western mind, and the myth has almost broken down under the stress of world events. There is neither East nor West any longer. The world is divided into two belligerent groups directed from Moscow and Washington. It is indeed sad to reflect that two or three big powers have become the arbiters of human destiny. People everywhere hanker after peace, but you can have it only if these two or three agree, and that too on their own terms. We can ill afford to cut ourselves adrift from the life currents of other parts of the world."

We can ill afford to cut ourselves adrift from the life-currents of other

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

parts of the world. That concludes the wise counsel of Acharya Narendra Deva.

Another danger we have to guard against is the possible domination of Asia by one or two powers. Imperial Japan's attempt in this direction is too recent to be forgotten. Any effort at elaborating a consultative or wider machinery like the Colombo Conference or the proposed Afro-Asian Conference must guard against the danger of domination. The failure of the United Nations is considerably due to the statutory domination by the Great Powers. We must be vigilant against these proclivities and tendencies, and deliberately favour the organisation of a concert of nations, all free and equal, valuable for their unending diversities. We must proclaim to the world what we have failed to proclaim so far, namely that peace presupposes erosion of the very concept of Great Power.

While closer understanding should grow with Britain, it would be dangerous to permit it to swerve us from the fundamentals, such as opposition to colonialism. It is disquieting to find that at the Colombo Conference, where the main attention was concentrated on South-East Asia, India failed to raise the question of the freedom of Malaya. While the freedom of Tunisia was asked for, and rightly, the question of Malayan independence and the fact of British occupation forces numbering 1,30,000, were left shrouded in silence.

I believe, another basic ingredient of our international policy ought to be to strengthen the position of small countries and enlist their spontaneous co-operation. Here is room for considerable thought and improvement. I am surprised at the failure to get the Prime Minister of Nepal invited to the Colombo deliberations. His gallant country boasting of centuries of freedom would have enriched the Colombo deliberations.

There is another aspect of the question to which Acharya Narendra

Deva has drawn attention with his characteristic forthrightness.

"We want to remain on the friendliest terms with China"

writes Acharya Narendra Deva, and he adds:

"In the matter of attitude towards her, we shall have to be guided by the wishes and interests of Socialist Burma, our closest ally."

I believe our friendship with big nations should depend upon their willingness and efforts to disarm suspicion and fear among free neighbouring small nations.

In this connection, particularly because our record is irreproachable, we are entitled to ask of the People's Republic of China to so re-orient its policy as to disarm fears. The ten million overseas Chinese, occupy important strategic, economic and political positions in the neighbouring eight countries of South-East Asia. We are told that the policy is likely to be revised, that the policy of dual nationality that has been pursued so far is today under revision. Peace in Asia depends to a considerable extent upon how the Indians and the Chinese overseas decide to integrate themselves into their adopted countries. As far as India is concerned, we have blessed that policy, and we have been encouraging Indians elsewhere to become nationals of the chosen countries. Most of our difficulties arise from the fact that we are anxious that Indians should become nationals of the chosen countries. We are entitled to point out to China that there are incidents, that there are happenings today, which do not give us, at least which do not give these small countries, a feeling of confidence. Only recently, a fugitive from Nepal, Shri K. I. Singh was feted in China. The exiled Thai leader, Nai Pridi, even today continues to broadcast from the Peking Radio, appeals to revolt against the established government in Thailand. These moves do not help to remove fears and suspicions, particularly

among the small nations on the periphery, who have long been the victims of the tragic logic of *matsya-nyaya* that has disfigured international relations throughout.

Prime Minister Chou En-Lai said during his visit to India:

"The menace to the peace of Asia comes from outside."

I am sure that it was his honest belief. But our efforts as strengthening the area of peace and mutual aid will succeed only to the extent we are able to invite China, and perhaps Japan too, to realise that it was at the instance of the small countries that the Colombo Conference was constrained to resolve:

"The Prime Ministers affirmed their faith in democracy and democratic institutions, and being resolved to preserve in their respective countries the freedoms inherent in the democratic system, declared their unshakable determination to resist interference in the internal affairs of their countries by external communist, anti-communist, and other agencies."

Our Prime Minister has been emphasising the five principles of the Sino-Indian Treaty on Tibet. These principles are undoubtedly welcome, but when it is realised that Tibet, whose people are alien to the Chinese in race, language, culture and religion, and who have received their Buddhism from India, whose script was devised by Indian pandits and whose culture contacts with India spread over centuries, is described in that very Treaty as 'the Tibet region of China', the valuable principles lose much of their motive power.

A more recent development that claims our attention is the establishment of the SEATO. Most of the free Asian countries absented themselves from the Manila deliberations. The countries that attended the Conference ultimately agreed; the pressure of circumstances led them to agree to form an organisation much looser and sans teeth than the NATO. The

organisation has not only looser texture, but keener awareness of its basic weakness, i.e., its close association with colonialism. This 'me-too-ism' of the SEATO is a tribute to the growing influence of the policy that the free and the democratic countries are striving to pursue.

The Prime Minister was right in describing these various pacts, NATO, ANZUS, SEATO, etc., that litter the world, as interlocked arrangements filled with danger to mankind. Interlocking is obnoxious in politics as it is in economics. But surely, monolithic hold, chinkless monopoly, is no better. The Sino-Soviet bloc, stretching from East Germany to North Korea and Viet Minh, provides little assurance to peace. President Mao Tse Tung has rendered no service to the cause of peace or the five principles, when he declared recently that alliance with the Soviet Union is the sheet-anchor of Chinese foreign policy. Let us hope that our Prime Minister's visit to Peking will make the ancient city realise that the best solvent of inimical interlocking is loosening the bonds of one's own blocs.

We are all greatly cheered by the visit of the Prime Minister of Indonesia. His enlightened statesmanship offers a new source of hope to the resurgent people of Asia. But danger still looms over Indonesia. The communists there hope to entrench themselves, and enmesh other parties. The counter-forces are being rallied round the cry of Islam. In the sordid world of power politics, there is the danger of an arc of antipathy, a crescent of pseudo-Islam, surrounding India, and stretching from Turkey to Indonesia. Let us not treat the prevailing Indian summer of 'distension' as the decisive change in the political climate.

To guard against these possible dangers, three positive steps need to be taken. Firstly, greater attention must be given to economic co-operation and mutual aid among the Colombo and allied countries. The Colombo Conference approved in principle the proposal of Prime Minis-

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

ter Nu, and that proposal has been referred for further consideration to the governments assembled there. We have pioneered in inter-state political relationships based upon freedom, equality and mutual respect. Now, it is up to us to map out new areas of economic co-operation and mutual aid, based upon the same exalted principles.

2 P.M.

We have learnt from our great leader and master that principles are universal. In the course of the historic movement he led, he taught us the value of equality and freedom. The fight against colonialism is a fight for change in status, and enlargement of freedom. Inside a country too, these principles apply. We must never be misled by the loud advocacy of the champions of social change that freedom is a mirage, nor must social change be allowed to clog up because of the croakings of freedom-firsters. If colonialism robs people of their national freedom, totalitarianism robs them of their political and personal freedom. The peace we seek, the peace that Gandhiji taught us to cherish, is peace that counters and combats colonialism as well as totalitarianism. There can be no co-existence with these vicious manifestations of the pursuit of power and pelf.

The world is in a bad shape today, because of its frenzied pursuit of power, of strength. Gandhiji taught us to abhor that kind of strength. I am amazed when I hear our people, responsible people, talk of strength, rapid industrialisation, building up of military might. That is the goal to which the roads from Washington and Moscow reach alike. Our goal is different. The patterns and purposes of our internal policies have got to be different. Administrative devolution, decentralised economy, production by small unit machines, State as not a sovereign but a servile institution, not the apotheosis of one leader but distribution of power and respect among innumerable authorities

are not empty words or traditional *mantrams*. They are the sole means of freeing man from his corrosive anxieties and alienations. If Asia and Africa are to be spared the weary journeys of capitalism and communism, India must realise that she must shape her policies on the traditions and the teachings of our master. It is because we see a tragic dissonance between external and internal policies of our Government, because we discover divided loyalties to the prince of peace and the moloch of strength, that we feel sad and unfulfilled.

A word about the foreign settlements in our country. The people of Pondicherry are restive for a definite pronouncement of their emancipation. How long, how much longer, must the people mark time outside the portals of freedom?

Negotiations with Portugal have filled a sad chapter in our history. The negotiations were initiated on the 27th February 1950. After four and a half years, we are where we were. The Portuguese Government have charged us with aggression, blackmail and all kinds of other crimes. To cap everything, the Goans have been left by our Government to fight their own battle. That is what Salazar wanted. His proud boast has been, to quote his words, "Try as you may a Portuguese from India, a Luso-Indian cannot be confused with a native of the Indian Union. All who visit Goa coming from the Union cross not merely a political frontier but also a human frontier, an original creation of a western civilisation, oriented by contact with the millennial culture of India". A capricious boundary, an accident of history, is turned into 'a human frontier'. The Prime Minister's policy has given strength to this atrocious distinction.

We are told that the Goans alone can fight for Goa. But even that is not allowed. On the 15th August, when 1,200 volunteers marched on Daman, there were among them 200

volunteers from Nagar-Haveli, a liberated enclave. Even these 200 were refused permission to march into Daman. With the rest they too were stopped by the Indian police.

It is good to negotiate. It is wise to be patient. Our patience is proverbial, but as Gandhiji told us in parallel circumstances, let it not be said that our patience is that of a coward.

Shri Raghuramalah: I do not pretend to be a Hamlet capable of philosophising 'to be or not to be'. I have a few clear notions about what I want and what I want this country to do. The previous speaker has been talking about Japan, about Nepal, about so many countries, raising so many problems which, I must say frankly, have confused me much. Oftentimes while listening to him, I was wondering whether I was listening to a debate on rationalisation or decentralisation or on foreign policy.

An Hon. Member: What is it? *(Interruption).*

Shri Raghuramalah: I have got confused and if Acharyaji can clarify it subsequently in his speech, I will be very grateful. I must confess I was confused whether I was listening to a debate on foreign policy or not.

I happened to be quite recently to some of these South-East Asian countries and the impression left in my mind in all those countries was not that India overlooked the problem of any country in South-East Asia but that India has been very much looking beyond her borders helping the solution of problems that confront every other country in South East Asia. Taking the case of Japan, about which Mr. Asoka Mehta has spoken in such solicitous terms, they are really very grateful to this country; the rank and file of the Japanese are really very grateful to this country for the manner in which we have dealt with them after the last war. It should be remembered that Japan, unfortunately, is not today in the same position as it was before, is not

in a position where she can express her ideas freely and frankly without some other powerful nation being offended. In spite of that, the common man in the street does not hesitate to express admiration for the wonderful manner in which India stood by Japan at the time the question of the treaty with Japan came under discussion. We did not join the treaty which the United States proposed, deliberately, because we wanted to pursue a different path consistent with the status and dignity of a fellow South East Asian country.

Now about Nepal. I really do not know how sometimes Members get confused. Probably the recent floods which have affected India and Nepal equally badly are responsible for the confusion. From what little I understand about Nepal's foreign policy it seems to me that the vast majority of the people in Nepal wholeheartedly approve the foreign policy which this country has adopted. Their Foreign Minister has said so on innumerable occasions, and whatever we do is admitted on all hands to be not merely for the good of this country but for the good of the whole of South-East Asia.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): Of the world!

Shri Raghuramalah: I will answer the next point, the next problem which was posed during the last speaker's speech which was, 'why do we distinguish between the East and West? Where is East? Where is West? There is no longer East there is no longer West or something like that. Well, it is really nice to hear that because, you know, it is really confusing—this East and West business—and none of us really likes that. But everyday it faces us. Wherever we go, we are regarded as people of the East. We are looked down as people of Asia. You cannot get over that by merely reading a speech that we are no longer in Asia. Asia is Asia, Europe is Europe, East is East and West is West. We cannot get over that by reading a speech.

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

We have to see our environment, the circumstances in which we live, the geographical area in which we are, and we cannot simply alienate ourselves from all this and go into a philosophic ecstasy. I mean it is impossible. We cannot help calling ourselves Asians. Today, it is not possible for any country to think exclusively for itself. It is a question of neighbouring countries, equally situated, equally exploited, organising themselves, trying to defend themselves and trying to forget 400 years of exploited history. Asia, since the last 400 years, has been slumbering, has been sleeping. It has been exploited, economically, politically and in every possible way by other nations, and now after a lapse of 400 years Asia is on the wake and we cannot but be conscious of it. However much we want to philosophise, we cannot forget the fact that we are in Asia. The freedom of every country in Asia is naturally therefore more precious to us than anything else. It is in that context that we have to see the SEATO Pact.

The SEATO Pact has, curiously enough, a little chapter at the end called the Pacific Charter. It is, to my mind, one of those tempting baits which those who want to fish Asian nations have placed before us. It refers to the economic upliftment of the various countries of Asia and also to the promotion of their freedom. Actually, Sir, when you read the next clause, you will see how hypocritical these pretensions are.

I am referring first of all to clause 1 of the Pacific Charter, in which, in very glowing terms, they pay tribute to the promotion of self-government and independence of all countries whose people desire it. But, in clause 4, the signatories, which include Great Britain, France and U.S.A. proceed to say that as decreed in South-East Asian collective defence treaty they are determined to prevent or counter by proper means any attempt in the treaty area to destroy their sovereignty or territorial integrity. I

would like to know what is the territorial integrity of Great Britain in this area. Will it not tomorrow assert this in favour of the retention of its colonial rule in Malaya? Will not France depend on this for the retention of her colonial rule in those few possessions in Asia? It is, therefore, Sir, nothing but an eye-wash. The Pacific Charter is too pacific, it is too soft. It is merely an eye-wash to attract the Asiatic nations to come into the grip of Manila Treaty. The only reply which can be given and which should be given is what is given by India because in our own history we have had an awful experience of these European nations trying to protect the various groups which then inhabited this vast sub-continent. You will recollect, Sir, how the Portuguese, the French and the British came, first set up their small business establishments and slowly tried to enter into various entangling alliances with the native rulers, pretending to protect them, to defend them, to help them against aggression by other Indian rulers, with the result, that, in course of time, the Indian rulers became so dependent on these foreign Powers that by and by the foreign Powers simply swallowed them. And, with these Manila Treaty signatories pretending to protect the various small Powers in Asia, the prospect is going to be the same. The main object of the Manila Treaty is to divide Asia, is to encourage dissensions among the Asiatic Powers. It is a direct reply to the recent upsurge of Asian nationalism. It is a direct hit at their unity and the only proper reply is what our Prime Minister has given. We cannot be a party to it.

Then, what is the alternative? It is really a very serious question. To many of us, it seems that the only possible alternative, the only possible reply for this can be the conference which is now proposed of the countries of Asia and Africa, to which the Indonesian Prime Minister has made a reference recently when he visited this country. What should be

the scope and object of this conference? I would suggest with the greatest humility that, apart from mere theorising, the one practical approach which this conference should make is to the question of colonialism in Asia and Africa. There must be a definite declaration by the Powers of Asia and Africa that they will not tolerate colonialism anywhere. I would go a step further and suggest that they should undertake to give all possible positive help to each other in liquidating colonialism. It is most surprising, nay Sir, it is humiliating that Pakistan should give encouragement to the Portuguese in Goa. Pakistan was a signatory to the statement by the Colombo Powers that they stand against colonialism in Asia. In spite of that, we hear and we read in the newspapers recently that Portuguese troopships coming to Goa were given shelter in Pakistan and not only shelter, Pakistan is actually giving economic help to Goa. This attitude on the part of some of the Asian Powers has got to be stopped, at any rate condemned, at the forum of public opinion of Asia and Africa. I would, therefore suggest that, at the proposed conference, there should be a declaration that the signatories not only will not tolerate any longer colonialism either in Asia or in Africa but that they would even go a step further and see that mutual help is rendered to liquidate colonialism and colonial pockets.

The second suggestion I would make is that there should be an equally vehement and equally determined declaration that the Asian and African Powers will no longer tolerate the racial superiority of the white man in some of these territories. We, Indians, have suffered by this policy in Africa but, perhaps, our grievances should not be so very grave as those of the Africans themselves, who, in their own countries are treated as worse than slaves. We have got to make common cause with the Africans in this matter and, racialism wherever it appears, whether it is in Asia or Africa, the peoples of Asia and Africa have got to put their foot down and say, we shall no longer tolerate this

racial arrogance of some of the European Powers in any part of these continents. Also, Sir, we should invite China.

I would earnestly urge that China be invited to this conference. Apprehensions against China today, to which the Prime Minister has referred this morning, are genuine. They are to be found in most of the countries bordering on China and it is now the primary duty of China to remove those apprehensions, to make it clear to those countries that she has no ideas of aggrandisement at their cost, that she will implement in actual practice the theory of mutual respect. Our Prime Minister has, this morning, referred to the international character of some of the political parties. I do hope that China will come forward with a positive and clear statement that she has no sympathy for those distant cousins in these countries. When China makes that declaration, then, there can be no scope for any apprehension on the part of the Asiatic Powers, her Asiatic neighbours.

It is a pity she could not be invited to the Colombo Conference. Probably, at that time, the situation was not so ripe; but, I do hope that the forthcoming Asia-Africa conference she would be invited so that the whole of Asia would be represented there. It is amazing that 600 millions of people should be treated as un-touchables. With what little I saw of China, I must say—whatever be the dreams of our American friends—and I am deeply convinced of it—that politically Chiang-Kei-Sheik is as dead as my grandfather. He cannot be restored to power in China. Nobody wants him in China and nobody can give him life politically speaking so far as the mainland of China is concerned. (*Laughter*). In fact, on any reference to Chiang-Kei-Sheik people in China used to laugh as you are now laughing. I mean he has become the scapegoat of many a huge joke in China. The fact is that the Chinese people, as a whole, *en masse* regard the present regime as the one most suited to them, as the one which

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

will give them that status internationally political and economic as is consistent with a great nation, which they believe they are. And, you have got to respect that feeling and so long as the United States pursues this mirage that Chiang-Kei-Sheik's Formosa can be overnight converted into the huge land mass of China, so long as United States persists in that, we can only be sorry for that hallucination. This hallucination is at our cost, is at the cost of the peace of the world. And, I do feel that like India the other South-East Asian Powers should also emphasise more and more that China cannot be any longer ignored. We must make that a condition precedent for the settlement of any international issue. I am glad, and in fact all of us are glad, that recently Mr. Attlee, the Labour leader, has found it possible to visit that country and has given a clear opinion that so far as China is concerned, there can be no question of Chiang-Kei-Sheik coming back to power. It is sometimes surprising how, nations which are the approved leaders of the world, like the United States, can have those hallucinations. It is for them to be a little more practical. They attack countries like the Soviet Union as being propagandists, propagating certain rigid ideas throughout the world, as being committed to rigid faiths, but, I do not know how to describe the attitude of United States itself in this matter. Is it not extreme rigidity to consider the admission of China as a closed affair? We must stop the mischief, which is being done by the exclusion of China, by making it one of the invitees to the Asia-African Conference, so that the Asia-African Conference can really represent the whole of Asia and the whole of Africa, and I do hope the conference will help us to solve the various problems confronting us and especially to liquidate the last remnants of colonialism throughout Asia and Africa. Here, in this country, sometimes we are impatient and that is I think one of the

penalties which we have to pay for democracy. When I was in China, I asked one young man—in fact many whom I met here and there—how they viewed the existence of Hong-kong, Makov and other foreign settlements in China and why they do not liquidate them. We often forget that these foreign possessions are to be found spread over in Asia even today. I was surprised at the answer that was given. The young man said that “the time for the historic process has not yet come and we have got to wait”. I know that is what their leaders said and the whole of the Chinese nation believes in it. They have patience to wait for their chance. They know when it is good to make a move on the international scene and they do not hide that fact, whereas some people in this country, people like Mr. Asoka Mehta, great men as they are, they are very impatient. They want today to jump into Goa. As to what will happen they are not bothered. They will have the chance to move adjournment motions, I am sure, and they will have the chance, under rule 215, to ask for a statement to be made by the Prime Minister. What happens if a hundred people are shot down in the streets of Goa? We want to secure freedom for the people of Goa but in good time consistent with the foreign policy of this country, and consistent with the dignity of this country and that we will succeed is abundantly clear from the progress we have made with our talks with the French. You might recollect that the French people too were at one time rather reluctant to part with their possessions. Public memories are short, but I remember myself having tabled short notice questions about happenings in Pondicherry. It all now looks like an old, old chapter to be forgotten. I am sure if my friends on the other side show that little bit of Chinese patience and wait for events to turn up, rather than hustle us into dangerous action, they will find that our dividends in respect of Goa will not be any less than what we are likely to have in respect of Pondicherry.

