

[Mr. Speaker]

Now, I do not think, really speaking, that should have been raised in this House. There are papers and papers and reporters and reporters and one cannot guarantee that all papers should report correctly or adequately. I was just thinking as to whether it was a question of privilege that the hon. Member was trying to raise, but there seems to be nothing of the kind. In future, whenever any such thing occurs, I think the best course will be to invite my attention to the point in my chamber, so that I could also have the advantage of seeing the proceedings as reported and verify as to whether a particular statement made by the hon. Member is correct—though it may be correct according to his memory—and if it is correct we might see as to what could be done with reference to the particular paper which misreports. Of course, ordinary misreporting will not be taken very serious notice of, or any notice of at all for the matter of that. But in case there is anything deliberately done, anything very grossly done the remedy will be elsewhere and not by an explanation in the House.

I am merely stating this, because the hon. Member's procedure may not be quoted as a precedent to me and every day we may be having, in the House, some Member or the other getting up and complaining about misreporting of his speeches.

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion of the Demands for Grants Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 25, relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. The Time Table showing the dates on which the Demands in respect of the various Ministries will be taken up has already been circulated. Today, the House will deal with the External Affairs Ministry. Regarding the time-limit for speeches, the usual

practice has been to fix a time limit of 15 minutes for all Members including Movers of cut motions and 20 minutes, if necessary, for Leaders of Groups, subject to that time being cut out in the whole time allotted to that Group. The time taken, as usual, by the Ministers in the reply in the end will be excluded.

I have here a number of cut motions to these various Demands. I would urge upon hon. Members and Leaders of Groups to hand over the numbers of those cut motions which they select, to the Secretary in 15 minutes. I will treat them as moved, if those hon. Members in whose names those cut motions stand, are present in the House and the motions are otherwise in order.

I have, up to now, received a list of selected cut motions as under:

Demand No. 22

Communist Group	561
Praja-Socialist Group	... 314

Demand No. 23

Communist Group	97, 564, 566, 570, 580.
Praja-Socialist Group	93, 94.
National Democratic Group	90, 572, 581.

Demand No. 24.

Communist Group	... 108
Praja-Socialist Group	... 106

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I request that cut motion No. 323 may be included in that list?

Mr. Speaker: He can hand it over to the Secretary. That will save time.

I shall now place before the House all the Demands together.

DEMAND NO. 22—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,00,54,000 be granted to the

*Moved with the previous sanction of the President.

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND NO. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,36,94,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 24—CHANDERNAGORE

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Chandernagore'."

DEMAND NO. 25—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,51,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

These demands are now before the House.

Shri Amjad Ali (Goalpara-Garo Hills): Is it the concern of the Chair to place these Demands before the House or of the Minister concerned to move them?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member is raising the same point again. I explained to him last time that we are following the English procedure and, if I mistake not, this has been followed for the last five

years and the Demands are placed by the Chair.

Meagre provision for welfare of Tribal peoples

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

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Policy with regard to the administration in N.E.F.A.

Shri Bishang Keishing (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to leave the Commonwealth

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

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

Liquidation of foreign pockets in India

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I beg to move:

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

Failure to stop the recruitment of Gurkhas by the British and their transport to Malaya through India

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

Failure to evolve concrete measures for countering the apprehended effects of the Pakistan-U.S.A. Military Pact

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

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

Necessity of evolving concrete measures for fostering friendship and amity with the people of Pakistan

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

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

Appointment of Ambassadors.

Sari M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): I beg to move:

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

Failure of Government to have a positive Himalayan policy

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

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

Measures to be taken in consequence of the Military Pact between U.S.A. and Pakistan

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): I beg to move:

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

Publicity by our embassies abroad

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I beg to move:

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

Need for action against Portugal and France regarding integration of Foreign Pockets with the Indian Union

Shri P. Subba Rao (Nowrangpur): I beg to move:

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

Failure to adopt a definite policy in the matter of determination of the future status of Chandernagore

Shri Tushar Chatterjee (Serampore): I beg to move:

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

Merger of Chandernagore with West Bengal

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Speaker: These cut motions are now before the House.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker in the course of this discussion on the Demands, I do not know if I should take the time of the House in discussing broad questions of foreign policy or confine myself rather to certain immediate issues affecting India, or again to the mere structure of our Foreign Service and the Foreign Affairs Ministry.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

In dealing with the latter subject, criticism is made in some of these cut motions in regard to extravagance, in regard to the appointment of Ambassadors and the like. Now, it is rather difficult for me to deal with that. There may well be extravagance here and there. We seek to check it. But, taking it by and large if hon. Members compare—and a test of comparison is helpful occasionally—the expenditure incurred by us with that incurred by other countries—I am not referring to the very big countries who are very rich, but I am referring to moderate countries—if we compare both, we will find that our expenditure is usually far less than theirs. In fact, it has been our attempt to carry on our Embassies as simply and economically as possible, and we have had considerable difficulties, indeed, often in keeping to the present rates of pay and allowances, because exchange values vary and our staff get into great difficulties. We receive, normally, requests from a considerable number of them to be called back to India because they cannot afford to remain where they have been sent—I am not talking of the Heads of Missions, but of the other staff. But nevertheless, I cannot say of course that on a close analysis one cannot find waste here and there—there might be; we try to check that. We have now taken steps to do that regularly by periodical inspections by senior officers.

Again, in regard to the appointment of Ambassadors and the like, I do

not quite know what I can say to this House. If this House expects that Ambassadors should be appointed, as they are done perhaps in the United States of America, all I can say is that I think that the practice of the United States of America in this and in some other matters seems to me completely wrong, at least so far as it applies to this country.

It is not for me to criticise the policy of other countries, as to what they do in their own countries. But in a matter of this kind it does not seem to me a happy policy to adopt. Again, where appointments are made, whatever they may be and whoever might make them, whether an individual or a group or the Cabinet or a committee, one has to leave it to their judgment. They may occasionally make an appointment which may not turn out to be happy. All these risks have to be taken. But by and large, if I may say so, our Foreign Service has done us well and its standing among the Foreign Services of the world is fairly high, and some of our senior Ambassadors and others are among those whose opinion counts, not only with us but with other countries. Considering that we started our Foreign Service five or six years ago from scratch, I think that is a creditable achievement. It has so happened, almost against our wishes, that we have been thrust into this arena of world affairs and have had to play some little part in it which has borne fruit or yielded some result. Therefore a heavy burden has come upon us, unasked for, and we could not say 'no' to it, because it resulted from some previous action of ours. This burden has been borne largely by members of our Foreign Service, senior and junior; and if I may express my opinion, I cannot speak, of course, of every one of them but on the whole they have borne this burden worthily.

There are a number of relatively secondary matters, but of great importance to us—secondary only in the world sense. I mean. I find a number of cut motions relating to Chander-

nagore. In this matter I should like to apologise to this House for a certain delay in placing the Report on Chandernagore on the Table of the House. I understand from my colleague, the Deputy Minister, that he placed it on the Table this morning. We had hoped to place it sometime earlier. The delay occurred really in finalising certain decisions about Chandernagore. I am afraid they have not been quite finalised yet, though they are very near that. I may say that, broadly speaking, we intend to adopt the recommendations made in that Report of Dr. Amarnath Jha who was sent to Chandernagore to find out what the conditions were there, to meet people, various groups, various representatives, and then to make recommendations as to what should be done with that particular place. Broadly, what is recommended is that Chandernagore should be merged into West Bengal—and, indeed, there is no other way to deal with it—but that at the same time it should be made into some kind of a Corporation with considerable powers such as a Corporation might have. There are a number of other recommendations also.

The House may remember that whenever we have referred to these French possessions or Portuguese possessions in India, we have always made it clear that it is not our desire to interfere. We have made it clear, first of all, that it is quite essential that they should be merged into the Union of India. At the same time, we have given an assurance that we do not wish to interfere with the customs, language, laws and various other such like matters which appertain thereto, without the consent of the people concerned. In fact, we were anxious in the case of some of the French possessions, especially Pondicherry which is the chief of them, that it would be a good thing if it should continue as a centre of French language and culture in India if the people there wanted so to do. So, in Chandernagore also we propose

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

to give some assistance in the preservation of certain cultural developments that have taken place. Whenever a change is made like this, whether in Chandernagore or elsewhere, a number of people there who have grown up in the last 100 years or more in a different background, linguistic or other, are necessarily put in some difficulties. We do not want them to suffer. That is so far as Chandernagore is concerned.

In regard to other foreign establishments in India, only yesterday in reply to a question, I referred to the present position that has arisen in Pondicherry and roundabout. This as the House knows, is an entirely spontaneous movement in the French possessions and comprises in its fold practically all the Ministers,—in fact, all except one who happened to be absent, accidentally,—all the Ministers and about 80 per cent. of the Councillors of the Municipal Communes who have unanimously asked for merger with India to be brought about without any referendum, as rapidly as possible. They have naturally addressed the various high dignitaries of the French Government in Paris on the subject. They sent these resolutions to me also and we have acknowledged them. It seems to me that this move, this spontaneous development in Pondicherry puts or ought to put an end to any argument that might have been raised by those who were opposed to merger and even get over the other technical, legal and constitutional difficulties which sometimes the French Government has pointed out to us in this matter. It is clear that there can be no clearer exhibition of popular will than we have seen, not only from the Ministers and Municipal Councillors, but at the other end from the industrial workers who, the House may remember, a little while ago demonstrated in favour of merger and there was some conflict with the French authorities. I hope that this will lead to a friendly settlement of this problem between

the French Government and our Government, and a *de facto* transfer of power there. I say *de facto*; *de jure*, of course, should follow and has to follow. It may take a little time for the legal formalities. Sometime back we sent a note to the French Government in which we suggested that the *de facto* change over might take place straightaway and the *de jure* can follow soon after, after the necessary formalities had been done. I am hopeful, therefore, about these French possessions. I am not very hopeful at the present moment about the Portuguese possessions, though it is inevitable that the same results must follow there.

I find that there are a number of cut motions also relating to tribal affairs. The House will remember that sometime back there was a tragedy there, not very far from the Tibet border, when a platoon of ours, the Assam Rifles, was attacked and ambushed and a number of people were suddenly killed. That was a kind of thing which sometimes occurred in pre-Independence days when the British ruled this country, and they had a way of dealing with them—a heavy way which involved much destruction of life and property. We were put in a difficulty as to how to deal with this matter, and the immediate reaction was that we must do something quickly to get back the persons who were held as hostages, and, well, to punish the guilty. The place was very difficult to get at. Even after sending troops by air, it was about three weeks' march to the exact spot. Anyhow, we decided on adopting not the old way, but avoiding destruction as far as possible and making a friendly—a firm and friendly approach. As a result of this, this matter was settled, I think, in a very happy way. Those who were dead, of course were dead: we could not get them back. We got back the hostages doing very little damage to anybody, and those simple folk who had, in a moment of excitement or whatever it

was, misbehaved, realised that we meant well with them. They came, surrendered the arms they had taken and the whole thing was settled in a friendly way, and we are receiving a good deal of co-operation there from these people, and it has become one of our Partly Administered Areas now. I should like to congratulate those in charge of our North-East Frontier Agency, who were responsible for this—for the very tactful and wise way in which they handled the situation there.

Sometime ago I made a statement about the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and our Custodian Force in Korea. There is nothing more to be said about it. I promised then to place the reports—the original reports—of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission on the Table of the House. I have not done so, I am sorry, because they have not come out of the press yet. They are very big reports, running into hundreds and hundreds of pages, and they are taking some time, and I hope that within a week or ten days I shall place those original reports here for members to refer to them if they so wish.

This chapter, of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and Custodian Force is over so far as we are concerned. That, of course, does not mean that the Korean problem is over. It is very much alive. But the only part of that Custodian Force business that is not over in a sense is that we have brought over here 88 prisoners of war, or ex-prisoners of war, who, for the present, are with us. Out of these 88, about 30 have expressed a desire to stay on in India, and there are others who want to go to other countries. For the moment we are holding all these people, in a sense on behalf of the United Nations, but, of course, it is for us to decide whether those 30 or any other who want to stay here should be given facilities to do so or not. Probably, we shall allow them to stay here temporarily. That is to say, we can-

not—we do not propose and we cannot in law—make them citizens of India, but if they have nowhere else to go to, we can hardly throw them out either. So, we intend giving them some papers of residence here which can be renewed periodically,—that is, it is for the Government then to keep them or not to keep them in future, and to provide, where possible, some occupation for them.