One thing is definite and it should not be forgotten—Asia is on the march. Those of you who have studied history will realise what wonderful changes have come on this landmass of Asia after a lapse of four hundred years. Two hundred years ago nobody would have probably thought of freedom for the Asiatic countries. Today, wherever you go in Asia, nobody talks anything but of Asia, of the freedom of the peoples of Asia, of the hatred they have for the foreign and colonial possessions in their countries. They are most impatient and they cannot tolerate any more, because this is a great psychological change—a historical sweep. It is one of those great things which no amount of jugglery can stop. Anything in the world can be stopped but not the progress of history, and history must proceed, and we have come to a time when the freedom of Asia cannot be stopped even if the whole world joins, let alone the NATO or the Portuguese interpretation of NATO. Whatever the Portuguese may say, it is impossible for Goa to become part of Portugal. If Goa can become part of Portugal, I would have said with equal force that Lisbon must be part of India. One is as ridiculous as the other and my purpose is served in pointing out how ridiculous is the claim of Portugal for Goa.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Two wrongs do not make one right.

Shri Raghuramalah: I am only pointing out one wrong to show how equally great is the other wrong. I do not claim Lisbon. It is equally ridiculous for them to say that Goa is part of Portugal. Would any European country tolerate the existence of a foreign power in their midst? The other day I was surprised to read an article headed 'Asia's Glass-house' by Mr. Chester Bowles—I think it was published in one of the dailies appearing here—and there he was referring to our objection to colonialism and he said "You yourself had a previous historical connection with the various South-East Asian countries and even now

you recollect them with glee. What is wrong if European nations also have similar connection or something like that. I was surprised at that analogy. Whatever influence India had with the South-East Asian countries was of purely cultural kind. We did not go and no Indian went to any other country for economically exploiting it. We sent our culture and that got intermingled with the culture of those countries, and there grew up in each one of those countries an independent culture of their own born out of our culture and theirs, and it was a case of mutual respect, mutual good-will, and a conglomeration of various ideas developing into somewhat of a common culture.

I do hope that people like Mr. Chester Bowles will see more clearly what exactly we want. We do not want an inch of any other country, nor do we wish to tolerate any other country having an inch of our country. This is our basic approach to the problem and I am Sir very happy to support the motion, approving the foreign policy of our country.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya-East): I rise to suggest that a Nehru-Malenkov meeting be arranged with a view to solving all the outstanding Asian problems in general and the problems of the Middle East in particular. I think that the cold war is coming to an end if it has not already ended. Mr. Winston Churchill is now talking about co-existence. Mr. Dulles was isolated in Geneva. The French have rejected the E.D.C. And most of the nations of the South-East Asia, barring Pakistan and Thailand, have refused to join the SEATO. Everything comes to an end and the cold war will also come to an end. It has exhausted its potentialities. It has reached its limits. If the cold war comes to an end, there are two or three alternatives left open to America—war or political settlement between America and Russia or, thirdly, America may have to withdraw completely from the politics of the old world. But I do not think

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

that war is possible, because both powers have become almost co-equal. The Americans are afraid that if war breaks out, most of the industrial centres of America will be ruthlessly bombarded, and New York, Washington, California and other industrial centres will be wiped out. The Americans are not going to risk the life and property of their fellow-citizens. I do not think that a world war is possible now. If cold war is going to end and if world war is not possible then the next alternative is a political settlement. I consider that a political settlement between America and Russia would be a danger to this country, for if there is a political settlement between America and Russia, Asia will be divided into three spheres of influence—Russian, Chinese and American. India, Sir, will automatically fall within the American sphere of influence. But suppose the Americans show cussedness; they are not willing to enter into any negotiations with Russia. Then what happens? There is another alternative left over. That alternative is withdrawal from the politics of the old world. Already we find a growing body of public opinion in America which stands for isolationism. If America at the end of the cold war finds herself politically defeated in the diplomatic field, she will have to withdraw from the politics of the old world. If America withdraws from the politics of the old world, Asia will be divided into two spheres of influence—Russian and Chinese. We do not know where we will stand—whether we will go under the Russian bloc or we will fall under the Chinese bloc, or India will be divided between the two spheres of influence—Russian and Chinese. But if we collaborate with Russia now, before the cold war comes to an end, our power position will be improved. We can avert the division of Asia either into three spheres of influence or into two spheres of influence, if now we collaborate with Russia.

I maintain, Sir, that the goal of our foreign policy—the establishment of

a third area of peace—is both possible and desirable. We can achieve this goal, but only in collaboration with Russia. If we had collaborated with Russia before, the SEADO would not have come into existence. Today we find, as the Prime Minister himself said in his speech, that this South-East Asian territory which he had expected to become the nucleus of a third area of peace has become an area of war, of tension.

Sir, I have said that I want a Nehru-Malenkov meeting with a view to solving the problems of Asia in general and of the Middle-East in particular. I attach great importance to what is happening in the Middle-East. The Americans want to integrate all the territories lying from Karachi to Ankara. They want to bring this whole region under their leadership. If this plan materialises, it will constitute a threat to this country. The falling of this region under the leadership of America will constitute a threat to world peace. It will jeopardise our power position and it will stand as a stumbling-block in the way of the political unification of Asia under Asian leadership.

I admit, Sir, that the political integration of this region is both desirable and inevitable, but it should be integrated under Asian leadership. If we collaborate with Russia, this region can be integrated under the leadership of India and Russia. Unilaterally, Sir, neither India nor Russia are in a position to frustrate American designs in South-Western Asia. But if the Americans succeed in establishing their hegemony over South-Western Asia, then our power position would be weakened. After integrating South-Western Asia they will try to detach Central Asia and integrate it with South-Western Asia. This has been the old plan of both the British and the Americans. The Americans want to disrupt Turkestan. They want to detach it from Russia and weaken Russia. Either this plan will succeed, or this plan will not succeed. It may succeed partly, or

it may succeed wholly. The Americans may succeed in detaching central Asia from Russia, but they may not succeed in integrating it with South-Western Asia. They may succeed in detaching it from Russia, but may not be able to prevent the emergence of chaos and anarchy throughout the length and breadth of Turkestan.

I want to give a warning to this House. Let us not be complacent. Because it is from this region, Sir, that Asia in general and India in particular have been invaded times without number from the very dawn of history. This region has always been a storm-centre of political unrest. Till 1925-26 there were rebellions in Chinese Turkestan. Till 1925-26 Russia was not in a position to consolidate her power in Russian Turkestan. It is only since the last 20 or 30 years that law and order have prevailed in Russian Turkestan. We seem to be under the impression that the days of Chengiz Khan and Tamerlane are over and over for ever. We do not seem to realise that civilisation and culture have a very unstable basis in Asia. Anything can happen any moment. We the proud people of India, who are proud of our civilisation and culture, indulged in acts of barbarism when the forces of law and order were weakened in 1947. I am afraid that if the forces of law and order are weakened in Turkestan nothing will prevent the emergence of barbarism in those regions. India may stand to suffer. Let us be thankful to the Russians; let us be thankful to the Chinese that they have kept these turbulent peoples of Turkestan under their control. The first condition to our very existence as a free nation is the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the USSR in Asia. The destiny of India and Russia are inter-twined. Those who are against Russia are our enemies. These are the broad conclusions which I have reached. American military aid to Pakistan is directed against Russia. This is what they—the Americans—say. I say, Sir, that even if it is directed

against Russia it constitutes a threat to this country. It must be opposed because the destiny of India and Russia are inter-twined. Any weakening of law and order in Central Asia will affect adversely the people of this country—our very existence may be jeopardised.

Sir, with these words of warning, I resume my seat.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—North-East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I do not in the least mind the provocative reference which the Prime Minister made in regard to the Opposition harping on the question of the Commonwealth. Personally, Sir, I welcome such provocation, for it is the sauce of debate, and I wish, Sir, in this House there was more of it from time to time. But there was an implication, Sir, that we on this side are perhaps repetitive. Now, Sir, in regard to that I would say that I am not apologetic about repetition. We repeat certain things because we are convinced that there are certain categorical imperatives which have emerged naturally and necessarily out of our people's struggle for freedom and when we repeat, Sir we only hark back to those imperatives, deviation from which is treason to our patriotism. Now our attack on the Commonwealth emanates from that particular point of view. As I have said many a time before in this House, we are not afraid or hesitant and we do not withhold praise for our country's present foreign policy when that praise is due. I welcome certain things which have happened in the last half year. The Prime Minister's stand on the hydrogen bomb tests, his rejection of Eisenhower's offer of military aid to this country on the same terms as to Pakistan, his efforts—I am rather chary about saying his Government's efforts—his efforts for bringing about the Cease Fire in Indo-China, his dissociation from—if not the kind of strident opposition that we like—his dissociation from the S.E.A.T.O. manoeuvres and their implications, the signature of the India-China agreement, and the promulgation of the Five Principles in that

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Joint Declaration by our Prime Minister and the Chinese Prime Minister, and then, Sir, lastly the Prime Minister's projected visit to Peking via the headquarters of Ho Chi Minh, all these we applaud certainly as positive contributions to peace at a time when, made with fury, so to speak, the war mongers in the United States and their satellites are grinding their teeth at the comparative success of the Geneva Conference and are straining at their leash.

We fear, and we tell our people to be constantly on their guard because of our fear. Our fear is, with the set-up in this country today which this Government so redoubtably tries to consolidate, that we cannot rely on this Government in spite of our support to certain policies which the Government follows from time to time in the realm of external affairs. We cannot rely on this Government because we feel that its policies are hesitant and, often, even contradictory, that the class relation on which this Government is based and on which it flourishes and intends to flourish is unmasking itself more and more as anti-people, and that it is accursedly tied up with the British Commonwealth and therefore willy-nilly with the American war mongers who are the prize malefactors of the world today. The result is our Government cannot follow a consistent and progressive policy on internal questions. And even in the sphere of foreign affairs we do not follow a consistent and positive policy of peace, achievement of freedom and of progress for all sections of our people.

I would like to refer in the beginning to certain things which happen from time to time which make us very chary about believing the *bona fides* of our foreign policy. I do not wish to reflect upon the Prime Minister who occasionally has taken a very good stand. But I do not understand what happens in his Cabinet. Only the other day we had a discussion on the ban on the sale of Soviet literature,

and on that occasion his Home Minister was here and he made slighting references to the entire idea of co-existence. And if you do not wish to give credence to my interpretation, I would tell you what the *National Herald* wrote in its editorial on the 17th of this month in regard to Dr. Katju's performance on that day. The *National Herald* wrote:

"The slighting reference to the Soviet and the policy of co-existence he (Dr. Katju) made on this occasion, and usually makes, are injurious to the interests of India. No Cabinet Member should be allowed to express his opinion so callously, and in a Home Minister such irresponsibility is reprehensible."

This kind of thing goes on over and over again and we do not know where we are. We have our suspicions which we give expression to very stridently from time to time. But I am sure the country would not like this kind of thing continuing, and that is why the country cannot take the Prime Minister's word at its face value. We want to support him as far as we can, because he has taken some very good stands—no doubt about it—but the way in which the whole set-up is proceeding is extremely suspicious.

In regard to this Commonwealth business, we have been having this as a hardy monthly as I described it once two years ago. Almost every time the question of the Commonwealth comes up. It does come up because of so many things. I do not see why at a time when the British are behaving so shabbily, we should have our Commander-in-Chief going to Kimberley and having staff conversations, and heaven knows what other things! I do not understand this sort of thing at all. I do not know why Lord Ismay, who is obviously a Britisher, who is Secretary-General of the N.A.T.O. goes out of his way to tell the Portuguese Government

fulsomenly how they can invoke articles 4 and 5 of the N.A.T.O., in order to use the Portuguese possessions in India as bases of attack against our integrity. I say so because the Portuguese are openly and unashamedly getting arms, and the British Government are behaving in this way. We refer to Malaya and Kenya. We do so because of valid reasons. It is only the other day we found that from the people of Kenya appeals were going to Britain on behalf not only of the Kikuyu tribe but of several other tribes, saying how they were being exterminated. Nothing actually has been done about this. What are the benefits which we get out of our association with the Commonwealth? I have not been able to find out. We may be obtuse, but we do not know how we can co-ordinate our support to the Five Principles adumbrated in the Nehru-Chou declaration, how we can co-ordinate that declaration with our relation with the Commonwealth. That declaration talks about the integrity of the territories of different States, of non-aggression, of co-operation and so on and so forth. But actually how are the British behaving in Malaya. How is it that the British are fortifying Trincomalee? How is it that the Dutch are behaving so badly in regard to New Guinea and attacking the aspirations of the Indonesian people? We know all about the United States having more than five hundred defence bases all over the world, thousands of miles away from their homeland, and yet we are supposed to imagine that all that might have some kind of co-ordinated connection with the *panch shila*, the Five Principles which have been adumbrated. We do not find any mutual benefit coming to us. On the contrary we find that our economic policy is still such—in spite of certain extenuating circumstances, certain symptoms of improvement—our economic policy is still such that we are tied up with British economy and as a result of it we cannot take an independent policy. I say this because particularly of Goa; and in relation to Goa there is no doubt about it and I want to have some

kind of clarification from the Prime Minister when he replies to the debate. I have no doubt in my own mind that the patience which we have exhibited, the patience we are trying to justify with reference to some pompous principle adumbrated on the floor of the House or elsewhere, that patience has other reasons. We were happy to hear the Prime Minister on the last occasion in the other House saying that the Government of India, in regard to Goa, "do not and will not function in this matter on a foundation of apprehensiveness and fear of probable consequences or of threats, from whatever quarter they may come." This sounds good, but we want to know if that is the real point of view.

Why are we behaving in this manner in regard to Goa? The other day, I referred to a certain document, which was circulated to Members of Parliament by the Portuguese Legation which sends with its compliments a copy of the speech by Dr. Salazar, which he made on the 10th of August, 1954. In this speech, which I cannot quote *in extenso* because I have not the time,—it is very interesting—towards the end, he says:

"Little India lives in the heart of Portugal and there has never been so much unanimity among all the Portuguese as when they felt that it might be in danger. From all sides, from overseas Portugal and from foreign countries, there comes the same appeal, the same call: keep Goa, with the help of possessions, of arms, of men, of the young and the old, of prayers and sacrifices, keep it as the dearest treasure of the Lusitanian family and history."

He ends up:

"The Government of India will also be realist if it understands that on our side there is not the whim of a government but the unmistakable imperative of a Nation which believes it owes it to dignity to denounce violations

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

of the law and to defend the territory inherited from its ancestors. In India blood has already flowed, has it? Portuguese blood is well known to India—in the sea and in the earth, and in the veins and souls of its people.”

That is the way in which Dr. Salazar has the gumption, has the temerity, has the insolence to talk in the context of what is going on. They are building air bases. Every time the External Affairs Ministry have to answer a question, they have to acknowledge that such things are happening in Goa: new air ports built, ships coming in, new route to Pakistan being negotiated and all that sort of thing. How long is this to go on?

The other day, in the Rajya Sabha, the Prime Minister referred Albuquerque. We have got an Albuquerque Road not far from here. This Albuquerque was an illustrious figure in Portuguese history. He said, if the whole of India is lost, you can reconquer it from Goa. That was his attitude. We know that it is silly, it is moonshine and nonsense today. But, that is their attitude. This “little Portugal” in Asia, which is frantically fortifying itself today, where there are so many thousands of troops from Africa, and Portuguese volunteers now joining bands which are organised, provides the strategic trouble spot in a critical period and may be turned into a N.A.T.O. supply and trooping point. We have the terrible example of the French using Pakistan air-fields for their Indo-China reinforcements even when India wanted to be neutral. This thing is going on all the time. How long are we going to tolerate this? It is intolerable that a foreign colonial power, that has long forfeited its rights to rule any part of India, should have the right, the capacity to make this unfriendly show, should have the impudence to display its military strength in our waters and on our soil.

What do we do? We say, the Goanese can fight for their independence; as far as Indian nationals who are non-Goans are concerned, we shall stop them. I say, as it has already been said, that it was the crowning ignominy of this Government that on the 25th September, there was a lathi charge on volunteers who were going to Diu. Only in the last session my hon. friend the Deputy Minister of External Affairs said how the Governor of Diu was presiding at a plebiscite and how he was compelling everyday to sign a declaration, “do you like the Portuguese Government,” and they had to say, yes. To this place Diu, volunteers were going and they were lathi-charged. Seven persons were injured and two leaders were taken into custody. I say this was the crowning ignominy. I ask what should be our attitude, under municipal law, or International law or ethics or patriotic canons? I wish the Prime Minister recalls the palmy days when he exhilarated in freedom's battle and did not have his generous impulses broken and restrained by the sedate satisfactions of office. I do not know how to recall the days of the Spanish War when he was supporting the idea of international brigades going to the assistance of the Spanish people who were fighting for their freedom. Today, the cry of sorrow has come from our people in Goa, and other possessions of foreign powers in this country. How long are you going to tolerate this? Why don't you come and say, our people are free to go there? Don't we know the lie of the land in Goa and other places? Don't we know how the smugglers, rogues, vagabonds, police, agents, all together have got a grip over the economy there? Don't we know that the Goanese people cannot go ahead today, unassisted by the glorious resurgence of the Indian people over this issue of wiping off the last ignominy from the face of India, and reach that freedom? Not because of any fault of theirs, not because they are quite happy with the Portuguese

administration, but because that is a reality. Are we going to allow the Goanese to go through agony, just because we have to be patient? Why have we to be patient in view of what Lord Ismay says? He said that the N.A.T.O. is being interpreted like that. What are our friends, the leaders of the Labour Party in Britain, who were once described as "sheep in sheeps' clothing" saying? Supporting the S.E.A.T.O., saying all kinds of nonsense, smiling at everybody, paying compliments to everybody, ultimately behaving exactly as the British Imperialists want them to behave. Whom are we counting upon? Why are we behaving in this fashion? Are we being told today by the British and the Americans and all that tribe, that if India today allows her nationals to go into Goa or any other place in order to secure the emancipation of these areas, they shall fight against us? Do they say, we will withdraw whatever assistance we are magnanimously rendering us? Are they telling us that they have got a pistol aimed at the heart of India, and that they have got Pakistan and that the two flanks of India are under their control, and that Ceylon is almost entirely under their grip? Are they telling us: behave in this fashion, otherwise we shall see what we can do? If that is so, let us know. If that is the way in which our friends in the Commonwealth and the U.S.A. are behaving, let us know. If that is the real position, let our people know the real truth. I beseech the Prime Minister; let him come out and say why this exhibition of patience. Why this attempt to show moral superiority on the part of the Government of this country? Why this attempt to white-wash something which cannot be white-washed? Is it because we have been told that unless you do this, the fear of God will be injected into you? To this, I want an answer from him. That is why we say that the British Empire is an enormity, the Commonwealth is a pill which we cannot swallow: not for mere emotional reasons, but for reasons which are vital, practical reasons which have a

great deal to do with what is happening in our country from day to day.

I have said before that there have been some welcome steps which the Government have taken in the sphere of foreign policy and also in the sphere of internal policy. We find the Government at least now taking some concrete steps like the permission which has presumably been given to Soviet technicians to come to this country and assist in the construction of steel works on terms which are extremely favourable to our country, on terms which have not the slightest implications of present or future control on our economy. But, our main orientation is pro-British and pro-American. We know how this liberalisation of the import policy, for example, hits our people. We know how the guarantee of profits to big money interests hits our people. We know how our Finance Minister uses a particular sort of language, in order to woo the people whom he wants to woo. We know how on the question of rationalisation, the Government has taken up an attitude which is anti-people. We know how on such issues as the Bank employees issue, the Government have shown that they are with the bigwigs in this country, people who live in the upper storey of our social structure. We know how this Government has not got at heart India's real interests, so far as the common people are concerned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The debate is on foreign policy.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know; I want to link up the two. I say that all these are indications of the way in which the wind is blowing. I would like you to go through the literature that is being produced by big money interests in this country. They say: 'of course, the Prime Minister is saying certain things, dallying with the Chinese, hobnobbing with Ho Chi Minh and such people; but we know what is what; and everything is going to be all right; for Big Money has got a grip over its economy.' Foreign policy is a function of internal policy. There is a link between the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

two which are absolutely inseparable and inseverable. That is why I do not want to go into details over it, but I say as long as the internal policy persists in this fashion, we cannot trust this Government; in spite of our applause for this Government's policy in so far as it is progressive, we cannot rely upon this Government. And I know that Government reciprocates that sentiment. I know in the last session when the United States—Pakistan Pact came up—so many things came up—the Prime Minister stated: "This is a national issue. It is not a party issue. Let us all combine." We took him at his word. I said—I remember having said very distinctly: "We are for co-operation wholly and entirely as far as fighting the implications of the United States—Pakistan Pact is concerned." I went back to Calcutta. Meetings were being organised. Attempts were being made to have a campaign on an all party basis. I found Ministers, Congress Ministers, when they opened their lips, going out of their way attacking China and Russia and so on and so forth. I found Congress Members—one or two of them who had the courage to come forward and speak from the same platform as I spoke,—were whipped up at once and they were told to stop participating in such meetings. This has happened.

3 P.M.

Is it the idea of the Government that foreign policy should emanate from the brain of the Prime Minister for whom we all have very great respect in varied fashions, in different ways, from different points of view, sometimes in our case with very strong reservations? But, is our peace policy to emanate only from the brain of our Prime Minister? Our peace policy as such is not obviously supported by some other participants in Government, other occupants of the treasury benches? Is our foreign policy to be such a policy with which the people would have nothing to do, by which the people would not be enabled to come out and say what they feel

about it, how they support it from their hearts? It is not being done because there is the fear of the people. And this Government will have to shake off its fear of the people, change its policies altogether if it is going to have a successful foreign policy. In spite of the applause that it is getting, it will never be a successful foreign policy, because it is preparing for being blackmailed in some future into actions which we shall all regret if such actions do ultimately ensue. We are getting ready for that kind of blackmail by these imperialist interests. We are fighting against them, and that is the main gravamen of the charge against us. That is why we hear from time to time accusations—accusations aimed almost entirely at us. The Prime Minister went out of his way again this time, more unnecessarily than in the case of the Commonwealth, to refer to the communist movement in Malaya and other places and said that they were not the nations' own movements, they were extraneous and all that kind of thing. I am not here to defend the Communist Party of Malaya, but I must say this. The communist movement is, of course, a 'world-wide movement. No getting away from it. The Prime Minister knows it more than most people here. And I say that the communists know very well that the communist movement can never get entrenched unless, in Mao Tse-tung's own words, the communists live with the people like fish in the water, work with the people, champion their interests and work for those interests. If the communist movement in any one country is not powerful enough, it is because it is not good enough. In Malaya, Sir, how is it that the leadership of the national liberation movement is in the hands of the Communist Party? It is because the Communist Party—whatever its composition racially, Chinese or Malay or Indian—has come forward to champion the cause of the entire people. In the whole of South-East Asia today there is this link-up between the people's freedom movement and the communist movement,

because the Communist Party has been able to come forward as the real champions of the people's interests. It is the people's interests, therefore, which will ultimately decide, and that is why we say to this Government: "Look to the people's interests. Run the country properly. Do not take the side of Big Money stalwarts when questions affecting the condition of the people come before you for consideration. And as far as the world is concerned, pursue such policies as will guarantee peace. Do not go on talking interminably in terms of the world being divided into two blocs. The Soviet bloc and the American bloc and so on and so forth. Take an independent line really and positively. Choose, decide on every single issue which side is doing right, which side is doing wrong. If it is doing right, support them, go as far with them as is possible." That is why we say: let us have today a definite plan for an Afro-Asian conference. We should call all the Asian States including the States of Soviet Asia. Let us place all our problems before them. Let us seek clarification of the difficulties and dangers which are confronting these countries because of the die-hard nature of colonialism which is today buttressed by the enormous might of the United States. And let us after that try to have treaties of peace, friendship and mutual co-operation with any country which is willing to come forward, wherever it is, whatever its ideology, on the basis of co-operation and mutual benefit. Let us have this kind of thing, and then in that case we shall be able to proceed on those lines which are absolutely essential if our country is to make real progress.

Now, Sir, I am sorry there are so many other things I could refer to, but I would like very much that the Prime Minister tells us why exactly this preternatural patience over Goa has got to be practised by us; and I wish the Prime Minister comes forward and says why he should not declare once and for all that we set a target date for the elimination of these

foreign pockets which are pimples on the fair face of India. I want him to come forward and say more concretely what he has in view after his talks with the Indonesian Prime Minister over the Afro-Asian conference; and I want him to tell us that he will call all the Asian States including the Asian Soviet States. As far as I remember they came to the first Asian conference which was held in Delhi.

Now, we want the Prime Minister to say those things and we want also the Prime Minister to tell us something about the likelihood of our being able to enter into treaties of friendship and co-operation on terms of equality and mutual benefit with different countries. I know many people would laugh at the idea, but those who laugh last would laugh best, and I put this forward as a very serious suggestion.

I have done. You are menacingly ringing your bell. I have already spoken perhaps for a good deal of time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have given him sufficient time.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: But I say in spite of what the Prime Minister said in the beginning of his speech, in spite of the charge of repetitiveness against us, that if we repeat it is because of certain categorical imperatives and today we know very well that the whole world set-up is such that if people are determined to move in a way in which lies peace, progress and happiness for all, then we can really and truly turn this country into a kind of place where all our people would have the happiness to which they are entitled under the so-called dispensation of freedom.

Shri Gadgil (Poona—Central): As I listened to my friend Mr. Mukerjee very attentively, I remembered what once Bhulabhai said: "If you want to know whether the line you are following is correct or otherwise, then put the extreme criticism on the one side against the extreme criticism on the other, and if they balance each other,

[Shri Gadgil]

come to the conclusion that the line you have taken is absolutely correct." Mr. Mukerjee raised very great apprehension by saying that on one side of us there is one part of Pakistan and on the other side there is another part of Pakistan, there is Goa and there is Ceylon. I am not at all affected by this geographical situation. What I feel is that if my conscience says that what I have been following is correct and in the best interests of the country, that is enough. May I tell him all these circumstances are not stable? They change practically at every third month. Only a few months ago the communists were all praise for the foreign policy of this Government. I am reminded of a couplet from *Mahabharata* where it is said that today's friends are tomorrow's enemies and today's enemies are tomorrow's friends:

कर्मणां सामर्थ्यानां
अनित्या वै सदा स्थितिः :

Because of the power of action, there is no step which is stable. There is nothing fixed, and as Lord Morley once said in the higher regions of politics nothing is unalterable, nothing is fixed. But, whatever views friends on the Opposition may hold, one fact is certain, that the situation is such that it requires constant attention, and there should be no dogmatic attachment to any superficial circumstances but complete faith in the righteousness of our cause and compliance with the fundamentals which we have accepted in the course of the last seven years. My object is not to deal with the biggest question, for the best answer to the criticism of my friend, Prof. Mukerjee, comes from some of the American press people who say that India today constitutes the outer defence wall of communism.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair]

Now, one fails to see whether this picture is correct or the other picture is correct. Beyond that, I do not want to answer his arguments in that respect.

What I am most concerned with is Goa, and I claim a little knowledge about that problem, because we are so close to it. Some of our ancestors and even *gadgils* have suffered at the hands of the Portuguese. Without making any claim for putting emotion into it, what I want to do is to make a complete objective analysis of the whole thing.

Only on the 10th of August, 1954, the Prime Minister of Portugal in his broadcast made two astounding statements. One was:

"The great mass of the population, who have been Portuguese for over 400 years, have never in fact wanted to be anything else."

That was at the beginning of his broadcast. Towards the end, he said:

"From all sides, from overseas Portugal and from foreign countries, there comes the same appeal, the same call: keep Goa, with the help of possessions, of arms, of men, of the young and the old, of prayers and sacrifices, keep it as the dearest treasure of the Lusitanian family and history. I believe there is not a single Portuguese, whatever his ideological or political divergences, who does not share this feeling and vibrate with emotion over this issue which is truly a national one."

Now, what has been the position during the last four hundred years? I will not go very deep into history, but in the sixteenth century, there were several conflicts between the Mahrattas and the Portuguese authorities, when the fortress of Bassein, about thirty miles to the north of present Bombay was in the possession of the Portuguese people. After hard and strong fight, the fortress was taken. Today, the Portuguese authorities are saying that if Goa is taken over, there will be no religious freedom and that it will be a dangerous thing to Catholicism. But in the year 1738 when a Treaty

was entered into between the retiring Portuguese General and the Mahratta General, the Mahrattas promised that their churches would be maintained and honoured, that there would be perfect freedom to practise Christianity. But as against this, you will find that in one year, i.e., 1563 A.D., 280 temples were destroyed by the Portuguese, and this destruction went on. But in spite of their best efforts at conversion, today, out of the six lakhs of population, sixty per cent. are still Hindus, thirty per cent. are Christians, and the rest belong to other religions. You will find that in the seventeenth century, between the years 1755 and 1824, there were fourteen uprisings against the Portuguese rule. In 1852, there was the rebellion by Dipaji Rane; in 1869 there was the rebellion by Kushtavo Rane, and in 1895 by Dada Rane. In the course of the last fifty years, there have been off and on occasional risings both, violent and non-violent. In 1946, there was the great agitation in which Dr. Lohia participated. And the latest one started from the 15th August 1954. In the face of all these facts, can it be said that the people in Goa want to be nothing else than to remain Portuguese? I think history has never been so perverted, although attempts have been made and are being made by Portuguese authorities to rewrite history.

You will be surprised to know that about six months ago, certain girl students from Goa, who went to Portugal for education, were forced to make a declaration that they were Portuguese, that their ancestors were Portuguese, and that the Hindus converted their ancestors, and hence they are Brahmins. This is how history is being rewritten. You have to consider also how accusations are made in the speech that has been broadcasted by the Prime Minister of Portugal on 10th August. He states:

"There are permanent threats, materializing into hostile actions against the interests and life of the populations of the Portuguese State in India and of the Goans living in Union territory."

I do not know how often you have visited Bombay. I come from the same State in which Bombay is situated and is bound to remain till eternity. Most of the professions there have very great representation from the Goans, whether it is medicine, law, catering, etc., Goan Community there has big merchants, small merchants, bankers, and so on. They are all Goan, and to say that we are ill-treating them is wrong. The words used in the broadcast are 'the interests and life of the populations of the Portuguese State of India'. It is said that there are threats against the interests and life of the population of the Portuguese State of India. We have done nothing to them. I have read as to how many attempts have been made in the course of the last four hundred years to get rid of Portuguese rule, but we never instigated them. It was because of the way in which the authorities behaved there.

There is a great difference between the Portuguese possessions and the French possessions. The French people are a noble race. They have the traditions of liberty, equality, fraternity and tolerance. I do not think there has anything been done in the name of religion in the French possession. But here in Portugal, you had in the past *auto-da-fe*, or inquisition and so on, and although the outward form had changed, the spirit remained absolutely the same. What is the position today? There are no civil liberties at all. You cannot print and publish and circulate even a marriage invitation. Everything has got to be pre-censored, and by the time the invitation is returned after pre-censoring, the marriage is already celebrated. However, that is not yet a ground for invalidating the whole thing; and that is all to the good.

What are we doing? How many people have gone into Goan territory in the course of the last four or five years? What about the risings that took place prior to that? In these four or five years, a few people may have gone there, but substantially all of them, and at least most of them, were

[Shri Gadgil]

residents of Goa, and no outsider, so far as I know, has contributed anything very substantially or materially to that threat.

It has been stated that not a single Portuguese man or woman wants to get away from Portuguese sovereignty. I have not the time, otherwise I would have quoted from the statements issued from Goa itself by leading lawyers, merchants and other men, who are considered to be important in the public life of Goa, complaining about the atrocities and the misrule in Goa. We have heard about the exile, and we have heard how the volunteers have been battered, and what sorts of things are taking place in Goa. These things are all there. They are nothing new. This is the position, and yet the Prime Minister of Portugal says that the life and security of the population of the Portuguese State of India—that is the language he uses—are being jeopardised. A land blockade of Portuguese territories has been set up by administrative measures. I wish this were done by the Government of India. That has not been done at all. If that were done, then Goa would have fallen into our lap years ago. Because the Government of India believe in peaceful negotiation, in consultation, in exchange of notes and in exchange of protests, this has not been done. And yet, this is what we find:

“Propaganda has been made, and permission given, for the organisation in Union territory of armed bands, pretendedly composed of Goans but in fact almost entirely of individuals foreign to the Portuguese community, for the purpose of carrying out subversive movements in Portuguese India.”

The best answer to this is what happened on the 25th of this month when some Indian nationals tried to enter there. I say they have every right to participate in that struggle. When we predicate that Goa is a part of India, culturally, historically—from

every point of view—it is the right of Indian nationals to go and participate in the struggle. But what the Government have done is also perfectly correct in the context of circumstances, because Government know the consequences of any such act, as was suggested by some of our friends here. The present circumstances demand that the principal burden of carrying on agitation and the struggle for freedom must rest on the shoulders of Goans themselves. In Ayurveda, some medicine is prescribed, but prescribed with different accompaniments. Some *matra* is first to be taken in milk; if it does not work, then in ginger; if it does not work, then in garlic. Today the Government of India are trying the *matra* with the milk of kindness and negotiation; if it does not succeed, I do not think we are permanently wedded to anything, because, according to the well-known principle which the Prime Minister has so often propounded, there is nothing static in politics, everything is dynamic. But, for the present, I do agree with him that anything like that which will create a situation which will not be to our liking should not be done today. I may quote Ayurveda again. If some foreign matter enters your eye, then it is no good taking some instrument and trying to take it out. Ayurveda lays down that someone should put out his tongue in the eye and quietly take it out. That is the treatment one should give with respect to Goa. There is a foreign matter; there is no doubt about it. Now, we have to take it out very nicely, tactfully and gracefully. So let us do the work with the tongue—in a different sense—and not with a sharp instrument for the time being.

Now there is a further accusation:

“Police or other armed forces have given open protection and support to the invasion of territories of Portuguese India.....”

As I said, what happened on the 25th and what is happening at the border

near Karwar are an adequate answer to this.

This is how the propaganda is being carried out. I might just say what these people are doing. There is a vast contrast between what they say and what they do. "Discrepancy between words and deeds, laws and habits, intentions and realisations—pacifist intentions and unfriendly or bellicose realisations" these are the accusations against our Government. In the light of what I have read and what I have described, these accusations fit in with what they have done and not with what we are saying or doing.

Another point was made that 'so far as India is concerned, our relations were excellent with the Britishers. In their place, the Indian democracy has come and the relations should continue as they were'. We all share that feeling. I can understand that. But when the people in Goa do not want to remain under Portuguese rule and since it is the policy of this Government right through these seven years to help the process of liquidation of colonialism, I think we are both morally and legally bound to go to their help, in so far as we consider it to be the best course in the context of circumstances. It is stated that there is no State necessity for India to have Goa immediately. Of course, there is no State necessity today.

An Hon. Member: No, no.

Shri Gadgil: But what is the position in Goa today? It has become a war camp. New airports are being constructed. I do not know about it, but I am told that quite a substantial army has been landed on the Goan coast and in fact the appearance is as if the whole country has been organised for some big event like an intended war. If that continues, and if what we hear in newspapers openly said or discreetly hinted, is correct, that behind the activities and attitudes of the Portuguese authorities, are the Big Powers like the UK and the United States of America, that is,

more or less the Western bloc, then what is the position? In the original NATO, it was only said that whatever it meant, it was confined only to the metropolitan States involved in that scheme. The Portuguese Government tried to put an interpretation in which they said that Goa was a part of their metropolitan State—an absurd proposition to which a reference was made by Shri Raghuramaiah a few minutes ago. Now, that original interpretation was given by no less a personality than the Prime Minister of Canada who was here a few months ago. But we find in the course of the last few days another interpretation in which it is said that they are entitled to be consulted in this matter, and when we know what consultation with United States means, we can easily see and come to the conclusion that Goa may not be a State necessity for India today, but it may perhaps be tomorrow? That is more than I can predict, for it may be used as a base for carrying out certain purposes which the western countries, particularly the United States of America have in their mind. Therefore, to be fore-warned is to be fore-armed. We must see that this does not happen. What I submit is that the Goa matter is very delicate and for the time being, we should give as much support to the Government as possible. I do not think that the Government or anyone of us in the House will yield to any temptation or weakening on this point. The question is, at what time we should act? May I also draw on another illustration from the great *Mahabharata*? When Draupadi was brought before the Sabha and she was being dishonoured and she started saying: 'What are you doing, Bhim, you Arjun, you this and you that, they all kept quiet. But Bhim—I do not compare him with the communists here—and others were all angry. Bhim was angry, he was about to take his *gada* and do something. Then Yudhishtira simply put his thumb on the earth in a pointed way. That was enough hint for Bhim, because *prithvi* is called *kshama*. When you understand that, you understand that for

[Shri Gadgil]

every action, there is a proper time. The communists will agree that in the words of Lenin, if you take the action today, it may be too early; if you take action tomorrow, it may be too late. Therefore, you have to find out the right psychological moment. If you agree with what Lenin did or said, why don't you extend that liberality of mind to the interpretation of events which the hon. Prime Minister has put on? Be sure that when the critical time comes, whatever is necessary will be done and India's honour will never be sullied; it is dear to me, it is dear to him, it is dear to every one of us. What we have achieved in the course of the last seven years some of you may like to belittle, but the whole world puts a different interpretation. Whenever there is any act of injustice, whether it is with regard to Tunisia or Malaya or Mau Mau, everybody tries to come to India. Why? It is just like the great Gajendra, when it was attacked by the Nakhra. He invoked and prayed for Maha Vishnu; he did not pray for any second-rate or third-rate God; he prayed to Maha Vishnu. Therefore, wherever in the world today there is an act of collective injustice, any act under which the people are suffering, the first thought that comes into their mind is to appeal to India. Why? Is it because we have got second-hand battleships? Or is it because we have a few squadrons in the air? Or is it because we have couple of lakh or three lakh land army? No. It is for something else. It is because we stand for certain principles of conduct. It is because we are not swayed by personal dislikes or predilections or prejudices. It is because we take a fair view of every event on its merits, and irrespective of consequences, we boldly proclaim our faith and act up to it. That is the secret of our greatness. It may not have any proportion to the material equipment we may have. But, this is a matter of which everyone should be proud. I would, therefore, urge that so far as Goa is concerned, it is a very delicate matter

because if something goes wrong, it might bring the peace of the world into danger. As I compared it with the eye, the treatment I suggested is the treatment that should be applied. That is all I have to say.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury (Nabadwip): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in foreign policy India has taken up a certain stand and we must see that it is not violated. The world, today, through science and speed has become much smaller and smaller and isolationism is a thing of the past. We have also travelled a fair way in foreign policy. Before freedom we had to follow the British policy more or less and we had no independent policy of our own. The circumstances were such. Our own thoughts of foreign policy were more academic than practical. Yet, even those long years ago the very core of our attitude, our foreign policy, was there in our minds and in the teachings of Mahatmaji and he did not merely teach us our foreign policy but he lived according to what he taught.