Another matter in which the House is interested are the negotiations that are going on in Peking in regard to Tibet. They have lengthened out rather more than we thought, not because of any inherent difficulty in the problems we are facing, but simply because there are so many details, and each detail takes a long time. I hope that within maybe a few days or maybe a fortnight these discussions might possibly end satisfactorily.

Now, these are the—if I may say so—secondary issues, with which we have been dealing. The major world issues, of course, are not entirely of our seeking or making, and we play a very distant part in them. Nevertheless, it is these world issues that govern the scene, as the House well knows, and in the course of a month or so, there is going to be a conference in Geneva, where some of these big issues, both of Europe and the Far East are supposed to be discussed. In this conference, the one further step that has been taken—and it is a good step—is that for the first time, the People's Government of China will be represented there together with certain other Great Powers. It is far better that governments should face each other and discuss these matters, than to try to do so through other intermediaries, or ignore each other.

During the last two or three years, the absence of the recognition of the Chinese People's Government by some Great Powers and by the United Nations has brought about such an unrealistic state of affairs that it has been hardly possible to deal with the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

question directly. As I have often stated, it was not a question of any person or any government liking or disliking any other government, but of recognising facts, as they were. Now it is manifestly something on the verge of absurdity for anyone to say—(I have nothing against that particular gentleman who is supposed to represent China in the United Nations today, he is an able person)—that he represents China; it is obviously a little absurd, quite absurd, for he does not; at the most, one can say that he represents the Government of Formosa. But to say that this person represents this great country of China is so wide of the mark that any discussion based on that must fail. And that has been our misfortune in world affairs that realities, because they were not liked, have been ignored.

I do not know what is going to happen at Geneva. So far as we are concerned, we have no desire whatever to appear at the scene in Geneva, to participate in these conferences. It is only when we feel that we can really do some good, that we wish to undertake any burden; for the rest, we would rather avoid these burdens.

In this House, sometime ago, I mentioned Indo-China. Indo-China has been, for the last six years nearly, a scene of warfare of a kind of civil war aided by other countries.

Now one fact we might remember when we think of Indo-China, and that is that the Indo-Chinese war started five or six years ago, before the culmination of the Chinese Revolution. I say this because people are apt to tie up too much what is happening in Indo-China with China. Now, it is quite clear that for the first year or two or more what happened in Indo-China had nothing to do with China; it was something which arose in Indo-China. In fact, in China itself, there was conflict, a civil conflict—civil war—which resulted ultimately in the establishment of the

People's Government, what is at present called the People's Government of China. Since then, this war has gone on in Indo-China and there have been varying fortunes: but, on the whole, one might say this is a kind of stalemate when neither party can defeat nor push out the other. More or less, the House will realise, that has been the result of the Korean war too. After all the bloodshed and the suffering and the terrible destruction of Korea and her people, it is a stalemate in Korea and neither side can say that it has won. That has a lesson for us. Wars nowadays tend to become stalemates—nobody wins. If that is so in a war like that in Korea or in Indo-China, when both of them were not so very small—the territory involved might be relatively small, but great Powers were behind them and great forces were involved—if wars tend to end in a stalemate even in such cases as we have seen, then what is likely to happen if there is a great war involving many countries in the world, many big countries in a great war? From this analogy one might think that a great war might go on indefinitely, with terrible destruction, no doubt, but with no ending and with nobody to end it.

However, in so far as Indo-China was concerned, I referred to the possibility of a cease-fire there. I made it clear that we were making no offer to take any step. We have no intention of doing so. But it seems to me that when this question of Indo-China is going to be discussed at Geneva a month hence, obviously it is desirable at least to put an end to the slaughter that is going on and discuss this question in a calmer atmosphere, even though a cease-fire might not come now; because I recognise that there are difficulties, there is no firm line of battle and forces go backwards and forwards. I realise all those difficulties, but sometime or other, whether now or at Geneva, they will have to consider these difficulties. So, why not begin considering them beforehand so that some part of this work of consideration might be done before the Great Powers meet at

Geneva? That was my suggestion, and although nothing very much has come out of it. I believe it has done some good, in the sense that there has been a good deal of consideration given to these problems and the possibilities of a cease-fire by the countries concerned.

Now, a problem which interests hon. Members of this House and the country greatly, and to which reference has been made many times, is this question of the U.S. military aid to Pakistan and its consequences. I do not think I need take up the time of the House over that because we have expressed ourselves quite clearly on that issue and it is very well recognised everywhere, all over the world, that in this matter, more even than in any other, there is almost a complete unanimity in the country, so that it is not necessary for me to place any argument before this House. We hold by the position we took up. We feel that from a variety of points of view, this was an unfortunate thing, not only because it creates, instead of security—which it seeks—insecurity, instability and uncertainty in all this area. But the mere fact that this question has been argued in this way not only in India but in many countries of Western Asia and South-Eastern Asia shows that something has happened which has brought about a new wave of uncertainty. The uncertainty is not of security but of insecurity. There are two approaches to this question of war and peace. One is the approach of feeling that war is almost inevitable and therefore one must be prepared for war. The other is that war must be avoided, if not at all costs, at almost all costs. The two approaches differ, as everybody will see. Of course, nobody wants war—or very few people. And yet many people may well say, "We do not want war, but how are you going to help? A war must come and therefore we must do this and do that." That is a legitimate approach. And yet, if you lay stress on war coming, you lose the battle for peace and war is likely to come, because your minds have succumbed to the prospect of

war coming in. That is the danger of the situation: not that people want war, but many people seem to succumb to the idea of the inevitability of war! It is from that point of view also that this military aid to Pakistan helps in spreading that mentality, that climate of war, and brings it to this area, this area of peace. But leave that out. I am referring to another aspect of that; the climate of war comes to this area and upsets many things. I need not say much about that. An hon. Member opposite, interrupting the Finance Minister said something about civil defence, that he did not budget for civil defence. I do not quite know what he means by civil defence. If I understood him aright, I can tell him we are not going to budget for civil defence. I am absolutely and perfectly clear on that subject. I say that there are certain aspects of preparation, which I do not consider 'civil defence' in the ordinary sense. Of course, we ought always to be prepared about those aspects of civil defence. But, when civil defence is talked about, it is normally meant preparation against fires, digging trenches and ditches in which you can hide yourselves if bombs fall, or such like preparations. That kind of thing, if I may say so with all respect to the hon. Member, is out of date in every country. It has no relation to modern warfare or fighting. You make a tremendous fuss, you create a psychology of fear and apprehension—as in Pakistan some years ago when Lahore was surrounded by trenches, and fire-control, and people were rushing into houses at the sound of some kind of trumpet, and all that. That may, to a small extent, be necessary if the danger comes. But if danger comes, well, one takes necessary steps. --

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): After it comes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: After it comes, yes, and not before. Let us all be clear about it. We are not going to be frightened or get panicky nor are we going to entreat our people to get panicky or frightened.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Why not disband the Army then?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Because the Army does some other work than digging trenches for civil defence. I really do not understand this talks of civil defence. It is some kind of relic of the last war or the war before when enormous energy was wasted in doing these things. I need not go into that but I am prepared to argue my point from the highest technical point of view with anybody. Apart from that point of view, I want to put an end to this idea of thinking that we should guess that there might be some danger and therefore we should go about with spades and shovels and tell people what to do if a bomb falls. It has no relation to reality or fact or protecting ourselves from danger. I have seen, and many hon. Members might have seen, bombs falling and how they are dealt with and how one has to deal with them. I know that no bombs are going to fall, but if they are going to fall, the first thing and the last thing is to keep absolutely cool and not run about, and the mentality of civil defence is not to remain cool but to run about.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Does that not require training, Sir?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, but it is true that we have to think about this matter and we cannot treat it in a casual manner. It is an important matter, that is, the defence of the country from any possible danger. When we talk of civil defence, we are apt to think that we are defending our country when we are not defending it, and we are apt to imagine that we are doing everything possible when really we are doing practically nothing. Therefore, we have to think in terms of defence in more realistic terms. I remember in 1938, a year before the World War, I happened to be in London, Paris and Geneva and there was a great talk of war then, the French Army was mobilised, the British Navy was mobilised; in London I was simply a resident for a short time then, but even I was given a gas mask to go about—a horrid thing, and

everybody was going about with a gas mask lest there might suddenly be an attack! Time and money were spent in making gas masks, digging trenches and in air-raid precaution practices. I have placed my gas mask in the Allahabad museum and anybody that goes there can see it. It was completely, not only a waste of money, but, what was more, it diverted people's minds, for they imagined, they felt, that they were doing something useful when they were actually doing nothing useful at all from the point of view of defence! Therefore, from that point of view, I would like the hon. Member to realise that it has no particular meaning except to show off, as our friends in Pakistan showed off two or three years ago by digging trenches roundabout Lahore and having actual air-raid alarms and people rushing out of their houses. The question is an important one of the defence of the country and one must consider it calmly and dispassionately, and even in regard to that, the best defence ultimately is a certain psychology that one produces in the country, a certain unity that one produces in the country and a certain lack of fear. Naturally, I am not suggesting, even as Dr. Khare just suggested, that we should do away with our Army or Air Force!

Dr. N. B. Khare: I did not suggest it, but I was simply asking you the question for enlightenment.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As a matter of fact, we have arrived at a stage when armies like ours though they perform a very useful function, are rather out of date from the point of view of modern warfare, which presumably will be largely carried on with atomic and hydrogen bombs. In fact, we have arrived at a stage when all these little pacts and other things between various countries do not mean much if a big war comes all of a sudden and atom bombs are hurled all over the place—what happens then nobody knows, except one thing and that is that the uttermost destruction will take place. You read in the newspapers from day to day

of some triumph of human skill in making a new type of bomb which will kill more people and destroy a wider area than anything before. It is a fact that countries are in possession of atomic weapons today which can destroy half the world, if not the whole. And I think it is right that we should realise what war means. Where do these petty things come in, civil defence and the rest, when modern war comes into the picture? We have arrived at a stage in the world when it is really a choice between war and extinction—not victory for any party. Not extinction of both the parties in the war, practically extinction—or an end of war. It is a choice for the great countries, not for us. We are not going to start a world war, but for the great countries that might start it, or might be involved in it, it is a choice. And, unfortunately perhaps, it is not sufficiently realised what this is.

I was reading only yesterday an article by a very eminent thinker, Bertrand Russell, in which he called upon India especially to point out to the world the horrors of war. Why he said India is this: because India being a neutral country, she can do so. If either of the power blocs try to do so, their voices are suspect by the other. It will be thought that they are trying to demoralise their own people by saying so. If hon. Members would read some recent literature by the Atomic Energy Commissions of other countries, not ours, including the American Commission, they might perhaps get some idea of what war is likely to be.

Now it is obvious that most countries cannot even participate in such a war. They have not got the atom bombs. The real power to decide today whether there is going to be war or peace ultimately rests, if you like, with two great countries, the United States of America and the Soviet Union; others also, no doubt, but these two principally, because they are the most powerful and they possess these terrible weapons of destruction. War

might not come—I do not mean to make the House feel that war is on the threshold. I think, on the whole, there are lesser chances of war now than there were perhaps a year or two ago. But again there can be no certainty about this, and there are so many uncertain factors that any mistake here or there might perhaps set off a chain of action and reaction resulting in war. We hope that at the Geneva Conference,—it will be too much to say that a settlement will be arrived at,—some steps towards the easing of tensions might take place, both in the West in Europe and in the Far East and South—Indo-China.

Now, it is in this context that we carry on our foreign policy. To some extent we have an opportunity which other countries have not got, an opportunity in the sense that it is fairly well recognised by other countries that we have an independent opinion on these matters and that we are not coerced into this or that opinion by any great country. Therefore, our opinion carries some weight—not much; I do not presume that we make too much of a difference in world affairs—but we have occasionally made some difference. In Korea, for instance, the whole armistice and truce was, to some extent, brought about by the efforts of India, and to that extent we can take some little credit. But it is not a question of taking credit. The affairs we deal with are much too serious for us to think in terms of showing off or taking credit. The burdens are too great for us to carry, but no country can seek to escape from discharging its duty if it is clear that it is its duty to do something. Therefore, in this wider context of world affairs, we strive to throw our weight, however light it may be, on the side of peace.

In connection with that, it is not only this wider problem of the conflict between these two great blocs of Powers but also other things which we think come in the way of establishment of peace, that is to say, colonialism, racialism and the like. Both of them have existed in various

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

cases, but more especially today in Africa both these things exist.

Again, we have avoided merely condemning countries even though in our opinion those countries may be at fault. Hon. Members know that diplomacy today has arrived at a stage when the language used often by even eminent diplomats might well shame the market-place. The public language used in conferences and the like is one of gross abuse of the other party. Indeed, that itself shows the tension, the climate, in which these conferences do their work, and the tension that exists. When they distrust each other so much and dislike each other so much, good advice given by one to the other has the opposite effect. Everything is suspect, and condemnation has no effect at all except to bring forth from the other side more condemnation, and it becomes thus a competition in strong language used against each other. Therefore, it does not help at all in our abusing or condemning, even though we might think that we are right in doing so. Our voice does not carry weight; it does not convince the other party. However much we might feel strongly in our hearts and in our minds, it does not help. Therefore, in our international affairs we try to avoid merely running down countries, even those who might be opposed to us in any policy. Naturally, we have sometimes to criticise that policy or to express our own views as precisely and clearly as possible, but even so, we try to avoid using strong language because, unfortunately, there is no face left; there are no common standards left to vast numbers of people, and unless gradually we develop some climate of peace where questions can be considered, it will lead to greater conflict.

The House is deeply interested in foreign affairs and every session we discuss them. It may be that during this session before we end the business of the House, the House might discuss these grave developments that are taking place all over, because it is important not only that Parliament

but that the country should keep in touch and discuss them, and that Government should have the advantage of the views of Members in regard to these major dramas that are taking place all over the world and in which however unwillingly, we sometimes become actors. So, we should do that, because in effect even our domestic policy naturally depends a good deal on some big event outside; we cannot isolate it; it may be upset. While our immediate concern is domestic, naturally it is so tied up with international developments that we cannot ignore the latter.

So far as these cut motions are concerned, apart from relatively minor matters with which, if it is necessary, my colleague or I will deal after Members have spoken, broadly speaking this question relates really to the general policy pursued by the Government of India in regard to international affairs. That policy has been so often accepted and approved by this House that I need not say much about it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Leaders of Groups or spokesmen will have twenty minutes each and other Members will have fifteen minutes each. Whatever time is taken by any Member will be deducted from the time allotted to his Group for the day.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Will you ask the cut motions to be moved?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall place the further cut motions in addition to the cut motions already announced by the Speaker. The following cut motions will also be allowed to be moved, subject to their admissibility:

Demand No. 23—cut motion No. 89 by Dr. Lanka Sundaram

—cut motion No. 322 by Shri Khardekar

—cut motion No. 323 by Shri Frank Anthony.

Lack of a policy of effective friendship towards our neighbouring Nations, in particular Afghanistan, U.S.S.R. China and Burma, through pacts of non-aggression, to meet the situation created by the Pakistan-U.S.A. and Pakistan-Turkey Military Aid Pacts

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I beg to move:

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

Basic principles underlying the foreign policy

Shri Khardekar (Kolhapur cum Satara): I beg to move:

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

Need for a more positive attitude towards Communism

Shri Frank Anthony: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These cut motions are also now before the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We have just heard the Prime Minister and I want to draw the attention of the House also to the statement which the Prime Minister made here on the 1st March—a statement which I feel should rightly dominate our discussion of the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry. This was one of those statements which to many of us summoned up remembrance of things past. This was one of those statements which made us recall why, in spite of the most strident differences so many of us have for the Prime Minister a kind of really personal, warm but often—too often—exasperated feeling. He said on that occasion: "This is no party matter, but a national issue on which there can be no two opinions." I wish to echo that statement. What he said on that occasion really amounted to the formulation of a national policy, and what we ask of him today is to follow it up with concrete measures which

would really bring to fruition the different aspects of that national policy.

But before proceeding further, I would like to know if there is any suspicion of accuracy regarding the reports which have been recently circulated of differences within the Cabinet. In this connection I would quote from the International Edition Supplement of the *New York Times* of the 7th March wherein a fairly well known columnist, Robert Trumbull, writes about the supposed existence in the Cabinet of very serious differences in regard to the policy which was stated on the 1st March. This Trumbull is not unknown to us. Actually, in November 1950, he wrote some articles in *New York Times* saying—I do not know why he said it—that his information was derived from non-Communist intelligence reports regarding Western Tibet. This gentleman is a customer whose steps we should watch very warily. But anyhow, he has said that there are very serious differences in the Cabinet and there have been Press reports to that effect, which I hope our Government would entirely and unequivocally contradict on the floor of this House.

4 P.M.

I refer to this also because when I listened to the Finance Minister giving his reply to the Budget discussion earlier in the day and referring particularly to a book called *Russia's Soviet Economy* by a man called Schwartz, I suddenly developed certain suspicions. This book has a foreword by William Henry Chamberlin who, I am sure, the Finance Minister knows, is notorious as a purveyor of anti-Soviet scandals. In this book, which is supposed to give a description of the Soviet Union, we are told that the working class is a perpetual under-dog class, utterly wretched and without hope, because they are slave labourers in Soviet concentration camps. We are also enlightened with the information that "Soviet figures are falsified and exaggerated." This is the gentleman whose book was thought worthwhile for reference purposes by the Finance Minister. It suggests a kind of anti-Soviet bias

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

which today, when they are trying to tighten the lengthening chain against the Soviet Union and People's China, is something which we ought to shed. At least I expect the Finance Minister to refer to books like those by Morris Dobb and by Sydney and Beatrice Webb and not those by partisan writers of this sort to whom he has chosen to refer today.

In regard to this point of the so-called differences inside the Cabinet I do wish to have a very unequivocal answer from the Prime Minister. I know it may be said of our Prime Minister, in a very much better sense than it was said about one British Prime Minister, that he can treat his Cabinet colleagues as directors of a private company where he held all the shares, and if he wants he can put his foot down. In case there is any such suspicion I hope he does it for the sake of the country, because that at least is something on which the country's mind is agitated.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: To cut short this point, may I assure him that I am not aware of any such difference?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I take it that we have today reached a certain position in our international relations when we can say that the iron has entered our soul, and through our experience certain lessons have been seared into our consciousness. Because, whatever the Prime Minister might say in very polite, diplomatic terminology, I am sure he has realised, particularly after the return of those of our gallant men who were with the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and the Indian Custodian Force he must have been told, regarding the kind of men these new-fangled imperialists from America are. These people have put Western Europe in thrall and are trying to tighten the chain around Asia's neck. They are ready with plans, as they were in 1947 when the *Life* magazine published a map, based on Burnham's *Struggle for World Democracy*, delineating the aims of the American World Empire. It reminds one of the Tanaka

Memorandum which the Japanese issued long years ago. I could give umpteen quotations, for which there is no time or necessity to show how U.S. imperialists declare themselves ready and willing to use the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb or any other enormity if only they are persuaded that that would bring about the triumph of democracy which they seem so stridently to cherish.

Regarding Korea I do not wish to say anything against our role either in the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission or the Indian Custodian Force. But we know that a delicate and difficult job in Korea was rendered deliberately and diabolically impossible of execution by the United Nations side—which is the United States. There is no doubt about it. I know there are truth tellers among those who give reports to our Prime Minister and I am sure he must have known what actually happened from that day even before explanations could start, when twenty-seven thousand prisoners of war were allowed to escape—they were actually pushed out so that they might join the slave labour camps in Taiwan. Many thousands were shipped away to Taiwan, because explanations could not be conducted for the overwhelming majority of the prisoners. We had to yield to pressure and even hand back murderers against whom there had been charges established. We had to do all these things. The only excuse was that local conditions were such that all kinds of embarrassments might arise and therefore we could not act as positively as it was necessary from the point of view of our national conscience to behave. There are among the people who formed the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and the Indian Custodian Force, truth-tellers, who must have told the Prime Minister about what really happened, how the Chinese and North Koreans behaved and how the United Nations and South Koreans behaved. And he must have felt that things were going perhaps a little too far and that we should cry halt, because this element in world politics today is a mischief

of the first water which it is the duty and the right of India to counter.

Our eyes to-day are on Pakistan because of so many things. And in this connection I wish to refer to certain proceedings in the American Congress last summer, in June and July 1953. It seems that they made no bones about what they were trying to do. According to a speech made by John M. Vorys in the House of Representatives, the Americans wanted to "arm and equip 4,900,000 men to fight, if necessary, in the cause of freedom". I am quoting from the Summary of Congressional Proceedings, published by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, June-August 1953, page 150:

"U.S.A. did not furnish all the arms, food and clothing. But whereas the average cost of an American soldier before he had a gun in his hand would be 5,566 dollars, this Mutual Security Programme would cost less than 10 dollars for a foreign soldier to help him put a gun in his hand."

And I expect if that foreign soldier happened to be an Asiatic 'gook' he would possibly cost even less than 10 dollars, as compared to the 5,566 dollars for a heaven-born citizen of the United States!

My question to the Government would be: is Government really conscious of the dangers which are involved today? I am happy that the Prime Minister has said that the presence of the United Nations Observers in Kashmir is improper. But they have not yet gone. And Not only these United Nations Observers. I know the Prime Minister will tell me: I cannot hurry things, I have to move in a particular manner, peacefully. I do not answer him by saying: go ahead, fast as thunder and lightning. I cannot say that. But surely we must take tangible steps here and now to see to it that the United Nations Observers quit, and quit as soon as ever that is possible. But what about the other United States personnel? I have

quoted the provisions of the Mutual Security Act under which assistance is given by the United States. There are so many people all over the place in our country today working the Indo-American Technical Co-operation Agreement. I cannot for the life of me understand how the Prime Minister could append his signature to this document, the Indo-American Technical Co-operation Agreement, a document which was characterised by Mr. Suresh Ram Bhai, who, I am told, is a noted Gandhian economist, as a slavery bond. Under this Agreement these Americans, who were paying only one-eighth of the cost of the Community Projects, have a veto over every single item of expenditure. Not only that. They are all over the place in our country, looking into everything, inspecting everything in every part of the land. This is the kind of thing that goes on.

I shall refer also to a book written by a man called Sherman Kent who was a key official of the O.S.S., that is the Officer of Strategic Services, during the war, a book called *Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy*. Therein he refers to the Central Intelligence Agency of America. He says for intelligence purposes, mind you, "Government agencies engaged in intelligence activities are drawn from the Departments of State, Defence, Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, Treasury and Justice, the Tariff Commission, etc." He placed foreign service officers first among the gatherers of intelligence followed by others in public life such as members of special commissions, U.S. delegates to international conferences, travelling Congressmen as well as the writers, newspaper men and big game hunters. He assigns an important role to learned institutions,—let us beware of Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, etc.—evaluating them as one of our most priceless strategic resources.

Perhaps you remember the case of one Dr. Sidney Ripely, who is supposed to be a distinguished botanist, leading a scientific expedition to

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Nepal, sponsored by the National Geographic Society and by Yale University. This gentleman was employed by the Office of Strategic Services from 1942 to 1944 as Director of Intelligence Operations for South-East Asia. He goes to Nepal for this kind of purpose. This kind of thing goes on; for much too long this has gone on. I wish the Prime Minister does really put his foot down on this kind of thing.

I will refer to another matter. In Congressional proceedings and annexures to Congressional proceedings, you find reports of certain hearings, and these hearings are very significant. For example on 24th July 1951, Mr. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on projects proposed by the State Government. There are three pages of testimony on agriculture, fisheries and geological projects recommended for India and then the text of the hearing reads:

"In addition to the specific projects that I have just described, there are others that I should be happy to discuss with you."

And then, Sir, the discussion is off the record. This kind of thing happens over and over again. They refer to projects in India and the discussion is off the record. In regard to Bokaro construction, the World Bank had a team and every two months reports were sent to the World Bank, reports to which this country's Government did not have any access. This is the kind of thing which goes on. This is because our position has not been stated very unequivocally.

I shall come back to Mr. Trumbull once again even though he is an unsavoury customer. He says certain things about which I want some clarification. The Prime Minister will say, I tell you, you have a funny habit of quoting from newspapers. I am sorry, I have not got access to all the wonderful documentation

which necessarily comes to him and I have to depend on whatever sources I have got. In the *New York Times* of 7th March, 1954, he says:

"Indians generally are aware of the United States' economic assistance. But, few know that Washington is also selling important military equipment to this country."

He writes from Delhi. I do not know, he may be even now in the precincts. He says:

"The Indians pay for it in dollars. But to make it available under any terms, Washington had to make a policy decision recognising that India is a 'friendly' country."

Despite all the dust raised by opposition to United States participation in Pakistan's military development, the first United States military advisory mission to function on the subcontinent is not in Karachi, but right here in New Delhi."

This is what he says. I suppose he has the gumption to say all these things because in another paragraph, he says:

"None can say what India's foreign policy will be under the unknown but inevitable successor to Mr. Nehru."