But, it is after freedom that we have come face to face with foreign policy. Ours has changed through many routes and devious ways. We have travelled through non-alignment, neutrality, dynamic neutrality, co-existence and now qualified co-existence by peaceful co-existence. We have now a place in the scheme of things. The world realises that what we stand by we really mean and stand by it with honour. Today there is a place for India in the Security Council, there is a place for her in the Atomic Energy Commission. The whole country, at least a very large part of it, is with the Prime Minister in his manner of approach because it has achieved results. I would not say that India has taken the part, as the previous speaker before me said, the part of Maha Vishnu; I would not really aspire to that. But, certainly she has contributed something very much more than the destructive suggestions that come from the opposite side.

Now the time has come to consider if neutrality can go hand in hand with friendly relationships or not. Absolutes of everything are hard to follow and we cannot think of absolute neutrality or absolutely equal friendliness. It would be impracticable and disastrous. We are bound to be closer to certain countries through geography and culture, through trade and economic advantages. Our dealings have, certainly, to be more intimate with Ceylon, Nepal, Afghanistan—with Pakistan who is on our very doorstep—with Indonesia whom we have supported in her freedom movement, with Burma, with whom we have age-old cultural ties. We must have friendly relations with them, yet, obviously, we cannot do without the help of the Western countries. We want to develop India as fast as we can and without their help it cannot be done, but that help can only be taken if it is given in honourable friendship. Trade must form a vital part of a nation's foreign policy and free trade is of advantage in the modern world today. When we accept the steel plant from Russia and also tractors from the same source, when we have signed trade pacts with China and concluded trade negotiations with East Germany, we will have completed bilateral trade pacts with practically all the communist countries.

The geographical region known as the Middle East has, to my mind, vital importance to India, for it is really Western Asia, is it not? In her relationship here, India must leave religious considerations out of the picture. From the early ages of history India has had give and take with Egypt; merchandise flowed from the Nile—the Neela as it was called in ancient India—to India across land and sea. Having rich resources of oil, Western Asia has always been the trouble spot. If India wants to further world peace she must establish friendship here. Western Asia's strategic position is important to all: it is a link between Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia and Africa and the vast seas. Because it

is rich in oil, there has been exploitation there and there has been a scramble for the spoils resulting in tension, bloodshed and insecurity. India must seat herself outside the orbit of the scrambling powers. She should never be one with the scramblers for spoils. Only a fair outlook about the waterways and oil resources can really relieve this tension in the Middle East.

To China, who occupies hundreds of miles that touch our territory we have given recognition and friendship. Yet, may I submit, there is a certain amount of consternation in our minds about China and that is bound to come when we find Tibet occupied—granted it belonged to China, when we find Formosa attacked—may be it also belonged to China—yet how can any violence be right is hard to realise. The whole proceedings remind me of something that we come across quite often. The blustering aggressive stout passenger who crams into a crowded compartment with mountains of luggage—we have all met this type sometime or other—he promptly sits plumb in the middle of a bench, strews his luggage everywhere, pushes everybody on both sides till the people on the ends are just barely hanging on and puts his feet up on the bench in front of him—he even leans across and reads your newspaper, while he breathes down your neck! If anybody objects, he is usually very angry and says he was “just stretching himself, and that everybody should be friendly and travel peacefully etc.”, while he keeps on occupying more and more of the bench. Well, what other parts of the map will be considered Chinese is what the country often wonders, in—shall we say—friendly contemplation.

With this in view, it seems absolutely necessary that Burma and every part of Burmese territory should remain inviolate, and the defence of Burma is, in fact, the defence of India. The fact that there are large numbers of Chinese nationals in Thailand, Indo-China, Malaya, Burma and in the Indonesian islands and have been quite an

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury]

important part of the population for whom China demands, naturally, equal rights, is a matter to be conjured with, and not to be looked at lightly. With the industrial development of India, these places will become excellent markets for Indian goods and India already depends for many of the commodities, such as rice, oil, petroleum, tungsten etc. from Thailand, Burma and Indonesia. So, our ties with these countries have to be forged close and fast. The link of nationalism has made Indonesia closer to India—for our zeal for freedom helped their freedom fight and the ties became stronger. A closer Afro-Asian co-operation will also strengthen the cause of peace, as was pointed out by the Indonesian Prime Minister, when he came to Delhi the other day. For strength does not lie in armaments alone; by having atomic weapons we may kill others but it is doubtful whether we could save ourselves. Strength lies in the vast mass of Asian and African people standing in a bloc. A conference of Afro-Asian countries would, I submit, be useful. We could never fail to voice our disgust at the racial differences that are being fanned and practised and we would, I am sure, say fearlessly that India has always felt that if our brothers are oppressed we are oppressed, if they hunger we hunger, if their freedom is taken away, ours is not secure.

Nearer home our foreign policy has averted much trouble. The merger of Chandernagore, though the territory is not big, is big in principle. People who have tried to shape their destiny have always commanded the respect of the world and people who have known when to withdraw and get over the dealings in peace and friendship attain a stature and dignity that calls for genuine admiration, for such a withdrawing power has realised that it is a condition that confronts them and not a theory. The Prime Minister of France, Mendes-France has proved himself not merely Prime Minister No. 20 in the long and sorry line of Ministers after

the War, but a statesman of power and imagination.

I strongly feel that we should make every effort to keep our doors open to France. Let us have centres of French learning in Chandernagore and Pondicherry, where the language is already well-known. Let us seek every facility to widen our mental horizon. The cultural contract is like the quality of mercy; it blesses him that gives and him that takes. French literature, folklore, poetry, delicate and polished like French paintings and handicrafts should always be a source of delight and study for India. The Jha Commission has already recommended this and I trust that Government will give this aspect their fullest support. I also feel that trade with France should be encouraged in every way now. A nation that is so alive to beauty will surely appreciate our own beautiful handicrafts. While we trade in steel plants and tractors with the communist countries, surely every effort should be made to popularise Indian textiles and handicrafts in France.

Cultural forces from India must work on all sides hand in hand with our diplomatic services, if we are to see the full fruition of our policy. There should be more and more exchanges of teachers, doctors, social workers and artists. We need the help of the West to get over many of our difficulties but I think the West can also get something from us. Let us give what we have to give, of thought, beauty, charm and peace. Let our Indian beauty spots be adequately highlighted. Let our cultural background be presented to tourists from all over the world. World peace can be achieved, definitely by friendliness, truth, non-violence and love, and we may not need the atom or hydrogen bomb at all.

I thoroughly support the Prime Minister in his foreign policy.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly):
When the Prime Minister was opening

the debate this morning, one Member of the House wanted to know something about the policy towards Pakistan and he said "I have got nothing to say excepting that I wish well for Pakistan." I think that the success of India's foreign policy really depends on how we deal with Pakistan, Kashmir and Goa, and also other important topics.

You know that the Great Powers of today are endeavouring their best to exploit the Indo-Pakistan dissensions in order to push through their expansionist policy in this sub-continent and they are still trying today to acquire bases for the fulfilment of their strategic aims. It is a matter for regret that in spite of India's pursuing a policy of steady appeasement of Pakistan the problem is still unsettled and the Indian Government has not yet accepted unequivocally the decision of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly that the accession is final. You know that the new Prime Minister Bakshi Ghulam Mohamed has said that the accession of that State to India is final and irrevocable and I expected the Prime Minister of India would stand up in the House and say "I accept the Kashmir Constituent Assembly's decision and Bakshi Ghulam Mohamed's decision". There should be no talk of plebiscite and no talk of plunging that unfortunate State into further chaos and disaster. It is a matter of great regret that even today we find that there are so-called Indian nationals who are pleading for the man who brought Kashmir to the brink of precipice and timely action against whom saved that State from ruin, chaos and disaster.

The recent Pak-American Pact is likely to jeopardise all attempts at widening the area of peace and it may involve Asian States in the conflict between the Power blocs and may lead ultimately to major conflict and war. That Pact has led to terrible disaster in East Bengal and has caused very undesirable repercussion on the position of minorities in East Bengal. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister has

not one word to say about that. As you know, the Huq Ministry in East Bengal inflicted a crushing defeat on the Muslim League and we hoped better relationship would prevail between India and East Bengal or rather between West Bengal and East Bengal. There were many people who were trying to go back, hoping that under the new dispensation, the new democratic regime, after the clear expression of national will in East Pakistan, there would be a new climate and a change for the better. But this wretched Pak-American pact has led to the liquidation of the Fazlul Huq Ministry and has also led to the installation of a quasi-military regime. The result is that the minorities today in East Bengal are in peril. What is the good of the Prime Minister saying "I wish well for Pakistan"? Pakistan should be told clearly what the position is. Exodus has again started and the minorities are feeling distressed. My hon. friend, Mr. Chanda, will bear me out that more than 10,000 or 12,000 people are coming every month and again this migration has started. The economy of West Bengal is put in peril and also the economy of India is put in peril. A section of Indian opinion suggests that as a counterblast to the Pak-American Pact, India should enter into some kind of pact with our comrades of the U.S.S.R. Such a move, in my opinion, will be fraught with great danger and will defeat its own object. It will certainly not be a measure of self-defence but an invitation to conflict and war. India will thereby play into the hands of foreign powers against whom all Asia has been labouring and fighting for two centuries and more.

Some people in Pakistan are fortunately realising the danger inherent in such pacts and you know the reactions against SEATO even in that State. I hope that Pakistani politicians will have the sagacity to impress upon their Government the serious and harmful consequences of such a move in the interest of Pakistan itself. I have no doubt that progressive and democratic opinion in U.S.A. will also, slowly but surely, prevail upon their administra-

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

tion not to adopt a course that will sow seeds of discord among Asian States and befoul the relations between Asia and America.

The word 'Peace' today has been uttered many a time, but that word, as with the Russians and the Soviet Empire, means recognition of the new and extended frontiers of communism and increased scope for their extension; preservation of the *status quo* in the case of exhausted Britain; and the pushing back of spheres of influence. Peace-making on such a basis can at best result in a re-grouping of the spheres of influence and a temporary adjustment between the rival blocs. In neither case will peace mean freedom for all peoples and nations of the world.

Pursuit of peace, in my humble opinion, does not mean the doubtful objective of maintaining the existing unstable equilibrium in the world. What is the good of merely saying 'Panchashila'? What is the good of saying or repeating the *mantram* of 'co-existence'? What is the good of repeating freedom from interference? These policies may intensify and even petrify the *status quo* in the world. Co-existence—I humbly beseech the House to remember this—with totalitarian States may mean progressive non-existence of democratic forces or democratic States in the world. You should beware of the danger ahead. We deplore the policy which subscribes to the system of Big Powers and still believes in collaboration with Great Britain. After all, what is the record of Great Britain today? Great Britain still continues to be the major colonial power in Africa. Great Britain even now exercises effective control over the economic, political and military affairs of South Asian States. It is this policy which has resulted in the continuance of foreign pockets on Indian soil. We are pleading that the French must quit Indo-China as if the quitting of France from Indo-China is more important than the French quitting Pondicherry. What is happening

today in Goa? Let us be frank. It is Mr. Nehru's police that is doing today duty for Dr. Salazar in Portuguese India. Dr. Salazar has not the courage, nor the ability, nor the police nor the guns to prevent our people from going to the help of Goan *Satyagrahis* in that territory. It is the India Government police, our police, that is doing it for Dr. Salazar. Our Government developed cold feet and banned the entry of non-violent *satyagrahis* into Goa. India should consider today whether our connection with the Commonwealth has really led to lasting and real benefit. If Ireland could regulate her relations with England by a treaty, why not India? What is the good of our being in the Commonwealth if Dr. Malan behaves in his own way, and if the Commonwealth countries do not treat us with respect. Membership of the Commonwealth makes us suspect and India cannot pull her full weight in the councils of nations.

Sir, I want to ask the hon. the Prime Minister: "Why has India not protested against Soviet imperialism in East European States which has not only deprived these people of their national independence but is exploiting their economic resources in furtherance of its own interests?"

Then there is the melancholy chapter to which reference has already been made in one of his speeches by Shri Purushottam Das Tandon and by Acharya Kripalani—I refer to the betrayal of Tibet. That is a melancholy episode in Indian history. The Tibetan Delegation was invited to Delhi. While the Delegation was going back *via* Calcutta the Chinese army invaded Tibet, and finally annexed it. Pandit Nehru was initially shocked and even sarcastically remarked: What is this liberation? Liberation from whom? In the end, India had not the courage even to support a resolution sponsored in the United Nations on Chinese aggression against Tibet. If I remember aright, the Leader of the Indian Delegation announced that India would support that resolution condemning

Chinese aggression on Tibet. But, later on, he backed out and did not give any support to that resolution. I call this appeasement of aggression. This is really not an effort towards peace. The Sino-Tibetan Treaty marks another episode. Our Government has made a free gift of the telecommunication, even though China was prepared to pay for it. The Sino-Russian bloc is making today North Korea, Manchuria, Sinkiang and Tibet a strong military base and is thereby threatening the security of Asia and the world.

Sir, I am raising this Tibetan question because I feel that this betrayal of Tibet and the surrender to the aggression of China has led to disastrous results in Nepal. There is a feeling that our foreign policy is neither independent nor really dynamic. There is a feeling that India is steadily, slowly drifting towards the totalitarian bloc. There is a feeling that India's Prime Minister is a fellow-traveller. A definite bias in favour of the Communist camp would be barren. Our Foreign Policy has succeeded in making America greatly anti-Indian.

Democracy has two aspects—it is a way of life; it is a way of life based on liberty—civil liberty, religious liberty and political liberty. These rights of liberty are recognised and fairly established in western democracies. Democracy is fundamentally an act of faith and self-discipline and willing allegiance. Totalitarian governments provide forced allegiance by authority, violence or compulsion. India stands for certain heritage and culture. She should never sacrifice or betray the spirit for material gains. An opportunist or puerile policy with a definite bias in favour of the communist camp will be a barren policy. Peaceful co-existence was ushered with a fanfare after the funeral of Tibet—which is called the liberation of Tibet under the Chinese forces. Our foreign policy vis-a-vis Nepal has succeeded in making Nepal gradually anti-Indian. That

has been the reaction after the betrayal of Tibet. The Parliamentary Goodwill Delegation which went from Delhi.....

An hon. Member: Not Parliamentary.....

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Then the Goodwill Delegation which went from here was given a very warm welcome indeed! It was welcomed with balls of mud and stone. There is a feeling that the leaders of the Gorkha Parishad have been kept in jail because they are anti-communist. What is more distressing is that the people who really believe that truck with communism will lead to disaster to Nepal are rotting in jail even after the Chief Justice of the Nepal High Court ordered their release. They were released and re-arrested and they are still in incarceration. There is a suspicion that the men who are ruling Nepal today are doing certain things at the bidding of the Government of India and our Government wants to suppress the Parishad and its supporters.

The Government of India talked big when the movement for the liberation of Portuguese pockets in India started. But I am sorry to say that, however much you may sugar-coat your policy, our Government has developed a cold feet and it has placed a ban on the entry of non-violent *satyagrahis* in the Portuguese Indian territories in India, although Goans are Indians.

Nearly one-third of the civilised world is being ruled by Kremlin, directly or indirectly. The Soviet oligarchy will spare no effort to destroy the free world and uproot the sphere of democracy. It is already on the march against the free world. Nearly a dozen countries of Europe have been brutally mangled. Complete neutrality is a complete delusion. We must see, India must see, that having regard to her past, her culture, her heritage and the great value we attach to them, that democracy shall not be defeated by totalitarian forces.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

We are saying that we shall be neutral among the two power blocs, two rigid power blocs. But look at the facts. Are there really two rigid Power blocs? I had made some calculations and I find that not on a single occasion in the deliberations of the United Nations the Soviet satellite countries voted differently from the USSR, even on small and trifling issues. Out of 429 occasions the Commonwealth countries have voted together only on 101 occasions. On 328 occasions they differed and voted differently. On every important issue the so-called western bloc or the democratic bloc voted independently.

I may, Sir, administer a note of warning that nothing should be done so that India should be driven into the totalitarian camp. That will not add either to India's prestige or India's glory and we should do nothing to consolidate, to help that Power which is based on force and suppression of civil liberties and brutal suppression of the individual.

Shri Tek Chand: Mr. Chairman, I heard with rapt attention the speech of my hon. friend Prof. Hiren Mukerjee and I was in a state of amazement. Hitherto it had been my conviction that any subject even involving the sharpest controversy is capable of being examined, criticised, appreciated, without being vehement, without being voluble, without being vociferous and he will excuse me, if I say so, without even being vituperative. We had an exhibition in the House today of wild and weird gestures. They were most impressive; they regaled us, but did they contribute to lucidity or logic?

4 P.M.

Our foreign policy has been the subject-matter of adverse comment from the side of my hon. friend Prof. Mukerjee and my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee. In criticising our foreign policy they have been pulling apart. The gravamen of the communist charge is that we are towing the line of the imperialists; the main basis of the accusation levelled

by Shri Chatterjee is that we are towing the line of the communists. He says that the Prime Minister of India, is, if not a communist, a fellow-traveller. I wish he had paused a little, pondered a little, considered a little before he indulged in that accusation. In a country where you are enjoying freedom of expression, where you have fundamental rights in your Constitution, where any violation of those fundamental rights is remediable by the High Courts and by the Supreme Court, what did Mr. Chatterjee mean when he said that we were fellow-travellers with the Communists? Is he elevating the status of the Communists to that of democrats? Or is he being unfair to the Constitution of this country? Or is he not by saying this, slighting his own great intelligence? In a country where you have all those rights, to style the government of that country to be a fellow-traveller with communism is a travesty of truth. He is as unfair to the Government as he is being unfair to himself.

What is wrong with our foreign policy? Let us examine the fundamentals of our foreign policy. What are the columns, the pillars, on which our foreign policy rests? The first column is there is antipathy to colonialism. What is wrong about it? What faults do my friends find in regard to antipathy towards colonialism?

The second pillar of our foreign policy is that we wish to avoid entanglements with the Big Power blocs. We do not wish to cling to the apron strings of America or Soviet Russia. We want to steer clear of Scylla and Charybdis. What is wrong about this aspect of our foreign policy?

Again, our policy is to build up an area of peace. We want to rivet the attention of the world to the fact that there is ample room, ample scope to exercise all the ambitions which are of a legitimate character. There can be variety of thought, even conflicting thought in the midst of homogeneity. That is the example which this country

has set. That is what is understood by co-existence: collective peace and not merely collective defence. We want to persuade peoples of the world that they can live in amity, they can pursue their own particular goal, they can carry out their own policies, by tolerating those of others. *Sic utere tuout alienum non laedas* is a well known maxim with which Mr. Chatterjee is familiar. Use your rights in a manner so that you do not encroach upon similar rights of your neighbours. In short, live and let live. That is the formula that has been laid down, and these are the fundamentals of our policy.

In theory there can be no fault to be found about it. But not only in theory is our policy the most admirable, but in practice, in performance, in results also it is equally potent and it has equally borne fruit.

Acharya Kripalani: Bitter fruit.

Shri Tek Chand: I hear an interruption that our foreign policy has borne a bitter fruit. When people are themselves embittered, sour and frustrated, bitterness is the only taste they are aware of! The Geneva Conference, the part we played in Korea, all bear ample evidence of the success, the thumping success of the foreign policy that has borne fruit, sweet fruit, conciliatory fruit, and understanding fruit. (*An hon. Member: Goa.*) I will deal with Goa in a second. So far as the Geneva Conference is concerned, non-Asiatics, barring China, were not there. India did not figure either as a participant or even in the lobby. Nonetheless, India was invited to play the most laudable role. On India was conferred the honour of being the Chairman of the Commission. Why? It shows that even in the midst of conflict the contending parties repose the utmost confidence in the impartiality of India, in the wisdom of India and in the honesty of purpose of this great country. That is one proof that our policy of non-entanglement, of non-alignment has borne fruit. The policy is not negative; it is positive, practical and dynamic.

There was a reference to Goa. Goa has been vexing the mind of every national of this great country. When one reads the speeches of Mr. Salazar, they are a little of swashbuckling and sabre rattling type. He is always, as it were, a volcano emitting venom, full of abuses, full of improper language. Nonetheless, the reaction of India is a reaction of firmness, a reaction of clarity, a reaction of commendable restraint and moderation. There was a recent speech of the Prime Minister of Portugal Mr. Salazar, and the title of the speech is, "Goa and the Indian Union Legal Aspects". I had an occasion to examine the speech with a fair amount of care and I have failed to appreciate and I have not been able to find either any law or any logic about it. A few samples from the speech will repay the pains. He says:

"Portuguese India provides no revenue. On the contrary it continues to be a heavy liability for the treasury of the mother country."