This kind of suggestion which is made in the critical position of today, is infernal effrontery and this is a matter of which we ought to take a very serious note. He also says:

"Military secrecy concealed the arrival of six United States Air Force officers and enlisted men and two civilian technicians, with the first two C-119 Flying Box-cars out of twenty-six purchased for the Indian Air Force with the aid of the Pentagon. The Americans will instruct Indian crews for six months."

These planes, like about thirty or more Sherman tanks, an undisclosed number of helicopters and the licences to use exclusively United States manufacturing processes for military equipment were obtained under provisions of the Mutual Security Act. This legislation permits Washington to supply American equipment and facilities of 'friendly' nations."

That is what he says, and that is why I am perturbed. I offer our hand of fellowship and co-operation in this task of warding off the menace which has now arisen. I find that on the other side there is no real response because possibly they have their own mental reservations.

In the last *Sunday Hindustan Times*, I happened to light upon an interview given by our Prime Minister to a foreign correspondent. There, he says :

"The Communists were, of course making much propaganda and using the poverty of the people for that propaganda. Consequently, more aid through the Colombo Plan and from America would stabilise conditions in the whole of South-East Asia. Economic improvement was the best defence against disruptive forces and the Prime Minister said that he was determined not to reduce the expenditure on development."

He goes on in this fashion. If his anti-communism is stronger than his support for the kind of foreign policy which he has himself promulgated then, I am afraid he is going to land himself and the country in a mess. We do not want him to do so.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : I am sorry to interrupt. I certainly did not use that language which the hon. Member used.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee :—

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : I know he is reading. I am merely saying that it is not my language.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : I know the linguistic accomplishments of the Prime Minister. But, I am quoting *verbatim* from the *Hindustan Times*.

Dr. N. B. Khare : The Congress Gazette !

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : I wish to refer to another matter which also ought to hurt our patriotic feelings. That is the support which we have given to all kinds of people to come and probe into our activities. There is a gentleman called Paul H. Appleby who is described as a distinguished expert on public administration. I have nothing against him; I have never known him from Adam; I have never seen his face. I find from the *Hindustan Times* of the 19th of January of this year that this gentleman has arrived here. He has reported on the Central administration earlier which we know about. Now, he is going all over the place to all the States in the Indian Union to study the systems of administration and recommend measures for their improvement. I do not know that Tammany Hall methods are so wonderful that a representative of Tammany Hall should come to this country to advise us in every single State of this country as to how we are going to organise our administration! I think surely our national self-respect revolts against this kind of thing.

The Prime Minister said the other day before the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry that no country which depends mainly on outside aid for her defence, security, progress and general welfare can hope to achieve anything substantial. But, our tragic reliance on Anglo-American good offices for our Plan, for our Community projects, for our armed forces, for our industrial requirements, for our railway stores and for a hundred other things continues. That is why we are perturbed. That is why we say that the Government should come forward with more positive policies.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

In regard to Goa and other foreign possessions in India, there are certain points which perhaps require to be clarified, and we ought to know exactly where we stand so that we may take such steps as are warranted. It seems that in 1950, the National Assembly in Lisbon modified the Colonial Act to include Portuguese colonies overseas in Asia and Africa as overseas provinces of Portugal. This technical change in the constitution enables Portugal to invoke the aid of the NATO Powers in the eventuality of India taking military or police action in these colonies. I referred the other day to the statement of Salazar in 1949 that the British Empire was committed by treaty to defend the Portuguese territories overseas. I find also in the *Hindustan Standard* of the 28th November, 1953, an editorial which says that two secret appendices have recently come to light in the U.S.-Portugal Pact of Mutual Assistance of 1951 which provide that dollars and armaments received by Portugal from America may be transferred to meet the defence emergencies of Portuguese possessions in India. This is the kind of thing which makes us feel very perturbed. We find also that in regard to French possessions, there was a report some months ago that some one thousand young Indians were recruited in French India and sent to Indo-China and recently 110 French Indian soldiers landed back at Pondicherry in frightful condition. They had taken part in what the French themselves call *le guerre sale*, 'the dirty war' in Indo-China. The Prime Minister has said many times that we cannot tolerate any foreign pockets in this country. I know that he has begun to take a more forthright attitude on this question, but we want to have more particulars in regard to the further steps which he has in contemplation.

A reference to the Commonwealth may perhaps make some Members of

this hon. House feel that we are flogging a dead horse, repeating something which is inane, but the attitude of Britain in regard to the United States-Pakistan Pact is very clear. Mr. Anthony Eden has made a statement in the House of Commons, and from the proceedings which are reported in the Press of the Commonwealth Conference at Lahore, the spokesmen of the United Kingdom are saying that they have nothing against the United States-Pakistan Pact—on the contrary, they support it. We find, therefore, that a situation exists today which is being aggravated because of our being inside this Commonwealth.

In Pakistan, our former Commander-in-Chief, Gen. Auchinleck or whatever his name is, carries on his business in magic carpets, and somebody said the other day he does really have that business somewhere in Pakistan. This kind of thing is extremely undesirable. The other day Mr. Tyagi revealed that there were so many foreigners in our defence installations, and I find that even Congress newspapers like the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* suggest that in today's international context if there are more than two hundred and odd foreigners in different defence installations, then certainly that is an extremely undesirable thing. We know that the *mystique* of the Commonwealth, the idea of a Commonwealth transcending racial barriers, is an idea which appeals to some minds, but today this *mystique* is the last refuge of imperialists, and that is why we have to beware of them, and I warn Government that just as in the case of Korea in our efforts to bring about a real restoration of the prisoners of war to either side we were driven to doing things we did not want to do, so in the sphere of international policy we may be blackmailed by sheer objective pressure into the camp of wrong-doers. That is the hope of the United States lobby, the existence of which is testified to by Mr. Robert Trumbull. He

says there are many Members of Parliament who are members of this United States lobby, and he says also they are very silent because in the present posture of Indian opinion it is necessary for them to be silent. So, perhaps, it is the hope of the United States lobby in India that we are blackmailed by sheer objective pressure into a position where we cannot get out of the octopus grip of the United States, but that is a hope which the people's wrath will sizzle into nothing.

I say again that we wish to offer all possible co-operation to the Prime Minister in the concretisation of those ideas in the realm of foreign policy which he has adumbrated, but I fear that his words—very aesthetically constructed words—have a penumbra of uncertainty. I want that uncertainty to be eliminated so that we know where we stand, so that all together we can march towards those goals which we all have in view. And we know all those difficulties will vanish when he forgets his fear of popular forces that is shown in the Press Act lately piloted so capably by the Home Minister, and in continuation of the Preventive Detention Act and a hundred other measures on the statute-book. That kind of feeling will go when the Prime Minister realises that his people will be ready to stint and work hard with all the exhilaration that comes of the consciousness of a truly co-operative community, if his policies at home and abroad really bring them hope of a better life for all, if not at once here and now but at least tomorrow and the day after. If they can be sure of that, if they have no hesitation on that score, they will certainly stint, certainly fight with the kind of psychology which the Prime Minister wishes to mobilise in case our country is in danger. We are prepared to play our part, we are prepared to mobilise our people in furthering those objects which the Prime Minister has stated in his statement of 1st March.

When you are in the Chair, Sir, I always feel tempted to refer to some Sanskrit adage, because almost every day you leave a Sanskrit book on my table; and I happened the other day to light on those slokas which, I think, Viswamitra pronounced. He said :

विग्नं बलं क्षत्रियबलं ब्रह्मतेजो बलं बलम् ।

एकेन ब्रह्मदंडेन सर्वस्त्रिणि हतानि मे ॥

That one *Brahma danda*, what is that? That *Brahma danda* is now in the manufactory of the people's heasts, and that *Brahma danda* has got to be found by us by work, by suffering, by a sympathetic understanding of problems, and not by a mere scientific exposition of our economic difficulties and acknowledgment of our incapacity to go ahead as fast as our idealism would demand. That is the job which is uppermost in our minds today. That is why we want to go forward together arm in arm even with those who abuse us in season and out of season. That is why we say: let us go ahead, let us work in such fashion that we can write, as with a sunbeam, on the rolls of the history of this country of ours, this emerald country which, all in our different ways, we love so deeply.

I have done, but I would just say this. As sure as the sun will rise tomorrow, this piled up pyramid of private profit which directs imperialist aggression over the seven seas will crash, and as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow, the forces of peace, of real democracy for the people, of real well-being for the people, those forces will triumph—not those forces of which perhaps a section of our people are afraid today, the forces which are represented by public enemy No. 1 of world peace and world peoples, the imperialism of the United States.

Shri Raghuramajah (Tenali): I am very happy to see a certain transformation in that champion of 'real democracy' who just preceded me. He was pleading for solidarity in the Cabinet. I know the Prime Minister

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

has denied there has been any split or any misunderstanding. But that shows the increasing measure of confidence which Shri H. N. Mukerjee has in this Cabinet and his anxiety that it should not be affected by any squabbles. Really that is the measure of confidence which, I think, the whole country is having in the foreign policy which is being pursued by the Prime Minister.

I know certain Members are very touchy about quotations from foreigners. There is one particular quotation, however, which I shall cite for the mere beauty of it. I would ask them, if they do not like the name of the person who has said it, to forget it but to remember the substance. Actually, it is a statement by Mr. Maudling, Economic Secretary to the Treasury, United Kingdom. And this is what he says summing up the foreign policy of this country:

"The hallmark of a nation justly proud of its independent status does not lie in the design or colour of its flag, or in its promptitude in asserting national grievances, rights or privileges. It lies, I suggest in the readiness and ability of the nation concerned to carry its share of the great tasks before the community of all the nations. Measured by such standards, India has won a leading place. Her opinions compel attention precisely because her participation in the common tasks of peace compel respect."

The language is really not only beautiful, but it has, I think, crystallised the actual state of affairs.

It is, I think, an admitted fact, that there has been, within the last twelve months,—I am not of course for the moment referring to the situation created by the American aid to Pakistan to which I shall refer a little later—the building up of a certain atmosphere of peace. A reference has been made this morning by the Prime Minister to the conference which is

going to be held in Geneva to consider the question of Korean and Indo-China situations. There have been talks, of late, which go to show that there might soon be even a trade agreement between Great Britain and China. Even President Eisenhower in his State of the Union Message the other day admitted that there has been a great change recently. Of course, he was referring to the initiative which has passed on to the United States, but he has in a way agreed with Mr. Malenkov that there has been a lessening of the tension in the world. If there has been a lessening of the tension in the world, if there has been happy transformation or change from the freezing cold of war to the warmth of an armistice sunshine. I think we in India can rightly take pride that we have done our utmost towards the achievement of that objective. I know that it is very difficult for any nation to try to follow a policy of non-alignment, and not to irritate either party which is wedded to its own dogmas. I know that, but in spite of it, we have been trying to do our best, without trying to take sides.

I would have normally understood a country deeply immersed in one of the blocs not understanding us, but not the United States. Mr. J. J. Singh, one of the outstanding Indians who has spent a lifetime in the United States, commenting on the general opinion in the United States about India, says:

"After several weeks of study of the matter, including talks with high U.S. government officials, senators, representatives, newspaper publishers, editors, political analysts, radio commentators and important public figures, I have come to the conclusion that the decision to give arms aid to Pakistan has been based fifty per cent. on a vague desire to create strength in the 'free world' and fifty per cent. as

the result of an anti-Indian feeling, which has permeated in recent years amongst a very large number of American people, ranging from the policy-makers to the man in the street."

I may tell the House that the words, 'peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations entangling alliances with none'—a phrase which firmly represents our foreign policy—is not of our coinage. They were the words of Mr. Jefferson, the first Secretary of State for the United States, and the third President of that great State. In fact earlier even Mr. Washington in his farewell address, advised the young nation to steer clear of permanent alliances. This was said somewhere in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. It was said at a time when the United States was poor and weak. Our American friends perhaps forget that India today is as poor as, or perhaps poorer and weaker than what United States was at that time. We are much poorer, because our resources have been bled white by the preceding foreign rule, and we have a population problem which has no parallel in the history of the United States. Apart from other things with our limited resources and our desire to concentrate on our economic improvement how could we adopt any other policy? It really surprises me that people in the United States should not understand this basic thing.

Of course, there is an opinion, and some American friends have been trying to impress it on some of us, that the American aid to Pakistan is not meant to be an anti-Indian measure, that it is meant to guarantee security on the southern side of the Russian border, and that it is meant to stabilise conditions in the Middle East. I am prepared to agree, and I am one of those who are convinced about it, that America does not mean any act of hostility towards India. I am quite prepared to believe, and it is my personal belief, that in advancing this aid to Pakistan, America

has only her own ideas of collective security, but the question is, what is the effect of that. Is this dream of collective security which America is so strenuously following likely to succeed in this particular area?

The atmosphere and the circumstances immediately preceding this aid must be borne in mind, if we have to come to a correct conclusion. Hon. Members in this House know the climate of friendship which our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Pakistan were trying to create only a few months ago, and as a result whereof the old spirit of violence and the desire to settle our disputes by recourse to war had given place to the desire to settle the disputes by peaceful means. We expected a lot from these friendly talks between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Pakistan, and there was a psychological change in the two countries. At that moment, comes this American aid to Pakistan. And what has happened? It has given a new hope to the warmongers of Pakistan. They think it is unnecessary to resort to peaceful means to settle the issues. I need not quote here the vituperative attacks made on India recently by Mr. Bokhari, the permanent delegate of Pakistan in the United Nations. Even Mr. Mohammed Ali, the Prime Minister of Pakistan has changed. He said only a few days ago that the American aid to Pakistan would make the settlement of the Kashmir issue easier.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): It has settled the Chittagong issue in East Bengal.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: It has been subsequently denied.

Shri Raghuramaiah: We have got enough of other material also, to come to the conclusion that hopes are being increasingly pinned in Pakistan on utilising this American aid for a settlement of its outstanding issues with India. As a matter of fact, one Mr. Robbins, a chain-writer who is well-known, writes,

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

after a great study of the situation in Pakistan :

"Pakistanis are even more interested in building up defences against India than against Soviet attack."

If the situation that has resulted from the American aid to Pakistan is a feeling of hostility between Pakistan and India, and if the only result it has achieved is an increasing uncertainty in the minds of 350 million people, I would like my American friends to say how far their object of stabilising the Middle East has succeeded. Mr. Dulles in his book *War or Peace*, written in 1950—I am referring to the year, because, since then, the figures might have changed, but that would not affect substantially my argument—disclosed that the total population of the United States and that of the countries covered by the NATO, the Rio Pact, and the Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey was 350 million.

If by one stroke of American aid to Pakistan, he should alienate an equal number of people, a population equal to that of all the areas covered by those pacts, is it worth the effort? This American aid to Pakistan, I am afraid time will prove that it has been let loose in a zone of delusion comparable only to the zone of delusion fostered in Chiang-Kai-Shek's China. I do not of course suggest that every Pakistani has been enthusiastic about this aid. There has been a good deal of criticism even in Pakistan. Only the other day, the President of the Awami League, which is the biggest component of the party which has succeeded in East Bengal, characterised it as a measure mortgaging Pakistan to United States, and there have been some others who have been plainly telling that Pakistan is no longer a viable State; that it has become a colony of the United States. Public opinion, no doubt, is gathering its momentum. It may take time. I am only indicating this to show that

we should not mix up the whole of Pakistan with the militant spirit which is now the dominating factor amongst certain people there. The question is, what should be done by us? The situation is undoubtedly critical. But about one thing I would utter a warning: let not our resentment against this aid drive us to be so anti-American as to hate every American, as to wish every American to leave the shores of this country. Of course, it may suit some parties; it may suit some purposes. But it will destroy—if we encourage that—the very foundations of our foreign policy, the very basis of it. It will drive us into some other party, some other bloc, which would shatter the very scheme of our foreign policy.

Having said that, I would like to emphasise the defence requirements of this country. It may be that in a modern war where you have got the hydrogen bomb, which is alleged to have a power of destruction 600 times that of the bomb which caused the death of 60,000 people in Hiroshima, or something like that, it may be that small civil defence arrangements may be useless. But I do think the country expects us to strengthen our defences in general now that our not too friendly neighbour will be gaining additional strength. The more accession there is to that country's military strength, the more we must be on our guard to defend the frontiers of this country.

In this context, I would like to point out that the foreign pockets are the biggest dents in India's security. It amazed me to hear the Portuguese Foreign Minister saying the other day that he would not allow foreign intervention. The Portuguese Foreign Minister probably still thinks in the terms of the Papal dispensation of the 15th century which distributed the then known world between Portugal and Spain. He forgets that the world is no longer governed by that

Papal decree. To call Indians foreigners in this contest is, I think, the very limit of absurdity. Goanese are our people, they are our blood and one day they must join us, and if we are polite enough not to make the situation hot there, let the Portuguese remember that the day of reckoning will not be far off.

As regards Pondicherry, I will just say one word and close, while going through some little pamphlet about Pondicherry, I came across a very interesting passage. It gives the chequered history of Pondicherry. It says 'it was founded by the French in 1674, taken by the Dutch in 1693, restored to the French in 1699, taken by the English in 1761, restored to the French in 1765, retaken by the English in 1778, restored to the French in 1785, retaken by the English in 1793 and restored to the French in 1814.' I hope when the further history gets written the addition will be 'honourably restored to India—1954' and not 'taken over by them' I would only like to add with reference to both Portugal and France that this country is in no mood to tolerate any longer this doll and droll game of these foreign powers—these decaying symbols of a past imperial glory, and that this game of foreign powers in India must cease. Sir, I have very great pleasure in supporting the demands for grants.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): Before I say something in support of the demands for grants, I feel it is necessary for me to refer to a few things which Mr. H. N. Mukerjee mentioned. Mr. Mukerjee in his speech on the demands for grants said he had objection to reports on Bokaro being sent to the World Bank, to which we had no access. I am surprised how, when any country takes a loan from another country or from a bank, it can avoid sending those reports. What objection can any one have to sending these reports to that Bank? Secondly, Mr. Mukerjee also mentioned about Mr.

Appleby, who came here at the invitation of the Government of India to suggest some measures to improve our administrative services, and asked why he was touring our country now. I really do not understand what objection could we have against him or against any citizens of any country with whom we have friendly relations. In spite of the U.S. aid to Pakistan, in spite of some strain on our relations with America, we have friendly relations with the United States and that has been repeatedly stated by our Prime Minister. I do not understand what objection any Member of this hon. House can have against any citizen of a country being invited by our Government to come and give a report on our administration.

Now, speaking on the demands for grants and in support of our foreign policy, I would say that I support the courageous and bold foreign policy pursued by our Prime Minister. The foreign policy of a country is primarily based on the enlightened self-interests of that country, and it is essentially conditioned by its internal circumstances. The foreign policy of any country reflects the internal policy of that country and, therefore, India's foreign policy cannot be the foreign policy of Soviet Russia, or the foreign policy of China or the foreign policy of the United States or, for that matter, of any other country. Sir, if we want to understand the present foreign policy of our country, the basis of our foreign policy, it is necessary for us to go through the history of the Indian National Congress for the last 15 or 20 years. It can only be in consonance with the past history and traditions of our country. In India, the Indian National Congress, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has stood for certain fundamental principles in the field of international affairs for many many years, and it was these principles which have given shape to the present foreign policy

[Dr. Suresh Chandra]

of our country. If we go through the resolutions passed by the Indian National Congress over the last 20 years, we find that even before India became independent India had the same foreign policy as today. India's present foreign policy reveals a continuity of ideas and identity of action. What are those fundamental ideas and principles at the basis of our foreign policy today? As our Prime Minister has repeatedly said in this hon. House, I feel it is necessary for us to emphasise those fundamental principles, and those fundamental principles of our foreign policy are: (1) that India supports the right of self-determination for all oppressed peoples of the world. In this, India was one of the first countries to give unqualified support to the struggles for freedom of Indonesia and Viet-Nam even before India became independent. Since Independence, we have witnessed so many things which have shown that India has always supported the right of people for self-determination. In the United Nations we know that India, in co-operation with other countries of the Asian-African group, has continued to support the freedom movements of Morocco and Tunisia and it has also supported other countries fighting for freedom. The second fundamental principle on which our foreign policy is based is anti-colonialism, to which our Prime Minister has referred. The third is India's non-alignment with political blocs and the fourth is the establishment of peace in the world and friendship with all countries; and the fifth is fight against racial discrimination. It is unnecessary for me to go into detail and explain how our country's foreign policy has been in regard to these principles. It has been manifest in our actions in the United Nations and elsewhere.

If we review the achievements of the Ministry of External Affairs, we note that thanks to the foreign policy pursued by the Prime Minister, we have strengthened the forces serving the cause of peace in the world. It

has been the continued endeavour of our Government to enlarge peace areas in the world and no one can refute this thing. Whether it was at the U.N. or at any other international conference, the motive of the establishment of peace has always guided the leaders and representatives of our country. The voice of India was always raised in favour of peace. In Korea also, we know, through India's commendable efforts at U.N. and other places, an agreement was reached between the two fighting sides to a procedure for the repatriation of the prisoners of war. For the first time in recent Indian history, the Indian forces went abroad on a mission of peace. The Indian Custodian Force in Korea performed this difficult and delicate task which was highly praised all over the world.

I was surprised to find some out motions today with regard to the failure of having established friendly relations with neighbouring countries. We have most friendly relations with the neighbouring countries excepting Pakistan, for which efforts were made. And, unfortunately, due to this U.S. aid to Pakistan, there have been certain strained feelings and we hope that in the near future our relationship with Pakistan also will improve.

At the United Nations also India had played a very active and effective part in different committees and it was because of India's efforts that the Asian-African group was formed, which helped also to support the rights of Morocco and Tunisia.

While I was going through the report of the External Affairs Ministry, I found that the Ministry was taking steps to introduce a system whereby young Indian Foreign Service men will be attached to the districts in India where they will acquire an intimate knowledge of the Indian scene as well as the background of our history and culture. I am surprised to find that this step

has been taken so late. I would suggest to the Prime Minister or to the Deputy Minister for External Affairs that more care should be taken at the time of the selection of candidates for the Indian Foreign Service so that only those candidates may go outside and represent our country who know something of our country, who have an intimate knowledge of the conditions and the history and culture of our country and who are also intimately acquainted with the history, culture, language and traditions of the countries to which they are accredited. I have found during my last tour in Europe that many of our Missions and many of our representatives abroad miserably failed in this. So, I would make a humble submission through you, Sir, to the Prime Minister to go into this matter and see that only those who can really represent our country are sent abroad. We have instances of our representatives abroad, who even after having been there for a number of years did not know even the alphabets of the languages of the countries to which they were accredited. How can they represent our country and how can they interpret the policies of our country to the countries to which they are posted?

During my last visit to Europe and also Egypt, I have found that India's foreign policy has been in high praise and the Indian Prime Minister has been held in high esteem. I would only quote one instance. While I was trying to purchase something in a street of Paris, a young man came to me and asked me whether I came from India, from that India which was fighting for peace. He said they all support the efforts for peace made by our Prime Minister. This I have found in every country, where I have met Parliamentarians and also the common people. Even among Ministers and other people. I have found a genuine respect for the Prime Minister and the policy which he has been pursuing, a policy of establishing peace and avoiding war, as far as possible.

I would like to say a few words about our external publicity. Last time also, I had submitted through you that though our external publicity is doing well, I would suggest that if we want to attract men of qualifications, if we want to attract men of experience, it is absolutely essential for us to give facilities to these people and not make them feel that they are inferior to the so-called Indian Foreign Service men. They must be made to feel that their service to the country is as much valued as the service of the Indian Foreign Service men. Therefore, I would suggest that the Prime Minister should look into this matter and do something so that the services of these people may become secure and they may be integrated with the Indian Foreign Service, because they are doing equal, if not more, service to the country.

One more point which I wanted to say is with regard to our Embassies. Before our independence, when I was in Europe and Pandit Nehru came to Paris or when we saw Vithalbhai Patel or when we had a meeting or when we have been working with Subhas Chandra Bose, we had a thrill. But, today when we go to the Embassies we do not really like to enter them and there is a kind of feeling of unfriendliness. I do not feel like entering the Embassy again. That kind of feeling is something very serious.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): To put it frankly, not to get humiliated.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I wanted to say that this kind of attitude is regrettable.

One word about our French Indian settlements. I have some intimate knowledge of this question. Last time when I was in Paris I had the opportunity of meeting some of the Parliamentarians and Ministers there and I had informal talks with them on this question. I found that the French people and powerful forces in Parliament were in favour of

[Dr. Suresh Chandra]

merger with India and they realised that this should be done. I appeal to the good sense of that great country—France—which has the traditions of equality, fraternity and liberty. I feel that it is high time that they should come forward and accede to the spontaneous demands of the people for the merger of the French enclaves with India.