I accept that fact. If that is so, is it for the benefit of the Goans that the Portuguese are there? If they are a burden, why not be rid of the burden? Then again, he says:

"Goans are Portuguese citizens, in no way different or inferior to any others."

Goans are different in race, in culture, in their outlook. With what sense of logic or reality can it be styled that they are citizens in no way different, that is they are like the Portuguese?

Then again there is another travesty of truth wherein it is stated:

"Discussions over the degree of autonomy they should have in their administration have never gone beyond the state of family quarrels."

It must be a most remarkable family where every member of that family is at loggerheads with the *paterfamilias*, namely Mr. Salazar. According to his notions it is just a family

[Shri Tek Chand]

quarrel, when the fact is that every Goan thinks that it is an outrage on his country so long as there is a single Portuguese there. Again, he says:

"By its behaviour towards Portuguese India, the Indian Union is breaking the law and is guilty of acts of aggression."

We are said to be guilty of acts of aggression; it is said that we have broken the law. It is amazing what little regard the author of this speech has for truth, for veracity. Acts of aggression galore are being done in Goa every day and night. Goa is being reduced to the position of a big prison camp. It is for the purpose of perpetuating their hold on Goa that they say that acts of aggression are committed by us. If we were to commit acts of aggression, they could be liquidated in no time. But, ours is a different policy. Ours is an attitude of persuasion; ours is a policy of negotiation.

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

Ours is an attitude of convincing them as to the error of their ways. We can afford to be patient and we have been patient.

Lastly, he says:

"But, the Indian Union will in turn be realist if it takes the reprobation of the universal conscience into account."

Where is the universal conscience reprobating India for the attitude of aggression that it has adopted, in the words of Dr. Salazar? Universal conscience upholds the right of the Goans and the right of this country that they must be united because of the homogeneity of geography, homogeneity of language, culture and because of unanimity of desire.

Regarding the attitude of France and the French settlements, no doubt, we have waited and we are willing to wait. Our approach is conciliatory. It is a good thing that mutual settlement

appears to be in the offing. It will not be long when we can repeat the first two lines of the French national anthem; we can tell the people of the French territories today:

*"Allons les enfants de la patrie
Le jour de gloire est arrive".*

We can tell them, come along, the day of glory is coming, you have not long to wait. Therefore, so far as the French problem is concerned, it is soon reaching solution and it will be solved very soon.

Then, there are the other major points. Not only has India done well unto herself, not only has India acquired a great place of honour and confidence and respect in the councils of the nations, but India has also raised high the head of Asia. India, though a great democracy, on grounds of fairness, on grounds of justice, has engaged herself as a great advocate, a very nearly successful advocate of China, when apparently a wrong is being done to China.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee made two references. He said that *satyagrahis* have been lathi-charged when they wanted to proceed to Goa and he has made a grievance of that. Anybody who is deterred from doing something that the entire country desires and wants is a little disappointed. Please remember that one awkward spark can ignite the whole conflagration. The whole world is a witness today. They know that it is the exclusive struggle of the Goans who want to break the shackles of the Portuguese. If people from this country, out of genuine sympathy, want to go and make their contribution, it will be India which will be given a bad name. Therefore, though the desire is there, it is proper, it is meet that we should remain aloof so far as actual participation in the *satyagraha* movement is concerned, though all our sympathies are with our countrymen who share our hopes and our desires.

There was just a reference to the treatment of the Tibetans. A carping

criticism has been directed against our foreign policy that we did not uphold the independence of the Tibetans. Nobody has a soft corner for China for a minute. Nevertheless, the Chinese claim to Tibet was recognised by the U.S.A. (*An hon. Member: When?*)

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Because the United States have agreed, is it that we must also agree?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Is that the logic?

Shri Tek Chand: If Shri B. S. Murthy had put that question, it would not have perturbed me at all. Now that Shri N. C. Chatterjee says, "is that the logic," am I to teach logic to Shri N. C. Chatterjee? Shri N. C. Chatterjee should not defy logic and say whether the policy of the country is in consonance with logic. The argument that I maintained was that there is no love lost today between America and China. Both of them have their teeth dug into the other's flesh as deeply as they possibly can. In this matter, even the U.S.A. was willing to recognise the claim of China over Tibet. That being so, who are we to contest that claim? According to my learned friends over there, if the logic is incomprehensible to them, I have all my sympathies for them.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: My point is that it is really encouragement to aggression which ought not to have been done by India.

Shri Tek Chand: According to Shri N. C. Chatterjee's notions,—perhaps the most lethal weapon that he can wield is a pen—we should wage war with anybody with whom we do not see eye to eye. That is a logic that one does not understand; but his vehemence one can certainly appreciate.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I was very carefully listening to the speeches made from both sides of the House, I mean, from the opposition as well as from the official side.

Some Hon. Members: In which side are you?

Some Hon. Members: Stateless. (*Interruption*).

Shri Velayudhan: I may tell my hon. friends who are interrupting, that I am on the side where I was and I am at present too there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is in Delhi.

Shri Velayudhan: When I heard my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta delivering his maiden speech on foreign policy, (*Some Hon. Members: No no.*) I say on foreign policy, in this House, I felt that it was a polished speech, just like polished rice. Because, polished rice lacks protein though it has plenty of starch. At the same, I heard my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee speak and I felt that it was full of proteins and I could hardly digest the whole of it. What is needed for a proper health condition is a balanced diet with a proportionate quantity of starch and protein. I shall evaluate the foreign policy of the Prime Minister in this light. I will have to tell my interrupter friends where I stand as far as the foreign policy of the country is concerned. Last year when the foreign policy debate was initiated in this House, when I had occasion to speak at that time, I said: "I agree with the Prime Minister completely as far as the foreign policy of this country is concerned". I repeat the same words to day also. In the circumstances existing not only in India or Asia, but in the world as a whole, I do not think that India can have any alternative policy other than the policy followed by the Prime Minister of India. I would ask my friends who are the critics of the Prime Minister of India what alternative they have got other than the policy which the Prime Minister has been following for the last six years. Of course, I have got my differences with him regarding the domestic policy of India which he is piloting. I must tell you, that, I have been a more vehement critic than many of

[Shri Velayudhan]

the critics of today here, of the Government of India but I must tell you that even at that time I supported the Prime Minister's policy on Foreign Affairs.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): It was good of you.

Shri Velayudhan: India is very young. She is very young as far as our foreign policy is concerned. Only very few of us study the *pros and cons* or the implications, the international or national implications, of the international situation and its effects as far as the country's domestic policy is concerned.

The most important or the most potential factor for disturbing the peace of the world today is not Asia. I must tell you, it is that spot called Berlin or Germany which is a potential spot for breaking the peace of the world today. I had been to West Germany last year and I studied the conditions there and when I came back I gave the impression that if there should be international peace in the world it could not come without the unity of Germany. And today the same problem is worrying the world politicians. We in Asia are thinking of our own domestic problems or the problems of Asia's liberation from colonialism. Our Prime Minister has taken it up in his own hands and he has given a great impetus to it. I do not like the nationalism of any country, but I must tell you that when I say about Asian nationalism, somehow or other I appreciate it, and I admire the stand taken by our Prime Minister.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Your Prime Minister?

Shri Velayudhan: Our Prime Minister. Of course, he is my Prime Minister. I thought yours too.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: He is the Prime Minister of India.

Shri Velayudhan: I am not too personal as Mr. Chatterjee is.

I wish to tell you that we will have to give great credit to the Prime Minister for upholding this Asian nationalism. He is the tallest pillar of Asian nationalism today under which you and I are living as citizens of Asia. (*Interruption*).

My friends from the socialist side were very much agitated over the Tibetan question. I do not know, how it has come as a mania with some friends.

An Hon. Member: It is not a mania.

Shri Velayudhan: It might have been megalomania if it was not a mania. I do not know how common-sense at least can justify itself the criticism regarding Tibet. Tibet was not at any time part of India, and if it was attached to India it was during the British imperial regime, and it was the imperial regime, that kept Tibet as it was and during the time of Chiang-Kai-Shek's regime the U.S.A. recognised it as part of China. And now some of our friends from this side come forward and say: "China is an aggressor of Tibetan people", as if they are the champions of the liberty of the people of Tibet. What I am going to tell you is this, that Tibet is not only racially connected with China, but politically also it was like that, and India has not got any business to interfere in the affairs of Tibet.

A word about Goa. Of course, I think the policy followed by the Prime Minister as far as the Goa question is concerned is consistent with the policy of peace which he has been following.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: No

Shri Velayudhan: Some of my friends might have liked to send an army to Goa and then conquer Goa immediately. Even if there were no interference from foreign powers regarding Goa, nor even pressure from other foreign countries, I would say if we had conquered Goa by military force, the whole peace policy we were following for the

last seven years would have been imperilled, and that would have been a colossal waste of the foreign policy which we have been following for the last seven years. It would have resulted in a colossal failure not only for India, not only for Asia, but for the whole world, because India is the only country that stands for peace in a scientific and correct sense.

About Ceylon I want to say a few words, because most of the Indians in Ceylon have gone from my side as well as from South India. The present position of the Indians in Ceylon is so fluid and so delicate that people are writing letter after letter to us, and it is painful indeed that we could not solve this problem till now. The Government of India had no settled policy as far as the Ceylon question was concerned from the very beginning. (*Interruption*) I repeat that it could not follow any definite policy, from the very beginning. I was wondering why the people who had migrated to Ceylon and been there for the last so many years could not become citizens of Ceylon and settle down there permanently. They have one leg here in the Indian mainland and another leg in the Ceylon mainland. The great confusion that is now existing in the Ceylonese question is because of the policy followed by the Government of India in defending the people who have migrated there and who were not given any proper leadership in proper time as the majority of the migrants were poor workers. Now the time has changed and it has gone beyond control. Now we are facing a critical situation in Ceylon. We are forced to plead with Ceylon that all the Indians there should be accepted as Ceylonese citizens. Let us try to persuade Ceylon, our sister nation to see that no disturbance is made to the large majority of Indians who have become part and parcel of Ceylon's social and economic life.

As far as Pondicherry is concerned, I think a settlement is in sight and that within a few months' time we will

be having a friendly and favourable decision.

Shri Syed Ahmed (Hoshangabad): Are you dealing with all subjects?

Shri Velayudhan: Of course. I think you know it in advance? As far as Pondicherry is concerned.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whatever might be the truth, making the period shorter and shorter is to our advantage.

Shri Velayudhan: I do not know. I want a longer period in life. I think that in some of the colonies like Goa or Pandicherry, if you go there, you can see a different culture already there. Take for example.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Different culture?

Shri Velayudhan: I say it is different culture. I have seen it also. I was, to some extent, attracted by their culture. For instance, there, there are no castes, no communities, and things like that.

Shri B. S. Murthy: There is the colour. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Velayudhan: What has it got to do with this? You cannot be out of colour. You cannot change your colour.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: You are a Scheduled Caste man.

Shri Velayudhan: I was very much attracted towards the civilisation that is existing in Pondicherry. There are no differences of caste or community there. I am here, of course, a victim of caste, like many others who are here in this House, and like many millions who are in the country. It is really a marvellous achievement how this small pocket has been able to wipe away caste and communalism as a whole. The Prime Minister of India has promised the French Government, I am told, that the people in the French possession will be allowed to retain their culture, as it is in existence today. Therefore, I agree with the policy that has been followed by

[Shri Velayudhan]

the Prime Minister in regard to the Pondicherry question also.

Peace is our aim and our objective. Whatever achievements we have had for the last few years have been due to the moral standard, the moral force we were observing, the moral force which was taught to us by Gandhiji. The entire success of our foreign policy has been due to the strength of this moral force. Even though there is criticism of this policy by the Governments of other countries, still I must tell you that the general public not only in India, but in other spheres in Europe, like Germany, France, Switzerland, England, or even America, are in support of this policy, and they appreciate the Prime Minister's policy.

Shri Syed Ahmed: We disagree.

Shri Velayudhan: The common people everywhere are our friends. Before the war, there was a close link or agreeable reflections between the political parties and the Government on the one side, and the public opinion on the other side both in Europe and America. But today, things have greatly changed there. At present there is a vast gulf between public opinion on the one side and Government on the other, in the various countries of Europe as well as in the U.S.A. If you take the public opinion in Europe or America, I must say, our Prime Minister has got the support of the majority of the people in those countries. He has got the support of the majority of people, in Pakistan also. Many kinds of news may appear in the Press about Pakistan but there is no need for India for any kind of mental disturbance over them. I can say that the people of Pakistan are with us in our foreign policy of peace though their Government may be against us.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): What is your authority?

Shri Velayudhan: My own authority. You can believe it or not. You can take it from me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House can accept an assurance from the hon. Member, because there may be a prospect some day of the hon. Member coming over to this side.

Shri Syed Ahmed: He has already come.

Shri Velayudhan: I always want to be an independent.

Shri Syed Ahmed: He has already crossed the road, towards us.

Shri Velayudhan: So far as the peace policy of the Prime Minister is concerned, I must tell you that I stand with him, I am with him, and I will be with him.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): I am very happy that the interest on Goa has been pin-pointed in this foreign affairs debate. I was one of the two M.Ps. on the Goa-Karwar border who on August 15th last, witnessed the Satyagraha of a band of volunteers crossing into Goa; fine young men, some of whom had not either their relations or friends to wish them good-bye, who went away into an unknown land, unknown in the sense that we did not know whether they were lost in prison-yards or spirited away into foreign lands. I saw only one Indian crossing that border then, (and I find him right in the press gallery here.)—I believe he is a representative of Reuters—I was surprised that the Portuguese allowed an Indian to go into Goa when they did not allow a single Indian correspondent of any paper to cross into their border, much less a representative of the PTI or the UPI. I am referring to this incident, because it was a pathetic sight to note British and American Correspondents getting out of a Portuguese warship from Karachi into Goa, and then their crossing into our own border. We had to see helplessly the pathetic sight of foreigners crossing into our land, walking into Goa, walking into Karachi, and walking into the vast sub-continent of India, as if they were the lords of this land, while we the children of

the soil were being denied the opportunity of crossing into our natural territory of Goa. We also witnessed the pathetic sight of these people crossing into Pakistan, which was a part of the whole sub-continent of Hindustan. We would not have minded if we also were left unrestricted in our movements. When the Canadian Prime Minister came, we had to contend against the British and the Americans. I might here repeat an incident that happened when Sir Stafford Cripps and two members of the Cabinet Mission came to India in 1946. I asked him a question as a journalist during their last press Conference here and these are the exact words that I used then, I remember those words, because they have been deeply imprinted in my mind "What will be the attitude of the Government of India towards Goa?" Sir, Stafford looked this side and that side, consulted Lord Pethick Lawrence and Alexander and then said very solemnly, "It is a matter for the future Government of India." In this context, I am surprised that Lord Ismay, who has eaten the salt of this land, Lord Ismay who has wielded the position of Military Secretary to Lord Willingdon in the old the Viceroy's House, Lord Ismay who had come along with Lord Mountbatten as one of his secretaries to India just before the Partition of this land, Lord Ismay who was one of the distinguished men who helped Churchill during War No. 2, that very same Lord Ismay, knowing as he does the sentiment of India, made this astounding statement as the Secretary-General of the NATO, that they would all consult amongst themselves when there is aggression, and that the NATO Powers actively and sympathetically look into this question of Goa, whenever India committed aggression! I remember meeting Lord Ismay in Bombay on his last day of his stay in India. Please forgive me for mentioning this incident. I had a long chat with him at that time, and I remember how he expressed his weariness over war. This was in 1947, when he packed off from India. He said then that he was wearied and torn-out by

the war, and if there was one subject of which he was tired and wearied, it was war! He gave me the impression that he was quitting the army and war for ever. But within seven years, he figures as the Secretary-General of the NATO, and in the salubrious and hospitable climate of Portugal, he says, the NATO powers will consult each other, and will see what measures to adopt in regard to Goa. We do not know who are our friends, and who are our enemies. We should know who are our friends, we should know what their kind is, and we should also know the herd from which they come.

Then came the visit to India of the Canadian Prime Minister, who is noted for this integrity and international reputation. We thought he had come here and made a great declaration. He made a speech to the Members of Parliament, and I must say, throughout that speech, there was an undercurrent of the thought of Western Powers arming themselves against the Powers of the so-called Iron Curtain, in conjunction with the East. Some of us were really dissatisfied with that speech, but we thought there was a saving grace, when he made a statement the next day at a press conference, to the effect that the NATO Powers were not entitled to invoke any provisions of the Treaty, if India took over Goa, or when India asked that Goa should be taken over by her. When this golden statement came from him, we were overjoyed, and we were so much enamoured of it, that we said, at last, here is a great man who has made a big statement, a statesman-like statement. Within a few months after this, his representative called at our Foreign Office and the result was that he had whittled down that statement. Here are the Canadians who are changing their word, to bow down to the Americans. I need say nothing further on this.

We are not afraid of any power in regard to Goa. Goa is ours. We shall take it either by peaceful means or even by violent means, if it comes to that, one day. But it is the American

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Powers that will aid and abet Goa in the aggression against India. When Diu and Goa are going to turn out effective airfields, let us not forget that the Americans are going to help them. Who shall supply them the arms? Who shall supply them the jet planes? Who shall supply the airmen? These are questions which we have to ask. Time and again, ever since 1950, I have added my humble voice in the foreign affairs debate and said that one day Goa will become a problem infinitely more dangerous to India than even Kashmir itself.

We are not afraid of Goa. Here is a statement of the Portuguese Prime Minister made in his speech, a passage which he deleted when the speech was sent down into Goa. Goa has neither an arts college nor an engineering college nor any other type of college except a small medical institution and a law school. When every district in India has got a college.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may speak slowly and more distinctly.

Shri Joachim Alva: I am racing against time, because you will not give me enough time. If you allow me more time, I shall speak very slowly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not able to follow what he is saying.

Shri Joachim Alva: Goa has neither an arts college nor an engineering college or any other college. Under these circumstances, how can we say that the Portuguese have established their rule for the people there? As has been said already, no wedding card can be printed without being shown to the censor. And this is what Salazar says:

"When one says that India fears Goa, it is ridiculous to imagine that it can fear the two or the twenty thousand men that we might have out there."

This very passage has been deleted from his speech which was circulated

in Goa. They have printed one version for American consumption, one for British consumption, one for our consumption and one for Goan consumption. But for these invisible friends of Goa, both Britain and the United States of America, we would not have been worried about it at all. I do not know what help Britain will render to the Portuguese in the time of their distress, when we really make up our mind. I may tell you in all solemnity, after I saw the twenty *satyagrahis* walking into Goa that I came humbly to the conclusion—and I say it in all humility—that the remedy suggested by the Socialist Party or by the Hindu Mahasabha will not stand the test. The Prime Minister's policy in regard to Goa is correct. When France is about to surrender her possessions in India in a gentlemanly, cultured manner, characteristic of the French race, and we are further embroiled in Kashmir and the Americans are enviably looking at our resurgence in Asia and the British also are thinking that way, we cannot put our hands in Goa. But no power on earth can withstand the power that will be engendered by our non-violence on the lines it was engendered after the Dandi March under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi during our struggle for freedom. If perhaps thousands of non-violent *satyagrahis* come forward and move into Goa in a peaceful manner, no power can withstand us from marching and capturing Goa. Perhaps a thousand people or two thousand people may be shot down. But according to international law, no one can be shot down if he is unarmed and he goes down into Goan territory in a non-violent fashion.

I feel that when the question of the French Settlements in India is settled, we shall be able to march thousands of peaceful volunteers into Goa. Though some of us or most of those who have been in the freedom fight may have grown weary and tired, physically and mentally, we have lots of young men who will be ready to enter

into the non-violent conflict. Then we shall see which Power—American or British—will be able to withstand the march of Indian nationalism.