5 P.M.

Shri Frank Anthony: Before I deal with my cut motion, which has posed the need for a more positive attitude towards communism, may I say a few words about the American aid to Pakistan? I wholeheartedly support those who have condemned this aid to Pakistan. Quite frankly, I believe there is not a single right thinking person in the country who has not condemned this aid, but—may I make it quite clear—in condemning this aid, I do not condemn or question the motives of the American Government. With an increasing threat posed by world communism, I presume the American Government has its own theory of security which consists in finding and building up more allies. Perhaps, the motives from the American point of view are not only *bona fide*, but also exceedingly good, but I condemn the American Government because this aid to Pakistan stems from a lamentable unawareness of the psychology both of India and of Pakistan. I feel that the American Government has failed to understand two very elementary matters in dealing with India. They have failed to understand India's pre-occupation with her relations with Pakistan. Our relations with Pakistan represent perhaps our first and most important pre-occupation in the international field. Secondly, the American Government has failed to understand the suspicion of the Indian people of Pakistan's religious fanaticism, the irredentism and the dangerous nostalgia for Muslim hegemony which today is reflected in the

mind and attitude of the Pakistan leaders. It is here that I feel that the Americans have made their greatest blunder and it is a tragic blunder because the net effect of American aid to Pakistan will be just this. On the one side, aggression on the part of Pakistan will be encouraged, and on the other side, Indian energy and Indian resources will be inevitably, increasingly diverted in order to achieve a state of preparedness against this increasing potential threat of aggression. We in India know that whatever the American Government may feel or hope or say about this aid, the aim of Pakistan in seeking the aid was not to resist any invisible Communist foe, but their aim was merely to use the aid as a whetstone on which to sharpen their religious fanaticism, with which to encourage the constant cry of *jeihad* against this country.

I wish to deal with what I regard as the primary and basic aspect of our foreign policy. I believe that the fundamental determinant which must inform and ultimately shape India's foreign policy is the fact that we are not only a democracy, but the democracy in Asia. I am one of those who believe that on the survival of the democracy in India depends the survival of democracy not only in Asia but in the Middle and the Far East. I believe in an international scene—where we have constant shifts and which is highly volatile—it is inevitable that our foreign policy should not be rigid and should not be monolithic. Statesmanship requires that the Indian policy must adjust itself and there must be some kind of accommodation without compromising our basic principles. It is here that I join issue with the policy of the Government of India. I say with all respect that I feel that in this play and interplay of certain forces on the surface, our policy loses sight of the fact that India is a democracy and that Indian democracy can neither exist nor survive in a vacuum. I know that we have a

general attitude of friendliness towards all nations. I endorse that attitude of friendliness towards all nations, and I believe it would be a measure of the smallness of India if we gratuitously antagonise any nation or a set of nations, but in seeking this ideal of general friendship that we have followed and that we continue to follow, we have fallen into an error. In seeking this ideal of complete impartiality,—I say with all respect to the Prime Minister, although he is not here now—we often strike this incongruous picture of criticising to be partisan or seeming to be pro-communist and to have a pro-communist partiality. We often present this incongruous picture of criticising those and being unfriendly to those whom we know best, those with whom we have natural bonds of political ideology. I say this with a sense of sorrow—I do not say that India is doing it deliberately—that because we are presenting this picture of partisanship, India is being increasingly misunderstood by her natural friends and well-wishers, the peoples of the other democracies, I do not say that the criticism of the democracies is not justified; certainly, we are perfectly justified in criticising the democracies and in pointing to their weaknesses and deficiencies, but we are not justified in constantly criticising the democracies only. That, I respectfully submit, is one of the weaknesses of our present policy. I myself understand the motives which go into the making of this attitude of seeming partisanship on the part of the Indian Government, but the peoples of the world's democracies do not understand the motives which represent the background of Indian psychology. I know that there are two main motives which go in the determination of India's present attitude. India, as an Asian country, is loath to criticise fellow Asians. India as a country, with recent memories of European colonialism, is obsessed with this particular aspect of European colonialism *vis-à-vis* the coloured people. We find that these two elements determine our psychology and they can be traced

in all our attitudes and in all our actions in the international field. We rightly condemn French colonialism in Indo-China because of our recent memories of European colonialism in this country. At the same time, our reluctance to criticise fellow Asians makes us very silent about the equally reprehensible role which the Chinese have played in giving arms and aid to the Viet Minh forces. We are right in condemning the viciousness of the South African and British policies in Africa, but we are strangely mute and silent in the face of the savage purges, the cynical shootings, the liquidation of millions of people and the enslavement of even more millions by the Russians, not only in their eastern satellite States but also in Russia itself. We are strangely silent about it. We react almost violently to the British policy with regard to Bermuda, but with regard to the Chinese attitude which affects our security intimately—I am talking about Tibet—we seem to have suffered from a convenient form of international amnesia. At first, we did seem to protest when the Chinese actually invaded Tibet, but more and more our protests have been pitched in minor key and today we seem to be acquiescing in this bare faced Chinese aggression and territorial vandalism. There is another facet of our foreign policy, with which I join issue squarely and completely. There appears to be no consistency in the attitude of our Government towards the communists at home and towards the communists abroad. We hear in the House and outside the Government's thunderings against the communists. According to the Government the communists stand for chaos and subversion, they represent everything that is undesirable, everything that is reactionary, everything that is totalitarian. The communists in this country are merely a limb of the larger body which the Government today extols—and I say this advisedly that the Government of India represents the greatest propagandist of Communism in India. It is the Government of India which.....

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Political thesis.

Shri Frank Anthony: Yes, that is right and the hon. Member may embrace the Prime Minister. I have very little time left in order to deal with this point further. I was merely postulating the axiom that the Government of India today is the greatest propagandist of communism in India. What do we find? We find spokesmen of the Government, we find Ministers of the Government, going about the country extolling communism,—more than that they romanticize communism. We find persons from the Treasury Benches, after a short, carefully-conducted tour of the communist countries, coming here and releasing a spate of concentrated, lyricized nonsense and half-truths. That is what we find spokesmen of the Government doing. I do not mind if the whole truth is told. These half-truths, the achievements of the communist countries, are extolled. One would imagine from the kind of pro-communist delirium which some of our Members of the Treasury Benches indulge in that the democracies, including India, have no achievements to their credit. But when, as I say you romanticize their achievements, when Government does it, why do you not give the whole picture? Our unfortunate people are not capable of analytical examination. Why do you not give the whole of it? Why do you not say that China and Russia have these achievements to their credit; but they have built these achievements on piles of corpses, on piles of murdered bodies. You should give them the whole truth; but you do not do that.

I accuse the Government, as I said of propagandizing, of romanticizing communism in this country. You tell our people of their achievements; but you do not tell them also of the terrible, the incalculable price that they have paid in human degradation, in human enslavement. This is where, as I say Government is playing the communist game. I say it with a

sense of sorrow. I do not say that they are doing it wittingly. Perhaps they are doing it without the slightest intention that by these panegyrics, by these proclamations, they are preparing the people of this country both mentally and psychologically for communism.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What is the difference between mental and psychological?

Shri Frank Anthony: I happen to have been a fairly profound student of psychology; I happen to be a student of the latest form of psychology, psycho-semitic medicine. But that is beside the point.

Very often I meet students in this country; very often I speak to them. Their reaction is typical. They say that communism cannot but be good for India. After all who proclaims it, who holds it out? Your own leaders. They hold it up. No one can accuse me of being a fellow-traveller. But sometimes after I read the speeches, the proclamations, as I say, the pro-communist sort of deliriums, I begin to wonder seriously whether after all communism, when these come *ex-cathedra* from our Ministers, may not be something better for our country than this variant of democracy which we practise. Sir, the communists in this country do not have to indulge in any sort of propaganda. It is no good members of the Congress Benches thundering against communism here. It is no good the Home Minister trying to tell us that the communists represent a menace to this country when all that they need do is to print and publicise these undiluted panegyrics of communism and its so-called achievements.

As the Government play this communist game unwittingly, it is garnering communist applause. I see in this House our friends on this side applauding not with one hand, but with all the hands they have. We find the Chinese Government, which not long ago was scurrilously abusive of our

Prime Minister applauding India's exploits in the international forum. The latest acquisition to these applause-mongers is Mr. Malenkov. They are all applauding the fact that we are unwittingly playing the communist game.

While we have this kind of praise on the one side of communism, on the other hand we have this constant decrying of democracy on the other. As I said, let us decry democracy, but why have this constant, unvarnished, unqualified praise of communism? Where is our logic and sense of consistency? While we decry democracy on the one hand and sing unqualified praises of communism on the other, do we expect the man in the street to accept democracy as something worthwhile for this country?

And what is worse, I say that the Government today apart from propagandising communism in India is indulging in not only wishful thinking, but dangerously wishful thinking. It appears to me that Government's basic thesis, so far as foreign policy is concerned, is that international communism poses no threat to India. I see two elements entering into this thesis: one is that communism is native to the soil of China; that it is something which has grown from the soil, that it is indigenous, healthy. Now, Sir, I do not wish to emulate my hon. friends in attacking violently any particular country. I am only looking at it from the point of view of a dangerous thesis. I am not suggesting that we should go about like international mad dogs wanting to bite this person or that person. But the main and the only function of our foreign policy must be to devise, to pursue a policy which gives to our people the maximum security and to say that in this thesis international communism poses no danger is a wishful and dangerously wishful thinking. We believe that communism in China is a natural and healthy and indigenous growth. I for one do not believe it at all. There is ample proof..... (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If freedom of speech is denied to a Member in the House, what can be done?

Sri Frank Anthony: There are so many incoherent, unintelligible interruptions that I am not able to reply to them immediately. They are only taking away my time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member need not take notice of them.

Sri Frank Anthony: As I was saying there is ample proof that this is not a natural or a healthy, or an indigenous growth in China.

We cherish our right to independent thinking in the international forum. There is instance after instance of India voting against, speaking against, acting against other democratic countries. But can anyone, including my communist friends, point out to us a single instance where Communist China has acted differently from, or acted independently of, the Soviet bloc? Has not China obediently toed, in regimented unison, the line, dictated by the Kremlin, along with all the other satellites of the Soviet? Is there a single instance to the contrary? After all we are looking at it from an objective angle. When a country obediently, subserviently, regularly, toes the regimented line proclaimed by Kremlin, how can you say that it is anything but a subservient variant of the kind of communism that you have in the Kremlin?

The other element which goes into this thesis is this. (Interruptions) Please give me five minutes more; my friends keep on interrupting me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whoever interrupts, I shall give the time so taken from his party's time to the Member interrupted.

Shri Nambiar: It must be counted in seconds!

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack): I want to listen to the hon. Member on his legs undisturbed by this kind of interruptions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the good of hon. Members keeping on interrupting like this. When Mr. Punnoose speaks, shall I allow the other 350 Members to keep on interrupting? It is for the Leaders of each Group to see that their members do not interrupt, but take note of points and reply in detail when they get a chance. Whoever is not able to answer in detail goes on interrupting. That is not fair.

Shri Nambiar: Here the discussion is about the Communist Party. He is attacking it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understood the hon. Member to say that while there is so much sympathy expressed for China's being admitted into the U.N.O., as an 'independent' country; that sympathy is uncalled for as China is blindly following the lead of Russia; and therefore, it ought not to be admitted into the U.N.O. That was how I understood him.

Shri Frank Anthony: I was only trying to underline this fact that in assuming that international communism and more especially communism from China poses no threat, our assumption is not only wrong but dangerous for the country. I have tried to show that Chinese communism is not an indigenous or a natural or an independent growth. I have tried to show that it is merely a variation of the prototype which we see in the Kremlin. I have tried to show that the other elements which apparently go into this thesis of the Government not to regard international communism as a danger are mere wishful thinking. I saw the other day a statement which was imputed to the Prime Minister to the effect that he believed that international communism had no motives of territorial aggrandisement, that history and geography made it impossible for the communists to invade this country. With a number of

mental reservations, I may believe that for a few years, at any rate, communism — international communism — could not actually invade this country, but then actual, direct invasion has never been part of communist technique. Communist technique which works to a different but consistent pattern has been not actually to invade but virtually to invade. We have seen this pattern in China; we are seeing the same pattern today in Indo-China, and God forbid, we may see the same pattern in our lifetime in India. It is virtual invasion by giving every possible comfort, by giving every possible form of military assistance, by giving every possible form of aid to the local communists. That is the form that communist aggression takes, and that is the form that it has taken in China, that it is taking in Indo-China and that it may well take in India. And may I say this to the Government: I know that their task is a difficult and delicate one and they cannot proclaim rigid policies, whatever we may think privately in our chancellories. But there is this fact, that the Government is presenting this picture of pro-communist partisanship and there is, as I said, this dangerous wishful thinking that international communism poses no threat at all to this country.

One of the greatest techniques of communism is that it can bide its time and an equally great technique is that it lulls its prospective victim into a false sense of security. That is the danger. India today is being lulled into a false sense of security. Communists will wait, not for five but for ten years. By that time, Nepal may fall into the communist lap. By that time, not only Travancore-Cochin but Bengal may well owe allegiance not only to the hammer and sickle but to the Kremlin. They will wait for ten years in order to get the greatest prize not only in Asia but the greatest prize in the whole world—India. Unfortunately this American aid to Pakistan has, in my humble opinion, increased the threat of aggression from Pakistan. But I

also say this that the danger of invasion by Pakistan pales into insignificance alongside the danger of invasion from the communist menace. I believe this too that if Pakistan is ever ill-advised enough to start any adventure against this country, we will not only be able to repel it but also to throw it back into their teeth and to administer some sort of a chastening effect on their adventurous spirit. Can we say that, when our friends are ready and are prepared to embark on an adventure, supported all by the mighty resources of China; will we be able to say that we will be able to throw such a challenge back in their teeth?

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी (जिला हमीर-पुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी अभी श्री एन्थनी साहब ने

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : अंगरेजी में बोलिये ।

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : अंगरेजी में तो बहुत से सदस्यों ने भाषण किया और हमारे इस सदन में ऐसे भी बहुत से सदस्य हैं जो केवल हिन्दी ही समझते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं अपनी परराष्ट्र नीति या विदेशी नीति जो कि भारत सरकार ने अपनायी है, उस पर हिन्दी में ही अपने विचार प्रकट करूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस नीति को हमारी भारत सरकार ने अपनाया है, उस से संसार में हमारे देश का केवल मान ही नहीं बढ़ गया, बल्कि जिस प्रकार से हमारे देश ने परराष्ट्र नीति के सम्बन्ध में दूर देशों में काम करने की प्रथा चलाई है, वह एक अवस्था में डालने वाली चीज है। इस से हमारी परराष्ट्रीय नीति और रीति का एक नमूना संसार के सामने उपस्थित हो गया है। अभी साम्यवादी लोगों ने आपके सामने तरह तरह के भाषण किये और टीका टप्पणी की। मैं ने उन को बड़े

गौर से सुना। मैं ने देखा कि श्री हीरेन्द्र मुकर्जी और दूसरे सज्जनों ने एक प्रथा सी बना ली है जब भी कोई बात इस सदन के सामने आती है तो वह उसका विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हो जाते हैं। वह उस दूर देश की प्रथा का अनुकरण यहां करने लगते हैं जो कि रूस कहलाता है। रूस के मुल्क में अगर जमीन अधिक है और अन्न की कमी है, अगर वहां पर फ' मली प्लैनिंग या संतति निरोध के लिये प्रयत्न किया जाता है तो वह यहां पर भी, जब कि हमारे यहां जमीन की कमी है और आबादी ज्यादा है तो वहां की बातों का समर्थन करते हैं। कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं कि वह रूस की तमाम नीति को लेकर उसका प्रतिपादन यहां करते हैं, जब कि भारत की समस्याएँ सब की सब वहां के विपरीत हैं।

हमारी परराष्ट्र नीति के सम्बन्ध में यह मुख्य सिद्धान्त स्मरण रखने योग्य है कि महात्मा जो ने हम भारतवासियों को एक सबक सिखाया था और वह सबक था शान्ति और अहिंसा का। हम हिंसात्मक उपायों से किसी देश पर कब्जा करने की ओर ध्यान नहीं रखते। हम किसी दूसरे देश पर आक्रमण नहीं करना चाहते। लेकिन साथ ही साथ यह भी स्मरण रखने की बात है कि जिस तरीके से हमने अंगरेज जैसी विलक्षण जाति को यहां से शान्ति और अहिंसा के द्वारा हटा कर संसार के सामने उदाहरण रखा, उसी तरह से हम परराष्ट्र नीति में भी इस सिद्धान्त को अपना कर दूसरे देशों के सामने आदर्श रख रहे हैं।

आप देखते हैं कि जहां एटम बम और हाइड्रोजन बम की बड़ी बड़ी तैयारियां की जा रही हैं वहां हमारा देश विश्वशान्ति के लिये दृढ़ प्रयास कर रहा है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने अभी बतलाया कि बड़ी शक्तियों द्वारा एक महान विध्वंस खड़ा हो जायेगा, अगर संसार में फिर से युद्ध उठ खड़ा हो गया और जितने भारी और विध्वंसक शक्ति के साधन इस समय

[श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी]

संसार में मौजूद हैं वे यदि सब के सब लगा दिये जायें तो आधे से अधिक संसार बिल्कुल बरबाद हो जायेगा . . . अगर कोई भी देश इस समस्या को सोचे और समझे तो क्या वह पसन्द करेगा कि संसार में विध्वंसक शक्तियों को बढ़ाया जाय जब कि लड़ाई का कोई अन्त नहीं है ?

अभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने बतलाया कि कोरिया में लड़ाई छिड़ी, लेकिन उसका अच्छा अन्त नहीं निकला, इन्डोचाइना में भी लड़ाई छिड़ी, लेकिन उसका भी कोई अन्त अभी तक नज़र नहीं आया है। दोनों शक्तियां लड़ती हैं लेकिन एक दूसरे को पीछे नहीं कर पाती हैं। अगर फिर युद्ध हुआ तो उसमें कितना विध्वंस हो जायेगा इसका अनुमान नहीं किया जा सकता। इसलिये हमारे देश के जो नेता हैं, वे यह विचार करते हैं कि संसार के लड़ाकू देशों के सामने उस उदाहरण को रखना चाहिये जो कि पूज्य बापू जी ने हमारे सामने रखा था और जिसकी सफलता के चमत्कार हम देख चुके हैं। उनका उपदेश है कि संसार को यह बतलाया जाय कि लड़ने से ही नहीं, विध्वंस से ही नहीं, बल्कि मनोबल से भी, आत्म शक्ति से भी हम दूसरे देशों पर विजय प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। जैसे कि हमने इस देश में स्वराज्य की प्राप्ति की। आज संसार की शक्तियां भारत की ओर देख रही हैं। हिन्देशिया और गाइना के लोग और दूसरे देशों के मंत्री और बड़े बड़े प्रतिनिधिमंडल यहां आये और उन्होंने भारतीय नीति की बड़ी तारीफ की। क्यों ? इसलिये कि आज के संसार में जहां विध्वंस का आडम्बर चल रहा है, जहां बड़े बड़े ऐटम बम और हाइड्रोजन बम बनाने की तैयारियां हो रही हैं वहां शान्ति का संदेश देने वाला कोई देश नज़र नहीं आ रहा था। अब भारत ने स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति

के बाद संसार के सामने एक नई नीति रखी है और मुझे विश्वास है कि यदि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और हमारे देश के नेता इसी नीति पर चलते रहेंगे तो सारा संसार इस नीति को मानेगा। इसका कारण यही है कि कोरिया में और हिन्द चीन में और संसार के दूसरे भागों में जो लड़ाई की आग की लहर चल रही है उस से मानव का कल्याण नहीं हो सकता। कल्याण तभी हो सकता है जब कि हम महात्मा गांधी के सिद्धान्त के अनुसार संसार को शांति बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करें। इस के लिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम अपनी नीति पर दृढ़ रहें, और हम दूसरों के दबाव में न आएं।

पाकिस्तान को जो अमरीकी फौजी सहायता मिल रही है उस पर भी हमको विचार करना चाहिये कि असल बात क्या है ? पाकिस्तान में आन्तरिक कमजोरी इतनी बढ़ गई है कि वह अपने नागरिकों को ही नहीं संभाल सकता। वहां के नागरिकों के पास हथियार हैं। पाकिस्तान की फौज इतनी कमजोर है कि वह नागरिकों से जो डर है उसका मुकाबिला नहीं कर सकती। पिछले दिनों जब अहमदिया आन्दोलन चला था तो वहां पर फौज को बुलाना पड़ा था। वहां पर फौज के लोगों में और सिविल सर्विस के लोगों में शक्ति के लिये प्रतिद्वन्द्विता चल रही है। सिविल सर्विस के लोग यह चाहते हैं कि इस देश की बागडोर हम अपने हाथ में रखें। वहां के प्रधान मंत्री महोदय भी सिविल सर्विस के व्यक्ति हैं। फौज चाहती है कि हमारी सत्ता रहे। साथ ही साथ वहां पर जो पांच सुबे भिन्न भिन्न भाषा बोलने वाले हैं उन सब पर उर्दू लादी जा रही है। वहां पर सिन्ध में सिन्धी, फ़टियर में पश्तो, पंजाब में पंजाबी, और बंगाल में बंगला बोली जाती है। लेकिन इन सब के ऊपर एक नई

भाषा बोध दी गई है। य० पी० केमुसलमानों ने जो वहां पर गये हैं उर्दू भाषा उन पर बोध दी है। इसलिये इन कारणों से कट्टर साम्प्रदायिकता के कारण पाकिस्तान में वर्तमान सरकार के विरुद्ध एक बड़ी भारी आग सुलग रही है। वहां पर सरकार के सामने यह एक समस्या थी कि वह इस अशान्ति को किस प्रकार शान्त करे। इसके लिये उपाय ढूँढते-ढूँढते उनको एक यही उपाय सूझा कि अमरीका से या किसी दूसरे देश से सहायता लें। अमरीका के सामने यह प्रश्न था कि दक्षिण एशिया में कम्युनिस्टों के प्रसार को कैसे रोका जाय। भारतवर्ष एक प्रजातान्त्रिक देश है, इसलिये यहां कम्युनिज्म की प्रगति का इतना डर नहीं है। यहां कम्युनिस्ट लोग बहुत दिनों से काम कर रहे हैं लेकिन कोई जड़ नहीं जमा सके हैं। लेकिन हो सकता है कि पाकिस्तान में उनका जमाव बढ़े। इसलिये पाकिस्तान को अमरीका ने सहायता देना शुरू किया। तो पाकिस्तान के सामने अपनी निजी समस्या है जिसके कारण वह अमरीकी सहायता चाहता है। लेकिन है यह बहुत गलत बात। कोई भी देश जो विदेशी सहायता लेगा वह कमजोर हो जायगा और खुद उस विदेशी सहायता का शिकार हो जायेगा। जो देश अपने ऊपर निर्भर रहता है और अपनी जनता के बल पर निर्भर रहता है वही बलवान हो सकता है। दूसरों से सहायता लेने में शक्ति न सिविल सर्विस वालों के हाथ में रहेगी और न फौज के हाथों में रहेगी बल्कि दूसरों के हाथों में जा सकती है। आजकल शक्ति सच्चे प्रजातंत्र के द्वारा ही स्थिर रह सकती है। इसलिये भारत ने इस प्रथा को अपनाया है। अगर पाकिस्तान ने भी अपने यहां प्रजातंत्र के सिद्धान्त को सच्चाई से लागू किया होता तो वह भी कामयाब होता।

भारत ने हमेशा पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ताना बरताव करना चाहा था और उसको आश्वासन दिया कि हम हमला नहीं करना चाहते। लेकिन पाकिस्तान के नेताओं के भ्रष्टाचार में यह बात नहीं आई। इसमें भारत-वर्ष का कोई दोष नहीं है। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि जो नीति हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने अपनायी है वही संसार को शान्ति की ओर ले जा सकती है। युद्ध से संसार का विध्वंस ही हो सकता है कल्याण नहीं। वह दिन जल्द आयागा जब कि यह विध्वंसक तरीका हट जायगा। संसार को शान्ति का उपासक बनने पर ही यह मालूम होगा कि वह तटस्थ नीति का अनुसरण करके ही और मिल कर समझौता कर के ही और सम्मेलनों के जरिये शान्तिपूर्ण तरीकों से ही अपना कल्याण कर सकता है। उसी समय संसार को मालूम होगा कि युद्ध से उस को लाभ नहीं हो सकता। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जो नीति साउथ अफ्रीका में, या लंका में या दूसरे देशों में उनके अपने वहां के प्रश्नों को सुलझाने के लिये अपनायी है उससे उन देशों के लोग प्रसन्न हैं और उसकी प्रशंसा करते हैं। तमाम आसपास के देश, एक दो को छोड़ कर हमारी नीति की प्रशंसा करते हैं। पाकिस्तान और एक आस और देश इसका अपवाद है, अन्यथा जितने समीपवर्ती देश हैं सब भारत की नीति का समर्थन करते हैं वह नीति किसी खास सिद्धान्त के विरोध में या पक्ष में नहीं है। जहां चीन की जनत की सरकार को हमारी सरकार ने मान्यता दी है, क्योंकि उस सरकार को जनता का समर्थन प्राप्त है वहां वह चीन की उस सरकार को स्वीकार नहीं करती जो कि च्यांगकाईशिक की मातहत में है। इस समय जो हमारे देश की नीति है वह हमारे लिये अनुकूल है और हमारे सिद्धान्त के अनुसार है। इसलिए मैं इस नीति का दृढ़तापूर्वक समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Before I proceed to deal with one or two matters of special interest to the people of South India in this debate,

I wish to answer a few points raised by **Shri Frank Anthony**. The hon. Member made certain statements which are at best half-truths and which will be embedded in our records and also publicised in papers all over the world. Unless we clarify those statements it would give a wrong impression to the world at large and to the House here.