Sir, we have been very, very generous towards Goa. Between 1947 and 1952, India released £13·16 million (convertible sterling) in favour of Goa and about £13 million (non-convertible sterling) in favour of Portugal through Goa, so that the Goan economy might be sustained. And you know in what spirit and gratitude they hit us back. They bought luxury goods from Britain and other places and dumped them into Goa and thereafter smuggled them into Goa. This is how they have given us a parting kick. They have stabilised their economy by Indian tourists going there, by smuggling gold and by various remittances from here—which do not make sound economy at all.

We have also the statement of Mr. Dulles. He made that statement in July last: "There is a slowing down of the process of granting increased self-government". There are statements made by various statesmen in the camp of the West in regard to Goa and we shall have to tackle this problem. We cannot allow Goa to remain away from us a minute longer than necessary. We cannot afford it. My friend, Mr. Chatterjee, has been asking for action; my friend, Mr. Asoka Mehta, has been wanting more and further action. But sometimes it is better to remain quiet and steadfast than to aim a blow which may come back on us and we may lose all the advantages that we have got in our non-violent way of action.

I want to refer to one or two points more. I want to protest against the appointment of Mr. Bokhari as Assistant Secretary-General of the UNO in charge of the information department. We never thought that he would be appointed to this job. I have got a cutting here about a speech he made a few months ago. Mr.

Bokhari, speaking at a luncheon meeting in New York on February 28, said:

"We have strong neighbours to the north and south. We do not have to go around apologising, for asking for military aid begging, 'please, please forgive us'.

"Mr. Bokhari did not elaborate further on the supposed threat from the north and south, but he said tensions between India and Pakistan were 'dangerous, alarming and threatening'.

"Referring to Pakistan's fear of expansionism from within Asia, Mr. Bokhari said that colonialism 'is not the disease that can be caught only by white people'".

This man, Sir, has been appointed as Assistant Secretary-General in the UN Secretariat in charge of Information. Does the UN Secretariat want to counteract or counterbalance the knocking down of American observers in Kashmir by having a man from Pakistan in charge of their information department? He was once the Director of All India Radio. Have we at least been given a chance of nominating our own Assistant Secretary-General for Information or for a similar post so that whatever this man may do on the forum of the information department of the UN Secretariat could be countered? I believe the Government of India have protested against this appointment. But it shows in what way the wind blows in the headquarters of the UN ruled by the USA. When they removed one pin-prick after our protest, they are able to put another pin-prick there.

I find that my friend, Mr. Chatterjee, made a reference to Nepal and Tibet. I am surprised that he is still flogging a dead horse. The joining of Tibet with China is a historic fact. No one can undo it. If the British Government in India were not capable of holding up Tibet in the manner that they wanted to do, it is not anybody's fault. If we want to be perfectly good neighbours with China, we must realise this and not raise any voice of protest in regard to Tibet.

[Shri Joachim Alva.]

When Mr. Chatterjee referred to the Prime Minister of India as a fellow-traveller, I felt we were all fellow-travellers. Who is not a fellow-traveller, if he thinks of the economic improvement of his own country? If we have an inner urge for the economic development of India, if we have an impatience with what is happening elsewhere and wanting to do those similar good things in our own land, then everybody is a fellow-traveller, and I do not think he can find fault with the Prime Minister of India by dubbing him as a fellow-traveller.

When Mr. Chatterjee spoke about Goa and said that the Indian police were on the frontier doing Salazaar's job, I felt in agreement with him, though the implication of his truth was not clear and we could not agree on that at all. I felt that he was thrusting down our throat a *jelabi* or chocolate with a great bit of salt. He thinks of the old bogey of Tibet and of offending China, saying that our relations with China should be on a war footing. That is a policy suicidal to our interest. It has long been given a decent burial. Mr. Chatterjee has still not taken any kind of inspiration from the great historic meeting between Mr. Chou En-Lai and our Prime Minister.

There are one or two words I want to say, about Cyprus. I thought that when the leader of our Delegation to the United Nations, Mr. Krishna Menon, abstained from voting on the resolution on Cyprus, India's voice in regard to liberty, the voice of our Prime Minister which has stirred up nations these two or three decades, was still. People, whether in the West or in the Middle East or the East, always look to us for inspiration. Wherever they may be, however tiny an island to which they belong, they feel that here is the voice from India and they can always count on it. So when on a technical ground the leader of the Indian Delegation abstained from voting, and when at the same time the resolution that the

question of Cyprus be taken on the agenda was passed, we felt that the great and powerful voice of India, which has always stood on behalf of oppressed people, was perhaps silent on account of a technicality or expediency or sentiment or any other factor.

I want to refer to Mr. Chatterjee. I am going to read from a newspaper cutting that U.S.A. had assembled a large fleet in China of 10 cruisers, 125 destroyers, 60 submarines and 15 aircraft carriers. If all these armaments are gathered up together along with the Seventh Fleet, I want to know which country will not be alarmed, which country will not be seized with fear in regard to its own security. This accumulation of fleet is bigger than either the fleets of Pakistan and India or both together. And, when we have such a fleet gathered there on the island of Formosa, we want to know how the Chinese will not feel alarmed. Can we say that we should keep silence and that Formosa should be allowed to rule the mainland of China.

Lastly, our foreign policy is not a policy of blades or swords. We want to turn the swords into plough-shares, we want to turn the blades into planes for the uplift of humanity.

When I find that there is an attack on the theory of co-existence, I find that we have forgotten our history. Co-existence has been in existence down the ages in our own land when the majority looked with respect and tolerance towards other minorities. That seems to be pervading idea around the world and today even Winston Churchill has to go abegging to Washington pleading the theory of co-existence. So far as the problems of the Far-East are concerned, both Britain and America are divided as much as they are united on Germany. In regard to policies of America, they say, that only two things are left in America—Mr. Knowland and Thailand!

Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary): Sir, I find that the criticism that has come from the various groups on the

opposition side bristles with contradictions of a violent and vital nature. Mr. Chatterjee said that the Prime Minister is described as a fellow-traveller, that the policy which he has been pursuing would lead us ultimately into the lap of Communism and Mr. Hiren Mukerjee said that our policy is inextricably tied up with the policy of the United States of America. (*Interruption*). So, Sir, between these two violent contradictions, I have a strong feeling that our policy is absolutely sound, independent and it is positive.

Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Asoka Mehta said that our policy is of dual loyalty. That is, there is no integration between our domestic policy and our foreign policy. That is also not correct because, even in regard to internal policy we have adopted a socio-political democratic structure which breathes that message of non-violence which has been handed down to us from Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi. That is the same policy that is expressed in our foreign affairs also, because we want peace and we want co-existence. There is fear with regard to the successful working of that co-existence, because, as the Prime Minister referred, there is the fear that the Communist Party may not be playing the game. So far as we are concerned, we will play the game and we will observe the rules of the game also with no pretence or pose and with absolute integrity and honesty.

Even in the last Scarborough Labour Conference, Mr. Attlee is reported to have said:

"But co-existence is not compatible with a campaign in which, secretly, you are going to overthrow the institutions of other people. It must be a two-way traffic."

The Comintern was first started with its headquarters in Moscow and leaders and statesmen of Russia, prominent people like Stalin were associated with its working. Afterwards in 1943, it was abolished because Stalin wanted to make a gesture to the Capitalist

Powers. After the defeat of Germany and Japan, the Cominform was revived with the same objective, world revolution and to help the working of the Communist Parties in other countries. As Attlee says, the parties in other countries are working secretly and underground and it is difficult to foresee or presume what will be done and what will not be done. What is the alternative to these conditions? Is it a policy of distrust, fear and hatred which will never succeed? The policy of distrust and hatred will not lead to progress but to a conflagration and a third world war. Therefore, I feel that our policy of peace which is based upon courage, which is based upon strength, which is based upon self-confidence and on wisdom is the only way which will ultimately work.

As I said, it is only an expression of our principle of non-violence in foreign affairs. This is the policy of peace. Our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of China recently issued a joint statement that in co-existence the integrity and the sovereignty of the other countries should be observed. That is peaceful co-existence. In this policy of ours lies the very preservation of humanity and civilisation. There is no alternative to this. Let us be frank about this thing; let us be clear-minded.

Mr. Chatterjee said that we shall, in no event, align ourselves with the Russian bloc and Mr. Mukerjee said we must untie our bonds with the United States of America and sever our connections with them absolutely. But, we are following a policy of absolute independence. It is a policy of preserving peace. We have entered into trade relations with America and trade relations with Russia. As Mr. Mukerjee himself admitted some offers have come from Russia to help us in the installation of another steel plant. We have taken the help of German experts for the installation of the Rourekela Steel Plant and we have taken assistance, both financial and otherwise, from the Americans for the Indo-U.S. Technical Co-operation

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam]

Scheme. It only shows that our minds are not closed and are not made up and that we have no prejudices and we have no distrust. We do not distrust any country, we do not fear any country and this is according to our own genius and heritage. Our fearlessness should be such that we should inspire that same fearlessness in others also. Therefore, when we approach the Communist or the Russian bloc we have no mental reservations. We have no distrust, we have no fear and when we approach the American bloc also we have no fear of the American bloc. Mr. Chatterjee feels that we are going every day nearer the Russian bloc, the Communists and Mr. Mukerjee and others feel that our policy is still tied up with the United States of America. Both are wrong as I said at the beginning. Our policy is one between these two extreme contradictions and our policy is perfectly consistent. It is a policy of peace. Ultimately, I feel, that if these tensions are to be removed and if these two blocs of Russia and America are to be brought nearer to each other, to have a mutual understanding of each other also, they must adopt our policy and there is no other alternative. Let us be clear-minded about these things.

Some hon. friends were saying with regard to Goa that we should take immediate action. Some people were also saying that we should march our forces, that we have shown too much of patience. It is true that we have shown phenomenal and tremendous patience and that is consistent with our policy of non-violence. The hot winds of liberty that we produce in India, the atmosphere of freedom that we produce in India would be so strong that foreign rule in these foreign pockets will disappear and wither away. There is no doubt about it. But, then it is to be on governmental level. People cannot take law or policy into their own hands. They will get into all manner of contradictions and complications and

that will lead to difficulties to Government and the people also. It is a very complicated and delicate question. But, still, we must have full confidence in our Government and allow our Prime Minister to choose his own time and his own technique.

My hon. friend, Mr. Asoka Mehta, said that the slogan of Asia for Asiatics is a wrong slogan. I say, Sir, the Asiatics have been subjected to foreign domination for several centuries and our difficulties have been common, our sufferings have been common. Therefore, if today we all realise that our difficulties are common, that our sufferings are common and we try to be guided by one policy, there is nothing wrong in that. On the other hand, we have been expressing our concern for the sufferings of other people. It is true that people in other lands are subjected to foreign rule but it does concern us and it does worry us. But we are more vitally and more immediately connected with the sufferings of the Asiatics. Therefore, Asia for Asiatics is not based on a love of isolation. There is no question of isolation and the world has become much smaller. Neither is it based on a policy of hatred of any other country, America, England or anything like that. We have our relations with the Commonwealth. But in Asia it is based on the clear fact that for centuries our sufferings have been common and, therefore, we should march together and see that the old colonialism will not succeed in Asia.

5 P.M.

Our policy is perfectly healthy and absolutely independent.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): I am extremely grateful to you for the chance given to me to speak on the foreign policy of this country.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Is it not a little embarrassing to say that an hon. Member is extremely gratified to have been given a chance to speak?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I have the right to express my thanks and I need not consult you on this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that time could be utilised for making some more observations on the subject matter on hand.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I have just begun to speak when he interrupted and he is in the habit of doing that and whenever he did it, he got it straight.

This subject is not coming before us for the first time. In every session we make it a convention to discuss our foreign policy because it is the policy of the nation and not the policy of a single party. From a national point of view I am viewing it and we on this side of the House have generally agreed with the principles of the foreign policy. Perhaps, some of us may have differences of opinion with regard to the details and the methods.

I feel that the foreign policy of India is unique in the whole world. I say it is unique because if you compare it with the national support that the foreign policies of other countries have, you will find the reason. For instance, take France, which has come out in recent years as a very good country in Europe, but what about the people's representatives in the legislature? With regard to Indo-China, there was wide difference of opinion and the great Prime Minister, Mr. Mendes-France, has not the universal support of that country. Again, take for instance England's foreign policy, you will find that England's participation in the SEATO was not appreciated completely by all the Members of Parliament. Take again the case of Egypt's pact with England which was not appreciated by the representatives of the people completely. Take the instance of U.S.A. itself. U.S.A.'s participation at Geneva was so much protested by the Congress in the U.S.A. that Dulles had to run away from Geneva Conference. Even with regard to our neighbour,

Pakistan, you will find that their participation in Manila pact is not yet ratified by the nation. On the other hand, India's foreign policy gets the support of the nation. In the general principles of the foreign policy, the nation is completely behind the Government, and that is why I say that our foreign policy is very unique.

Today Asia looms large in the foreign policy of the world, but no sooner she came into the picture, you have heard opinions expressed throughout the world with regard to the part played by India. If you want to understand the character of an individual or the status of a family, you always depend upon the opinion expressed by the immediate neighbours. Today, we have heard in this House opinions expressed on our foreign policy as 'fellow-travelling' and so many shades of opinion as that of 'a frog in the well', but let us understand what other countries think about our foreign policy. The U.S.A., for instance, with all her jealousy for India, appreciate India's stand on Indo-China, and India's stand on Korea. Mr. Eden himself sent messages of appreciation to our Prime Minister after the conference of Geneva. The Prime Minister of China expressed appreciation and sent messages to our Prime Minister after the Indo-China settlement. So, you will find that every country in the world has appreciated the stand taken by India today, and it may be that one or two within the country, frustrated in position, may not agree, and that is nothing. India stands before the world today as a unique country, with a strength, with a custody of the moral grandeur of the whole world.

No sooner Asia came into the picture, the international politics took a complete turn. This is not unique in the history of humanity. Due to the historic incidents in the march of humanity following a changeless policy of evolution, with its ceaseless repetition in the rise and fall of nations, the pendulum of power had

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

swung from the East to the West and back again. This process of functioning from age to age has created a nebulous state of affairs in international politics, especially during the last few years when Indian independence was born. The first two world wars have brought about in European politics such changes that from the very wreckage of the war, new enemies have risen so much so the enemy that had just been defeated was asked to re-arm themselves. That is how we see today in Western Europe, Western Germany, and in Asia, Japan, are to be re-armed. They are the victims of the late World War II. Attempt to establish peace has been the trend of international politics during the last few years and the custodians of peace have come forward evolving new and contradictory methods of peace and try to mobilise world opinion in their favour either by the threat of dangerous weapons or by policing the world with military organisations, with regional associations, creating rivalry and jealousy among the opposing blocs. So much so, Sir, the idea of peace and the prospect of peace are completely driven away from the horizon. The experiments at Bikini, the poisoning and polluting of the air and water, the scorching of human beings and the drowning of islands, regional organisations like the NATO, ANZUS, SEATO, EDC, the Balkan Union, the Commonwealth of Nations and most of all the UNO, in the name of self-defence, in the name of peace and harmony, in the world, are liable to create friction between nations and nip in the bud the attempt of Asia to consolidate herself into a union of peace and friendship.

But as long as power-mongering is going on in the world, as long as there is colonialism, as long as production and distribution of basic and capital goods, are in the custody of the capitalist nations of the world, and as long as dangerous weapons are created for the destruction of humanity, there is no peace and there is no

prospect of peace. The position of India soon after attaining her freedom was a precarious one. She saw Europe in the words of John Foster Dulles "a military, economic and moral vacuum," and she was forced to fall headlong into European recovery schemes, into Marshal aid, with its economic and political bondage. In Asia the friction of the two power blocs created sparks in Korea and Indo-China which burst into flames. In Kashmir, though it is far from the combustion, political intrigues had created a hot situation for her. The oil fields in the East and the Middle-East had been exploited by the USA, the UK and the Dutch, which exploitation they wanted to continue.

In this way, the international situation was tense when India had to steer herself. In the midst of these conflicting situations India had to steer herself without being burnt by the sparks of warring nations, without being involved in the knotty problems of intrigue and without incurring the displeasure of the conflicting 'isms', which demanded great wisdom on the part of her politicians and statesmen. She had to maintain her integrity, establish her ideals of peace and non-intervention within and without her domain and create by her tolerance, wisdom and humanity a position of stability and esteem for warring nations to seek her advice and suffering nations beseeching her sympathy. Her appeals and advice to nations to help to come to peaceful settlements have had great effect and her contribution in that respect could be seen in Korea and Indo-China. Today, she stands before the world gratified in reaching her ideals through peace and non-violence. Today she is looked upon as the custodian of moral grandeur, as the angel of peace, as the presiding power in settling the Indo-China dispute and as a Great Power wielding influence in settling international questions with equity, justice, peace and harmony. That, Sir, she has achieved without

resorting to shot and shell and without investing her fortunes in dangerous weapons.

I say, time has come for her to be cautious, to look around with circumspection to feel the subterranean currents against her to foil her attempts to create a climate of peace in Asia.

The Conference of the South-East Asian Prime Ministers in which India took a leading part had a very disquieting repercussions in America. She lost her reliance of collective security and her threat of dangerous weapons had no sting. On the other hand, there rose on the eastern horizon the splendour of a Power with her ancient culture and civilisation, coming back to regenerate herself in the wheel of fortune. So, we are today by force of circumstances taking a leading part in Asia to get together and form a third area of peace.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. I am afraid the hon. Member has taken sixteen minutes.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Just allow me to speak on the latest developments regarding the Manila treaty.
.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: She can reserve her remarks to a future occasion.

श्री श्री० एन० रावभाज: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, परराष्ट्र नीति के सम्बन्ध में बोलना मेरी समझ में एक कठिन बात है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने सारी दुनियां में हिन्दुस्तान का सिर ऊंचा कर दिया है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं। दुनियां में शान्ति स्थापित करने के लिए उन्होंने जो कोशिश की है वह भी बहुत हिस्सा में सफल हुई है। लेकिन मेरे मन में जो सन्देह आता है वह यह है कि हमारी तटस्थता की नीति से दुनियां की लोकसत्तावादी शक्तियां मजबूत हुई या कमजोर हुई। लेकिन जो हुकम-शाहीवादी राष्ट्र हैं और राष्ट्र समूह हैं वह एक जगह अपना आक्रमण रोक लेते हैं तां दूसरी जगह पांव आगे डालते हैं। रूस की बात छोड़ दीजिए क्योंकि वह देश हम से बहुत दूर है,

परन्तु चीन हमारा पड़ोसी है, और उसके लिए पीड़ित जी ही नहीं बहुत सारे लोग मित्रता रखते हैं। उन्होंने कोरिया में क्या किया? इसका आपको पता है। इंडो-चीन में भी उन्हीं की सहायता से लड़ाई जारी रही। यहां पर मैं यह मान लूंगा कि इन दोनों देशों से उनका सम्बन्ध था, और अपने देश के लिए ही उन्होंने कुछ कार्रवाई की। पर तिव्वत का मामला कैसा है? वहां तो ज्यादातर लोग बौद्ध धर्मावलम्बी हैं। वहां तो एक रामराज्य व्यवस्था थी। ऐसा माना जाता है कि कई शतकों पहले तिव्वत चीन का ही एक भाग था, बैसें कई देश दूसरों के ताबे में थे, लेकिन अब कोई भी उन देशों पर कब्जा नहीं मांगता। मेरा ख्याल है कि तिव्वत का पूर्व इतिहास कैसा भी हो, वह एक स्वतंत्र सार्व-भौम राष्ट्र था।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: मैं आपका इस ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उनके ऊपर आक्रमण करके उनके ऊपर कब्जा करने का चीन को अधिकार नहीं था। उस आक्रमण को हमने सहायता की है। हां, मैं यह समझ सकता हूँ कि तिव्वत के बारे में हिन्दुस्तान कुछ कर नहीं सकता, क्योंकि तिव्वत के लिए चीन का मुकाबला करने की हिन्दुस्तान में ताकत नहीं, और हिन्दुस्तान के लिए यह जरूरी भी नहीं था। लेकिन जब हम हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के बीच में दुश्मनी का नारा लगाने लगे तब मुझे आश्चर्य होता है और दुःख भी होता है। वहां करार के लिए अभिधान करने की बातें समझ में कोई जरूरत नहीं। सच बात यह है कि चीन ने तिव्वत जैसे एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र को खरम कर दिया है और हिन्दुस्तान ने इस बुरी बात में चीन को सहायता दी है। पीड़ित जी की तटस्थता धारण का ही यह परिणाम है। इसीलिए मैं मानता हूँ कि यह धारण असफल हुआ है।

पीड़ित जी को मैं यह इशारा दे रहा हूँ कि तिव्वत पर चीन को कब्जा लेने का उन्होंने जो मौका दिया है, और उस आक्रमण का जो उन्होंने समर्थन किया है, उससे उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को खतरा में डाला है। और एक बार

[श्री पी० एन० राजभाज]

दीखिए। नेपाल की आज हालत कौसी हैं। वहां कम्युनिस्टों का प्रभाव बढ़ रहा है। कम्युनिस्ट आन्दोलन नेपाल की सुरक्षा को खतरा पैदा कर रहा है। मुझे यह बात अजीब लगी कि हिन्दुस्तान नेपाल सरकार को हर तरह की मदद करता है। नेपाल हिन्दुस्तान का एक मित्र राष्ट्र है जैसे चीन हमारा मित्र राष्ट्र है। फिर चीन क्या कर रहा है? नेपाल में जिन्होंने बलवा किया था और जो नेपाल से भाग कर चला गया उस के० एन० सिंह को चीन सहारा दे रहा है। मैं पीडित जी को पूछता हूँ कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति से यह रीति अच्छी है क्या?

एक बात और मैं पीडित जी की नजर में लाना चाहता हूँ। वह थाईलैण्ड के बारे में है। थाईलैण्ड का एक भूतपूर्व नेता और सेनानी आज पीकिंग के आकाशवाणी से थाईलैण्ड को क्या आर्ष-दं रहा है? वह कहता है कि थाईलैण्ड की सरकार को उखाड़ दो। मैं पीडित जी को फिर पूछता हूँ कि चीन की यह कार्रवाई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति से अच्छी है या बुरी? पीडित जी को इस बात पर गम्भीर रीति से गौर करना चाहिए। मैं साफ साफ बता देना चाहता हूँ कि चीन जैसे राष्ट्र का अपनी सरहद पर कायम हो जाना एक ऐसी बात है जिसकी तरफ हमें ध्यान देना चाहिए और अपनी नीति, अपने राष्ट्र के हित का विचार करके तब करनी चाहिए। नहीं तो तितब्बत आज चीन के पंजे में फँस गया है, कल नेपाल भी कम्युनिस्टों के हाथ में चला जाएगा, और कारमीर की हालत भी वैसी ही हो जाएगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक दूसरी बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। पीडित जी को मेरा सवाल यह है कि चीन हो या रूस हो या दूसरा कोई सा भी देश हो, उन्होंने इसके बाद आक्रमण किया तो पीडित जी उनका मुकाबला करने के लिए तैयार होंगे या नहीं? हर एक देश की सीमा आज कायम हो गई है। पीडित जी को हमें यह आश्वासन देना जरूरी है कि वह सीमा किसी तरह से हटाने के लिए और बदलने के लिए

तैयार नहीं होंगे। अगर उस सीमा को बदलने की कोई राष्ट्र या राष्ट्र समूह कोशिश करेगा तो दुनिया की शान्ति के लिए हिन्दुस्तान अपनी आवाज बुलन्द करेगा। पीडित जी से हम यह आश्वासन चाहते हैं।

चीन के मामले के बारे में अभी कुछ फैसला नहीं हुआ है और जो कुछ हो रहा है वह सिर्फ गोलमाल हो रहा है। मेरे ख्याल से काश्मीर के विभाजन का मामला वहाँ की जनता पर छोड़ देना चाहिए ताकि मुस्लिम क्षेत्र पाकिस्तान में जावे और जम्मू और लद्दाख अमुस्लिम भाग भारत में आवे।

दूसरे राष्ट्रों से शत्रुता होने का और कारण चीन विषयक नीति में कीन्द्रित है। चीन को राष्ट्रसंघ में स्थायी सभासदत्व प्राप्त कराने के लिए भारत को लड़ाया जा रहा है। यह विचित्र स्थिति है। जब चीन स्वयं अपनी लड़ाई लड़ने को समर्थ है तो भारत को उसकी लड़ाई लड़ने का क्या प्रयोजन है। साम्यवादी चीन का हिमायती होकर लड़ने के कारण आज अमरीका का भारत से वैरत्व चला आ रहा है जिसके फलस्वरूप भारत को अमरीका से आर्थिक और पाँचक सहायता मिलना असम्भव हो गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, सार संसार का उद्धार करने की यह असंगत और अविचारी नीति भारत को नाश की खाई में ले जाएगी। हम जितनी जल्दी यह आत्मघाती नीति बदल दें उतनी ही वह भारत देश को लाभप्रद होगी। सार एशियाखंड का हिमायती होकर उसका उद्धार करने का प्रयत्न करने के पहले भारत को स्वयं पूर्ण और बलशाली होने के लिए भगीरथ प्रयत्न करना चाहिए और तद्द्वैतु प्रत्येक उपलब्ध सहायता प्राप्त करनी चाहिए। तब ही भारत की आवाज प्रभावशाली हो सकती है।

मुझे एक बात और कहनी है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने गोआ के बारे में कहा लेकिन उन्होंने गोआ के बारे में कोई निश्चित रूप से बात नहीं कही

हैं और उसके बारे में कोई निश्चित फैसला नहीं किया है। उनकी जो पॉलिसी है उसको हमारे कांग्रेस भाई भले ही अच्छा कहें। लेकिन उससे कोई मामला हल नहीं हो रहा है। पांडीचेरी का मामला उससे हल नहीं हो रहा है, काश्मीर का मामला भी हल नहीं हो रहा है और न पाकिस्तान का मामला हल हो रहा है। मैं हाउस को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा देश सब प्रकार से समर्थ होना चाहिए और हमारी हाउस से प्रार्थना है कि जिस तरह से हम फारन प्राबलम्स की ओर ध्यान देते हैं वैसे ही हमको अपने घरलू मामलों की ओर भी ध्यान देना चाहिए जिनमें हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना है और हमारा छूतछात का मामला है और हमारी आर्थिक अवस्था को सुधारने का सवाल है। जब हमारी घरलू समस्या हल हो जाएगी तो हम अन्तरराष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में जोर की आवाज उठा सकेंगे। हमारे पास अपनी ताकत बढ़ाने के लिए क्या योजना है। हम बाहर की तो बहुत बातें करते हैं लेकिन हमारे घर का यह हाल है, कि औरों के घर में दिवाली है और हमारे घर में दिवाला। हमारा देश इतना बड़ा है। हमारे देश का नाम संसार में अक्षर के साथ लिया जाता है। मैं अभी विलायत और दूसरे देशों में गया था। वहां लोग हिन्दुस्तान की बड़ी इज्जत करते हैं। लेकिन हमको पहले अपने घरू मामलों को भी ठीक करना चाहिए। आप बाहर बड़े बड़े एम्बेसेडर भेजते हैं लेकिन उनमें आप हमारे आदिमियों को नहीं भेजते। हम भी इस देश के नागरिक हैं जैसे कि मुसलमान हैं, ब्राह्मण हैं और दूसरी जाति के लोग हैं। आप और लोगों को एम्बेसेडर बनाते हैं, गवर्नर बनाते हैं, लेकिन हम लोगों को नहीं और अपने कानफिडंस में नहीं लेते। मेरा यह कहना है कि जैसा साउथ अफ्रीका और अमेरिका में नीगांज का प्राबलम है वैसे ही यहां पर हमारा प्राबलम है। इसलिए मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे लिए भी कुछ योजना होनी चाहिए और हम लोगों को ऊंचे पदों और दजों पर लेने के लिए पीडित जी को आश्वासन देना चाहिए। हम यह आशा करते हैं कि वे ऐसा आश्वासन देंगे। अन्त में मैं फिर यह कहता हूँ कि अछूतों के घरू मामले में

और फारन मामले में उनको सहायता देने का आश्वासन पीडित जी की तरफ से मिलना चाहिए।

पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (गुड़गांव): जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, इस एक्सटर्नल एफेयर्स के मामले में, इस फारन पॉलिसी के मामले में मैं शायद पहली मर्तबा दखल दे रहा हूँ। मैंने उस वक़्त तो हिस्सा लिया था जब कि कामनवैल्थ का सवाल दरपेश था और मैंने तबचीब की थी कि हमें कामनवैल्थ का हिस्सेदार बना रहना चाहिए। लेकिन उसके बाद मैंने आज तक हिस्सा नहीं लिया।

जब कभी हमारा सेशन होता है तो एक दो दिन के लिए हमें इस मसले पर बोलने का मौका दिया जाता है और वही पुरानी शिकायत अपॉजिशन की तरफ से की जाती है और वही पुराना जवाब सरकार की तरफ से दिया जाता है। जहां तक हमारी बैसिक पॉलिसी का सवाल है आज उसमें किसी को हाउट करने की जरूरत नहीं है। उसके बारे में बहस करने की जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन मैं क्या देखता हूँ कि, जैसा पीडित जी ने फरमाया, वही पुरानी बहस मौजूद है और वही पुराना जवाब मौजूद है। मुझे एक कहानी याद आती है। एक आदमी के यहां शादी थी, तो उसने उसमें कुछ ऐसे लोग बुलाए जो कि उससे रूठे हुए थे। उन्होंने सोचा कि इसके यहां शादी में तो जाना नहीं है इसके लिए कोई बहाना ढूंढना चाहिए। तो उनमें से एक आदमी कोठ पर चढ़ गया और दंगा करने लगा। किसी ने पूछा कि कौन है तो उसने जवाब दिया कि तुम कहते हो कि कौन है, इसलिए हम तुम्हारे यहां नहीं आते। तो कुछ ऐसा ही हाल यहां पर है। चूंकि अपॉजिशन की तरफ से कुछ बात अपॉजिशन की कहनी है इसलिए कुछ बात कह दी जाती है। आज हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक सीधा सवाल किया और अपॉजिशन को चाहिए था कि वह उसका सीधा जवाब देता। उन्होंने कहा कि साउथ ईस्ट एशिया के कुछ देशों में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टियां मौजूद हैं लेकिन वे वहां की जमीन से पैदा नहीं हुई हैं, वे इंग्लैंड

[पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

जिनस नहीं हैं और उनकी सारी पालिसी किसी दूसरी जगह से गवर्न होती हैं। और उन्होंने यह एक वजह बतलाई थी जिसकी वजह से उन देशों में ठीक तरह से न कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के काम की कद्र की जाती है और उनको शुबह की नजर से देखा जाता है।

हमारे प्रोफेसर मुकर्जी ने बहुत बातें कहीं लेकिन पीडित जी ने जो उनसे एक सवाल किया था उसका जवाब उन्होंने नहीं दिया। वह कहते हैं कि हमारे हिन्दुस्तान की जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है वह इस देश की है और उसको अपने देश से मुहब्बत है और हम किसी दूसरे देश के लायल नहीं हैं....

श्री टी० बी० बिट्ठल राव (खम्मम) : अगर हो तब तो कहें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not called upon the hon. Member to speak.

पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मुझे यह जानकर खुशी हुई कि मेरे भाई के अनुसार कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का किसी बाहरी देश से सम्बन्ध नहीं है। लेकिन वह माँका था उनके डिप्टी लीडर को पीडित जी ने जो पूछा था उसके बारे में जवाब देते और इस तरह का एलान मुकर्जी साहब को अपनी स्पीच में करना चाहिए था लेकिन जवाब क्या दिया जाता है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी बहुत अच्छी है, होगी अच्छी, लेकिन पीडित जी का एतराज यह नहीं था, पीडित जी का एतराज तो यह था कि इन सब की बागडोर रूस के हाथ में है, इसका क्या जवाब है ?

Dr. Rama Rao: It is a mischievous lie.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Members have had an opportunity. He will have another opportunity to speak.

पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : डाक्टर साहब बड़े जोर से कहते हैं कि यह बात गलत है, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक़्त पीडित जी ने यह एतराज किया था, तो मुकर्जी साहब जब जवाबी तक्कीर करने खड़े हुए थे तब उनको माँका

था कि इसका एलान करते, लेकिन उनको तो यह कहने की जरूरत नहीं हुई कि पीडित जी ने जो कुछ फरमाया है वह इस पार्टी पर लागू नहीं होता। अगर वह ऐसा फरमाते तो हमें बेहद खुशी होती और अगर हमारी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी किसी दूसरे देश से कोई सम्बन्ध और लगाव नहीं रखती और हिन्दुस्तान से मुहब्बत करती है तो मैं उसकी उसी तरह इज्जत करता जैसे पी० एस० पी० और दूसरी पार्टियों की करता हूँ। लेकिन अगर ऐसा नहीं है और उनकी लायलटी डिवाइडेंड है तब चाहे वह पार्टी दक्खिनी की ही क्यों न हो, मैं उसको शुबह की निगाह से देखूंगा।

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: It is an Imperialist saying.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : अगर आप और आपकी पार्टी इस देश के प्रति वफादार हैं और बाहर के देशों से कोई लगाव नहीं रखते तो मैं आपको बहुत इज्जत की निगाह से देखने वाला हूँ, मैं जानता हूँ कि आप में से चन्द लोग हम मामूली लोगों से ज्यादा सैक्रिफाइस करने वाले हैं, मैं जानता हूँ कि आप में हिन्दुस्तान से मुहब्बत करने वाले लोग हैं लेकिन जब तक पीडित जी का जवाब नहीं दिया जाता, तबतक आप नहीं कह सकते कि यह पार्टी दरअसल हिन्दुस्तान में ही महदूद है और बाहर के देशों से इसका कोई लगाव नहीं है।

दूसरा सवाल हिन्दुस्तान का कामनवैल्थ में शामिल रहने के बारे में है। हम पर यह आरोप किया जाता है कि हिन्दुस्तान कामनवैल्थ में क्यों शामिल है ? श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी कहते हैं कि आप आज भी कामनवैल्थ में क्यों रह रहे हैं। साथ में वे यह भी कहते हैं कि मुझे पीडित जी पर शुबहा नहीं लेकिन बाकी जो चालीस मिनिस्टर हैं उन पर शुबहा है। काटज़ साहब यां बोलते हैं और चन्दा साहब यह कहते हैं, मैं मुकर्जी साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब उन्हें श्री नंहरू पर कोई शुबहा नहीं है तब तो बात ही खतम हो जाती है क्योंकि आखिर

में वह ही तो हमारा लीडर हैं, रहनुमा हैं और वह ही तो गवर्नमेंट चला रहे हैं और सार मिनिस्टर उनके नीचे और उनके आर्डर के मुताबिक काम कर रहे हैं, आज सारा दश उनके पीछे खड़ा है और उनके बताए रास्ते पर दश की हुकूमत चल रही है। अगर हमारे दोस्त किसी मिनिस्टर की किसी बात से या फर्ज कीजिए मेरी किसी बात से यह नतीजा निकालें कि हम अमरीका और विलायत वालों के साथ बहे जा रहे हैं, या हमारे चटर्जी साहब कहें कि हम लोग रूस के साथ में बहे जा रहे हैं तो मैं कहूंगा कि आप किसकी बात मानेंगे। सच तो यह है कि दोनों सच हैं और दोनों भ्रूठ हैं, भ्रूठ अन-पार्लियामेंटरी न करार दिया जाए, इसलिए मैं कहूंगा दोनों सही हैं और दोनों गलत हैं। हमारी फार्न पार्लिसी बिल्कुल साफ है और वह यह है कि हम इंसोफ और सच्चाई की बुनियाद पर खड़े हैं। भारतीय संविधान की धारा ५१ में जो हमने डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स पास किए हैं और जो उसमें हमने चार चीजें रक्खी हैं, अगर उस कसौटी पर आप अपनी फार्न पार्लिसी को कसैं तो मुझे कोई शुबहा नहीं है कि डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स में जो दिया गया है उसी के मुताबिक पीडित जी की हर एक पार्लिसी आप पाएंगे। पीडित जी की पार्लिसी उन्हीं उस्लॉ पर आपको बंस्ट मिलेगी। दरअसल बात तो यह है कि जब महात्मा गांधी जिन्या थे तो उनके अन्दर क्लाइन्ड फेथ रखता था, उनके बाद पीडित जी एक ऐसे जादूगर हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हुए हैं और जिस खूबी के साथ उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की एक्सटरनल पार्लिसी चलाई है कि दरअसल हमारी सारी अकल पर एक परदा सा छा गया है और हकीकत यह बन गई है कि पीडित जी अगर शाम को सुबह कहें या सुबह को शाम कहें तो मुझे वैसे कहने में कोई दिक्कत न होगी क्योंकि तजुर्बा हमें बतलाता है कि इंटरनेशनल फील्ड में जो कुछ उन्होंने हम से और दुनिया के दूसरे देशों से दोस्ताना तौर पर कहा, वह बिल्कुल सच निकला, सोलहों आने सही निकला। पीडित जी ने चंतावनी दी कि बर्टी-एट पॅरलल मत पार करो, नहीं तो लड़ाई हो जाएगी और चुनावें हमने ईसा कि उनकी

सलाह और चंतावनी नहीं मानी गई और जंग हुई। पीडित जी ने कोलम्बो कांग्रेस के मौके पर कहा, पीडित जी को कोई कहने का हक नहीं था तो भी उन्होंने अपनी आवाज बुलन्द की और दुनिया के देशों को राय दी कि इन पांच सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार लड़ाई बन्द कर दो। दुनिया भर में एक पैगम्बर की मानिन्द वह सामने आए और कहा कि तुम लोग इन पांच उस्लॉ पर लड़ाई बन्द करो और हम आगे देखते हैं कि इंडो चाइना में उन्हीं उस्लॉ पर पीस हो जाती है। पीडित जी ने चीन की सरकार को ५० एन० ओ० में मान्यता दिलाने के लिए वहां पर आवाज उठाई, बाबजूद अमरीका की सख्त मुसालफत के चीन के सवाल पर हमारे कम्युनिस्ट दोस्त पीडित जी को एप्लाउ करतें हैं और वह भी मानतें हैं कि दूसरे देशों में पीडित जी की बढ़ी इज्जत है। मेरे एक भाई ने बड़ जौर शौर से कहा कि मैं फला फलां मुल्कों में गया और वहां मैंने लोगों को कहते सुना कि पीडित जी एक बहुत बड़े आदमी हैं। और यह वाक्या है कि पीडित जी की बढ़ाईलत आज हर एक हिन्दुस्तानी की और हमारे देश की बाहर के लोगों की निगाह में इज्जत बढ़ी है और हिन्दुस्तान का सिर ऊंचा हुआ है। पहले जब लोग यहां से बाहर विदेशों में जाया करतें थे तो उनकी कोई कद्र नहीं थी लेकिन मैं खुद अपने तजुर्बे की बिना पर कह सकता हूं कि जब मैं पिछली मर्तबा विलायत गया तो मेरे साथ सब लोग बहुत मुहव्वत और इज्जत के साथ पेश आए क्योंकि वह जानतें थे कि हम लोग महात्मा गांधी और पीडित नेहरू के मुल्क के हैं। मैं अब से अब करना चाहता हूं कि जो पार्लिसी पीडित जी ने यहां पर रक्खी है उसको आप किसी नुकत्त निगाह से देखें, जाहिर तौर पर हमको कुछ नुकायस भले ही पाएँ लेकिन थोड़े ही असें के बाद यह चीज साबित हो जाती है कि पीडित जी की जो पार्लिसी है वह बिल्कुल सही और सच निकली। इसी तरह आप पाकिस्तान के प्रति हमारी पार्लिसी को देखिए। पाकिस्तान ने कारमीर के अन्दर भगड़ा पैदा किया, हैदराबाद में उसके बाद भगड़ा हुआ और पाकिस्तान की यह सब ज्यादातीयां देखकर हमारे लोग कहने लगें थे कि

[पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

पीडित जी की पालिसी पाकिस्तान की तरफ एक कमजोरी की पालिसी हैं और लोग तो यहां तक कहते थे कि अभी वक्त हैं, पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ाई छंड़ दो। उसके बाद हम देखते हैं कि नेहरू लियाकत पेंकट हुआ उसकी हम में से बहुत लोगों ने बहुत मुखालफत की, लेकिन आज हम क्या देखते हैं? हम देखते हैं कि पीडित जी की पालिसी कामयाब साबित हुई और हमारा सिर ऊंचा हुआ। इसी तरह मैं कहूंगा कि आज मुक़र्बी साहब गाँआ के लिए इतने जोर शोर से बोल रहे हैं और गवर्नमेंट को एक्टिव कदम उठाने को कह रहे हैं, मंत्रिदल में उनके लिए बहुत इज्जत हैं, उनसे मैं कहूंगा कि थोड़े दिन बाद यह बात साबित हो जाएगी कि गाँआ के बारे में भी पीडित जी की पालिसी कतई सही थी और जैसा कि मुक़र्बी साहब चाह रहे हैं, हमको इस कदर जल्दी नहीं करनी चाहिए थी। क्या हम नहीं जानते कि किस तरह हमारे देश के उस बुजुर्ग और रहनुमा महात्मा गांधी ने आजादी के लिए जद्दोजहद की, चौराचौरा के कांड के त्रादुहमने देखा कि हमारी लड़ाई का रुख बदल गया और कभी नर्म और कभी गरम इस तरह आगे बढ़ कर महात्मा गांधी ने अपने तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान को आजादी दिला कर छोड़ी और मुझे पूरा यकीन कामिल है कि जब तक हमारे सिर पर पीडित जी का हाथ है, जब तक देश की बागडोर उनके हाथ में है, हमें पूरा यकीन है कि हम सही रास्ते पर चलते रहेंगे और हम हर मसले में कामयाब होंगे। गाँआ के अन्दर अगर हम जल्दबाजी में कोई कार्रवाई कर बैठेंगे तो हमको खराब नतीजा भुगतना पड़ सकता है और इसीलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि पीडित जी गाँआ के बारे में जिस तरह चल रहे हैं वही सही रास्ता है। परमाल्मा की कृपा से महात्मा गांधी के बाद मुल्क को पीडित नेहरू जैसा लीडर मिला है जो हमारे मुल्क को सही रास्ते पर ले जा रहा है और हमारा सबका फर्ज है कि हम उनके पीछे चलें और उसका हाथ बंटाएं। कोरिया के सम्बन्ध में जो कमीशन कायम हुआ था, हालाँकि हमारा उस लड़ाई से कोई वास्ता नहीं था लेकिन हमने उस पीस

मिशन के काम को अपने हाथ में लिया और यह हमारी फार्न पालिसी की कामयाबी देखिए कि दूसरे मुल्कों ने हमको उस कमीशन का प्रेसीडेंट बनाया और हिन्दुस्तान को ही क्यों उसका प्रेसीडेंट बनाया, वजह उसकी साफ है, क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में दूसरे मुल्क वालों को यकीन है कि वह इस मामले में बिस्कुल इमपार्शियल रहेगा और किसी की तरफदारी नहीं करेगा और वह इन्साफ के साथ ठीक ठीक काम करेगा।

अभी हमारी बहिन मैस्करिन ने जो कहा, तो मैं उनकी बड़ी कद्र करता हूँ और उन्होंने बहुत ही सुन्दर अंगूजी जवान में अपनी बात को कहा और मुझे तो वैसे अंगूजी भी नहीं आती कि मैं उतनी खूबी के साथ अपनी बात को कह सकूँ, अगर कह सकता होता तो मैं भी अंगूजी में बोलता, लेकिन मैं उनसे अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो सीटो सम्मेलन हो रहा है उसके बारे में कोई शुबहा नहीं है कि अमरीका और अंगूज क्लॉनिचल पावर को कायम रखना चाहते हैं और यह सीटो इसी गरज से बना है। आज हिन्दुस्तान के पास आखिर वह क्या चीज है जिसकी बिना पर वह साफ साफ उसके बारे में एलान कर रहा है। मैंने हिन्दुस्तान के जहाज देखे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की फौज देखी है, मैंने अन्दर से इन चीजों को देखा है, तो क्या हमारे पास कोई ऐसी फौजी या दूसरी ताकत है जिसकी बिना पर हम किसी बड़ी ताकत या मुल्क से लड़ सकें, क्या हममें इतनी ताकत है कि हम अमरीका या अंगूजों से लड़ सकें? लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पीडित नेहरू के हाथ में सारे देश की मारल ताकत है और उस मारल स्ट्रेंथ की बिना पर लड़ते हैं और साफ साफ बातें कहते हैं। जापान के साथ सेन फ्रांसिस्को के अन्दर भगड़ा होता है, हिन्दुस्तान अकेला ऐसा मुल्क है जो कहता है कि हम तुम्हारे पंजे में नहीं आते। अभी जब पीडित नेहरू अमरीका तशरीफ ले गए तो लोगों ने उनसे सीधा सवाल पूछा कि आप हमारे साथ लड़ाई में शामिल होंगे तो उन्हें पीडित जी ने

जवाब दिया कि हमारा दंश की सारी मारल स्ट्रथ तुम्हारे साथ लड़ाई में शरीक होगी अगर तुम्हारी लड़ाई जस्ट काज के लिए होगी। आज मुल्क को ऐसे ही लीडर की जरूरत है और बावजूद इसके कि हिन्दुस्तान फौजी नुकते निगाह से कोई बड़ी ताकत नहीं है ताहम उससे दुनिया के अन्दर नाम पैदा किया है और उसकी गिनती बड़े वंशों में हो रही है और उसकी एक ही वजह है और वह है पीडित जी की रहनुमाई और महात्मा गांधी का बताया हुआ रास्ता जिस पर पीडित जी हमें ले जा रहे हैं। अपनी उसी मारल ताकत के भरोसे पर आज हम सारी दुनिया का चैलेंज मंजूर करने को तैयार हैं। इसमें शक नहीं कि आज अमरीका हम से नाराज है, तो नाराज है तो हुआ करे, लेकिन पीडित नेहरू हरगिज उनके सामने भुक्कने को तैयार नहीं हैं। भले ही वह अपनी एकानामिक एंड उठा रक्खें, पीडित जी ने साफ साफ उनसे कह दिया कि अगर आप हमको एंड दना चाहते हैं तो हम उसको तभी तक लेने को तैयार हैं जब तक कि उससे हमारी पालिसी पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ता है।

हाउस को याद होगा कि थोड़ा अर्सा हुआ अमरीका चाहता था कि हमको बड़ी भारी खुराक की मदद करे जैसे पाकिस्तान को कर रहा है और वह भी बगैर किसी कीमत के करे। लेकिन पीडित नेहरू ने इसको गवारा नहीं किया और कहा कि हम कीमत देंगे, हम मुफ्त में मदद नहीं लेंगे। यह स्पिरिट है पीडित नेहरू की जिसकी वजह से दुनिया भर में हिन्दुस्तान का नाम हो रहा है।

मैं अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज 'सिएटो' का हमारे पास क्या जबाब है? आज अमरीका और इंग्लिस्तान के मुकाबले में हमारे पास क्या जबाब है? उसका जबाब वही है जो कि पीडित नेहरू ने दिया है और जो महात्मा गांधी का ताकत के सामने जबाब था। आज उसका जबाब यह है कि इतने मुल्क हमारे साथ कलैक्टिव पीस में शामिल हैं। बैचार् इंडिया, इंडोनेशिया और बर्मा दूसरे मुल्कों के सामने क्या हस्ती रखते हैं, लेकिन ताहम हम

एक कलैक्टिव पीस का जो एरिया है उसको लेकर सारी दुनिया के सामने रख सकते हैं। आज 'सिएटो' का अगर कोई जबाब है तो वह पीडित नेहरू का कलैक्टिव पीस एरिया का मुब ही है। मुझे यकीन है कि आज हमारे पास ताकत नहीं है लेकिन यह मुब ऐसा है जो कि किसी भी ताकत का सामना कर सकता है। दुनिया उसूलों के पीछे चलती है, दुनिया इन्साफ के पीछे चलती है और जब तक इन्साफ का राज्य है तब तक हमारी पालिसी सही है। अगर हम इस पालिसी पर चलते रहें तो हम दखेंगे कि दुनिया हमारी कद्र करती है और कोई शक्ख हम पर हमला नहीं कर सकता। लेकिन इसके यह माने नहीं हैं कि हम किसी चीज के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। मुझे मालूम है कि हमारी सरकार मुल्क की हिफाजत के लिए क्या कर रही है। लेकिन 'honesty is the best policy and honesty is the best principle' दोनों

लिहाज से, पालिसी के लिहाज से और उसूल के लिहाज से, हर तरह से हम ने जो पालिसी अख्तियार की है, जो हमारी आज की फारन पालिसी है, वही पालिसी आज काम कर सकती है और जो कि दंश की सभ्यता के 'इन लाइन' है और सारा हिन्दुस्तान इसको चाहता है और सारा हिन्दुस्तान इसके पीछे है। मैं निहायत अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि दो दो तीन तीन दिन अपनी एक्स्टर्नल पालिसी पर बहस करने के लिए हमें खर्च नहीं करने चाहिए क्योंकि इसमें आपस में कोई डिफरेंस नहीं है। यहां पर सिर्फ यही तो कहा जाता है कि कामनवेल्थ से निकल जाओ। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कामनवेल्थ में रहने से हमें कोई नुकसान नहीं है। अगर मरे दंश को नुकसान इस वजह से मुझे मालूम होता तो कांग्रेस पार्टी तो क्या अगर कोई राज भी मुझे को मिलता होता तो भी मैं अपनी जबान से न कहता कि हिन्दुस्तान को कामनवेल्थ में रक्खा जाए। मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारा कामनवेल्थ में रहना सफल हुआ है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे एक भी चीज ऐसी नजर नहीं आई जो कि किसी मंम्बर की तरफ

[पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

से कही गईं हो और जो फिलवाक्या हमारी फार्न पालिसी के बखिलाफ हो। दरअसल बात यह है कि जब वह हमारी फार्न पालिसी को उसूलों की नजर से देखते हैं तो पीडित नेहरू को एप्लाज दते हैं, लेकिन एप्लाज दते दते जब उनके पास कुछ रह नहीं गया। उनके पास कोई 'स्टाक इन ट्रेंड' नहीं रहा, तब एक ही 'स्टाक इन ट्रेंड' बच गया है कि "हम को कामनवैल्थ से निकल जाना चाहिए, अमरीका से लड़ पड़ना चाहिए। आज हम से न अमरीका खुश है न रूस खुश है।" लेकिन हम क्यों किसी की खुशी की परवाह करें? हमें अपनी पालिसी को जो पीस और इमानदारी के असूल पर मबनी है चलाना चाहिए और मजबूती के साथ चलाना चाहिए।

मैं आपका शुक्रीय अदा करता हूं कि आपने मुझे अपने ख्यालात जाहिर करने का मौका दिया।

Shri Sadhan Gupta: We have never failed to appreciate the contributions which the Prime Minister has made to the cause of world peace. Contributions have been made, significant contributions, for example, in the matter of the attitude of our Government regarding the hydrogen bomb, regarding SEATO, regarding the policy towards China, regarding the cease-fire in Indo-China—and we have never failed to acknowledge it. We shall acknowledge whatever contribution is made from whatever quarters; however inimical to us those quarters may be, we shall acknowledge those contributions. But what fills us with apprehension is the Prime Minister's apology for making those contributions.

Last time when he spoke on foreign affairs in the last session, he did not speak in the vein in which he spoke today. Today he came out with slanders on the communist parties, with insinuations, with oblique references which would imply that there are two war blocs in the world, one led by the Soviet Union and China and the other led by America. Why

is it? Why is this apology? Everyone who has come back from the Soviet Union or China, whether they are Congressmen, whether they are Communists, whether they are Socialists or whether they belong to no party, they are all agreed in this, that the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic do not want war. They are engaged in massive construction and they want peace, and they are striving for peace. That is agreed by people of all parties, people of undoubted integrity who have visited the Soviet Union or China. Now, Sir, why this slander against the communist parties? Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava was surprised to hear that communist parties were indigenous to the country, that they did not spring from Russia. I can give him the assurance that we are indigenous. (*Laughter*). Let those who indulge in laughter not forget....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I never said anything about the Communist Party myself. I only stated that Pandit Nehru stated this and no reply was given to it.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I am going to give him the reply. Let them not forget that in the elections held for this august Parliament it was a communist candidate who got the highest number of votes in India, and let us not forget that not a single Chinese, not a single Russian voted for him. It was the people of India who voted for him. Let us not forget that the Communist Party was voted as the second party in this Parliament and was given the position of the second party of India, not by the votes of the Chinese or Russians, but by the votes of our people. And let us not forget that in other places in the world the position of the Communist Party is even better. It is even stronger than the Communist Party of India, because the communist parties are entrenched in the affections of the people. There is no doubt in any quarter. Every impartial visitor has agreed that every communist party is absolutely popular in the countries in which the Communist-led regime

exists, and that those regimes are entrenched in the countries with the solid and enthusiastic support of the countries.

Now, Sir, so far about the communist parties. Therefore, why these apologies? Why these slanders against the communist parties? Why this oblique reference to a fact which is not true, that the Soviet Union and China are also allegedly seeking to do some war-like acts against America or England.

An Hon. Member: Nobody said so.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: May we ask the question whether the reason is the millions of dollars of aid we are receiving from the United States, whether the reason is our Commonwealth tie-up? I am coming to the Commonwealth in a moment, and I hope to demolish all the arguments and convince Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava and others what damage we have suffered from our Commonwealth link-up. But it is sufficient about this particular point to say that it is perhaps due to our Commonwealth link-up and the millions of dollars we receive from the United States that today in spite of our contributions to world peace, we have to be apologetic for those contributions, we have to say that we understand the fears of America. Have the Americans any fear of communism? It is not fear; it is because communism stands in the way of their imperialist exploitation and imperialist expansion, that the United States is seeking to unleash a war in the world.

About our Commonwealth tie, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava seems very touchy about it. The Prime Minister seems very touchy about it. He is tired of our repeating the necessity to leave the Commonwealth. I do not disagree that our Commonwealth tie-up has been really one of give and take. We have given, and we have taken. We have celebrated the accession of 'Her Britannic Majesty'. Our Prime Minister, when he went to Kalyani, did not have time to meet the delegation of strikers

from Titagrah, because he was busy, but he had the time to go and participate in the coronation of Her Majesty. We have waved the Union Jack over this House on the occasion of the accession of Her Majesty. Of course, in Britain, a similar thing was not done on the occasion of the declaration of our Republic. Now, that is not all.

In liberating the French settlements. Indians of India as well as Indians of the French possessions participated in it, and they were freely allowed to do so. In the liberation of Nagar-Haveli, Indians and Portuguese nationals—i.e., in international law—Indian nationals, i.e., non-Goan and Goan Indian nationals participated, and no objection was raised, but suddenly we find the High Commissioner in India for the United Kingdom calls at the Foreign Office, and we find a change; we find wisdom dawning upon us, and we ban non-Goans from the 15th August. Are we not justified in asking whether there is any connection between this visit and the sudden decision? Are we not justified in asking whether that is not part of our subscriptions as membership for Commonwealth? Again, that is not all.

We have given other things also. We have, to our great prejudice, settled the sterling balances against our interests. Those balances were won with the sacrifice of 3½ millions of lives in Bengal, but we have looked to British interests in settling the matter. There are so many other things that I could catalogue, but I have not the time. That is what we have done. It is not that we have not received anything. We have received certain things. We have received some kicks from our little brothers in South Africa on the racial question. We have received kicks from Ceylon, and we have received from Pakistan the threat of war, and hostile action by receiving American aid. And from the British, we have received a very solemn and reassuring assurance to Portugal through Lord Ismay that when Portugal raises the question of

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

Goa in the NATO, it will be considered, and not only considered, but it will be considered very sympathetically. So, it is really a give and take. We have given and we have taken. If Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is satisfied with this give and take, I have nothing to say, but we could not be satisfied. Let us assure the Prime Minister that our objection to the Commonwealth is not mere sentimental nonsense; it is based on patriotism. When we took a vow on the 26th January, 1930, that our real independence consists in severing the British connection, I take it we did not take only a sentimental vow, but we took a vow which corresponded to the reality.

We have found that the British grip on our economy is killing our economy today, and I take it that it is for the politeness that is expected of us as members of the Commonwealth that we cannot touch that economy today, and free our economy from that vicious grip. I take it that it is for the politeness required of us as members of the Commonwealth that we cannot refuse to let British recruits to have transit across our country to murder the valiant Malaysians who are fighting against British rule. I take it that it is our Commonwealth association which forbids us from saying anything against the British oppression in Malaya, against the British carnage let loose in Kenya and Uganda, whereas we can freely condemn the French atrocities in Tunisia. These are the facts. These are not sentiments. These are not emotions. If these facts are overlooked, if the Prime Minister persists in overlooking these facts, we shall persist in repeating our demand for leaving the Commonwealth. We are not ashamed to repeat it; as long as this unpatriotic attitude persists in the Government of India, we shall go on repeating it. Let us assure the Prime Minister that he will not get away with it by simply persisting with it; he will not make a thing right, which is wrong, merely by persistence

and merely by repeated declarations that it is right. Let us not forget that up to now, he has not given us a single fact in the balance-sheet to show that our Commonwealth link-up has been profitable to us, that we have really been able to exert our influence in the Commonwealth in a manner which really does credit to us, which really is to our national interests. On the other hand, there have been many occasions, and innumerable instances, where we have had to surrender, we have had to suffer indignities, we have had to suffer economic losses, and we have had to suffer economic backwardness on account of our Commonwealth tie, and we have not said anything.

In conclusion, I want to say that what we want the Prime Minister to do is to follow a policy of consistency. If he does something right, let him not be ashamed of it; let him not try to woo other countries in order to allay their suspicions. If we do something right, and it happens to coincide with the interests of a certain group of countries, let us not be ashamed of it. If right is right in India, right is right in the Soviet Union, and it must coincide. If the Americans do not like it, let us say, we are very sorry for it, we cannot help it. Secondly, we want the Prime Minister, we urge upon him again to fulfil the patriotic aspirations of India, the patriotic pledge which we took on the 26th January 1930, by renouncing the Commonwealth tie. It has done us no good. It will do us no good. On the other hand, it will do us plenty of evil, and we want to avoid it.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): During this turbulent time, not Moscow or Peking, neither Washington nor London; perhaps, there are other two vantage points from where we can observe more or less objectively what we may call, in the words of our Prime Minister, the crisis of our times.

We have just to be for a few minutes on the border points of the two sectors in Berlin, the western and the eastern, to observe whether the tension in world affairs is increasing or decreasing. If you find that there is some tension, you may take it that the Western as well as the Eastern blocs are preparing for a show-down. If you see that there is no tension, then you may with reasonable surety conclude that some negotiations are going on.

In order to check these observations, you go to Geneva, and in Geneva, you have to stand only for a few minutes at Pont Du Mont Blanc to observe whether some Cadillacs of seasoned diplomats are moving in a definite direction towards a certain Chinese restaurant. If they are, you may be reasonably sure that under the influence of some Shangai-chop-sui, they are going to realise the realities of Asia.

Looking at these things so lightly also, you will see that it is not a coincidence that lately, two conferences

have been held, one in Berlin and the other at Geneva. In regard to these conferences, we may differ as to whether they have achieved anything or not. But we are today obliged to see a number of problems of the world in their light.

6 P.M.

. Let us take European problems, for example, the European Defence Community, the reunification of Germany or, let us say, the rearmament of Germany—these are all affected by those conferences. But more are affected the Asiatic problems....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may stop at this stage. He may continue tomorrow.

The House will now stand adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 30th September, 1954.