Firstly, I will take Mr. Anthony's statement that the Prime Minister of India said that he has nothing to fear from expansion of world communism. What the Prime Minister said, to the best of my recollection, is that he has nothing to fear from Chinese expansion, and that is proved by facts. I will detail one or two instances to show how we have nothing to fear to show from Chinese Communism expanding to other regions. In the year 1949-50, the Kuomintang troops—I wish Mr. Anthony was here, because what I am going to say is unpalatable—entered into the territory of Burma. Actually Chinese Communists drove them and they took refuge in the territory within the Burmese borders. The Chinese Communist forces did not trespass the borders of Burma and actually refrained from following in pursuit the Kuomintang troops. Then, long before the Korean conflict arose, the Chinese Communists assured the Burmese Government that they would respect the established boundaries between Burma and China. When General Li Mi's troops took refuge in the Burmese borders, the Chinese Communist forces did not pursue them in those areas. In the last Session of the United Nations this matter was brought up by the Burmese Delegation asking for the help of the United Nations for expelling the Kuomintang troops from the borders of Burma. So, it is rather strange, whether on facts or otherwise, that Mr. Anthony should say that the Chinese Communists are expan-

sionists in their attitude and that they are actually bent upon expanding by military aggression over other parts of Asia. I am quite positive that the Prime Minister's statement that the Chinese Communists have no aggressive intentions is more than amply borne out by these two instances which I have cited.

Then Mr. Anthony referred to Tibet. He said that we first violently protested against the occupation of Tibet by the Chinese, but we soft-pedalled it later and now we have reconciled ourselves to the expansion of Chinese Communism not only over Tibet but even on the borders of India. Let me analyse this a little further. The Tibetan Delegation sometime ago went to the United States for purpose of, I think it was, selling of yak tails—tails of a certain animal—and then the United States told the Tibetan Delegation that the Chinese suzerainty over Tibet was acknowledged. But, then there was one difference and that is, the Chinese suzerainty which the United States then recognised was of the Chinese Government of Kuomintang Chiang Kai-Shek and not of the present Chinese Government. Would that make any great difference, I ask, in principle? If the Chinese Government did have suzerainty over Tibet how could it be said that, because China has a different Government at present, because an old discredited Government has been thrown out and a new Government has come in its place, that Government has no suzerainty over Tibet?

Mr. Anthony then said that actually the Chinese have occupied the borders of India. Sir, the position in Tibet is somewhat confusing because the so-called MacMahon line which drew the boundary between India and Tibet was only an imaginary line and I am told that some of the Lamas on the Tibetan side come and pitch their tents farther and farther. The people because they are Buddhists, go and

render obeisance to the Lamas with the result that it becomes difficult for one to judge whether that particular territory is Indian or Tibetan. Whatever it is, the matter is under negotiation and actually the Prime Minister in his opening statement said that it is likely to be settled.

Now, I may turn round and ask Mr. Anthony what has been the record of the so-called democracies. The democracies which are now very bitterly opposed to world communism were themselves the greatest allies of the communists. In India, when we were struggling for independence in the 1942 movement and people were in jails, were not these democracies taking the aid of "People's War" slogan to strengthen themselves in the country?

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): There was no democracy in India at that time.

Shri Nambiar: Let there be no interruption.

Shri Venkataraman: I know it is unpalatable to my friend Mr. Nambiar.

Shri Nambiar: Not at all. I never wanted to interrupt.

Shri Venkataraman: Had they not appointed the communists to the post-war development committees? For a while it looked as if they were going to be the successors, if at all, of the British administration in this country, the British would think of transferring power to the more disciplined and more co-operative Communist party in India, than to the rugged, rebellious Congress! Therefore, when people come forward now with a lot of angry protests against the so-called world communism we are tempted to ask ourselves whether it is only a question of convenience now, as it

was then a matter of convenience for the Western democracies to align themselves with the communists. At that time we were not able to judge whether the Western democracies were in their real spirit of devotion to the cause of democracy and fight against communism, or whether it is not even now a matter of convenience to protect their own interests. India does not take her lessons from others. She decides things for herself. And the decision she has taken in this matter is that there is no fear of Chinese or Communist expansion territorially in Asia and other parts.

Mr. Anthony referred to the number of occasions in which India has voted against the democracies and asked: have you found any instance in which the other satellite countries voted against the Soviet Union? It is not for us to go and examine how the satellite countries voted. But I will at least explain to this House and to the country how we voted on every one of these occasions. So, far as India was concerned, it always voted against the so-called Western democracies on issues which involved colonialism. We voted in favour of the principle of self-determination. We voted in favour of Morocco and Tunisia getting their freedom and independence. We voted against the United Kingdom in the matter of the Central African Federation. We voted against the administration in Kenya, consistent with our policy of supporting the under-developed countries to reach their full measure of self-government. Does my friend Mr. Anthony want that India should have voted with the so-called Western democracies against each one of these items that I have mentioned? Does it mean that merely because Mr. Anthony and people of his way of thinking are opposed to communism we should stultify ourselves by voting in favour of the perpetuation of colonial domination in African and other areas?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: On a point of clarification. Mr. Anthony who spoke is not here, but I had listened

[Shri Venkataraman.]

to him very carefully. I wish to point out to Mr. Venkataraman that what he had said was : is there any occasion in which China had voted against the Kremlin on any issue?

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): How can China vote? It is not in the United Nations.

Shri Venkataraman: It is not for us to sit in judgment over others. It is for us to tell how India behaved in the U.N. I said in all the occasions on which we had to vote against the so-called democracies it was mostly on the issue of colonial domination. I ask this question whether Mr. Anthony wants that merely because some people are opposed to communism we should support colonialism. Certainly not. And those are the occasions where India voted against the so-called democracies.

There is another matter to which Mr. Anthony referred, namely the question of China. He asked: why are you opposed to communism in this country and arguing for its admission into the United Nations. It is an elementary principle that the effective Government of the day is recognised. Apart from all the other technical considerations, it is a simple principle of international law, which I studied for a while to defend our INA men in Malaya. The principle is that the successful revolution is the Government established by law. If Cromwell beheaded King Charles, his was the Government of the day. Likewise, if the Chinese People's Government is the effective Government of China, we, for our part, are willing to recognise them. Apart from this, there is another greater practical value. It is necessary to have the opponent to sit with you for a discussion if you have faith in the process of negotiation. If the opponent does not sit with you in any councils or committees, there is no negotiation at all. We begin to question whether you have faith in the process of

negotiation so long as you keep out your opponent from the councils.

Before I conclude, I want to refer to only two matters. The House will join with me in sending its sympathy and admiration to the people of French India who are now struggling to free themselves in Pondicherry, Karikal and other places. Some of friends are there now actually in the throes of struggle. One of them has been shot at; some people have had to undergo belabouring at the hands of goondas as well as the police. All for the purpose of merging this tiny dot of territory with the Indian Union, which is its birth right. I would only add on this occasion that so far as Indians in Ceylon are concerned, our Government has to exert itself to the full measure to see that the agreement which they have arrived at is observed in spirit. There is disturbing news that the Ceylonese Government is going to compel the people to register under the Agreement and if they do not register themselves, they are going to be deprived of service and means of livelihood in Ceylon. A reading of the Agreement does not warrant such a stand being taken by the Ceylonese Government. I am sure that our Government will protect the interests of the large majority of Indians in Ceylon who are denied citizenship under the India Pakistan Citizenship Act.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I am extremely grateful to you for keeping up the tradition of calling me at the fag end of the day. Any way, I shall take this opportunity to express my opinion on the foreign policy that our Government is pursuing.

It is now six years since the Republic of India has begun to function. For such a young life, we should think that we have had great achievements far ahead of our age. The seventh year has dawned with our presiding over the UNO. Therefore, we think that in foreign policy we have discharged our functions with regard to

international relationship to the best of our capacity and set an example of a peace-loving country in the world. We have risen from the very depths like a bright constellation above the horizon shedding its peaceful rays of friendship and neutrality, hitting up at the same time the tumultuous billows dashing against each other and foaming over the sea of misery. We have steered in the midst of these tossing billows like the magic case-ment floating on the foams of perilous seas forlorn. Our attempt in extending the cause of peace in Korea has been the subject of comment in the international world. Though we were not able to fulfil our mission, the services rendered by our Generals and soldiers are worthy of a great nation, adding gems to our coronet. Our troops have returned from Korea, the land of military aid; they have returned from Korea, the land of sepulchres, where the victor and the vanquished lie side by side, whose, venom has lost its sting, whose passion has lost its heat, whose ambition has lost its glamour and glory, and whose valour has passed away like the smoke of their guns still lying clutches in their ghastly grip, cold smouldering into dust, proclaiming to the whole world the futility of military aid and the illusion of collective security in a free world, as mentioned by President Eisenhower in his letter to the Prime Minister dated the 24th February.

And undaunted by our experience in Korea, the peace dove of India has risen again like the snow white dove from the deluge with a fresh twig of olive in its ruddy beak, hovering over Indo-China as the harbinger of peace and tranquillity, trying to pacify and drop a message of peace. Let us hope that our attempt will meet with fruition.

There are nations who can beat us in the strength of military aid and monetary value, but we have our moral grandeur that rises like an edifice of ivory against the blue dome of the sky.

The year has dawned with very disquieting news of the military alliance
47 P.S.D.

between Pakistan and America—an alliance which has set at nought the relations of cordiality and friendship existing between India and Pakistan; an alliance which has heightened the tension of cold war in the East and the Middle East; an alliance which has prevented the crystallisation of democratic majority in Asia and Asian countries; nay, an alliance which is carrying the atmosphere of the slaughter-house with its degenerating morale into the recipient countries. They have concluded the Pact, and now they are about to implement it. Already eleven of the Americans are in Pakistan to survey—yes, to survey and interfere in the internal administration by fanning the fanatic fire, to cause friction, and subsequently the spark which God forbid. We are now aware of the dangerous weapons of the latest and nefarious models arrayed around us by the self-appointed custodians of collective security, of international economic welfare and universal peace. We are now aware of the tangled web of intriguing politics woven round us to render our position insecure. We are now aware of the high-power machinations to misinterpret the moral codes of international justice against us, against our rights and against the amity of relationship that exist between India and Pakistan and her other neighbours. In the face of this psychological impasse created to camouflage us into accepting the military aid, I appreciate the stand taken by our Government. I congratulate the Prime Minister for refusing the offer with countries worthy of a nation. At the same time, I cannot but recall to the memory of this Government—I have not made this statement in this august House merely for the sake of argument, but I have made this statement with past history to prove the truth of what I am going to say—that the acceptance of the economic aid is viewed with great concern by us on this side.

6 P.M.

The history of economic and military aid is plain enough in the world.

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

In 1917, the Americans gave economic and military aid to Russia. Subsequently, they interfered in the internal administration, and brought about the civil war helping the reactionaries against the civil war, slaughtered millions, and finally the Russians rose equal to the occasion, formed their Red Army, and made their own machinery and became the master of their own economy.

They gave military and economic aid to China. The experience of China is a warning to the Prime Minister of Pakistan who has committed his country to a similar fate. Subsequent to the economic and military aid, the United States Government adopted the policy of interfering in their internal administration, and helped the Kuomintang reactionaries against the people of China, and ultimately the Chinese Communists won the whole of China; and today the Americans are holding up Formosa against all pacts and treaties against the Chinese people.

As for Korea, I have already dealt with it. The military aid there has been a ghastly picture for all the world to learn. The North and the South Koreans were disintegrated and entangled in a civil war, millions were killed, and today they are still in ruins.

They have helped with economic and military aid Indo-China, and today still the Viet Minh forces are in the battlefield, with all our good wishes at their feet. In the Middle East they have disintegrated Palestine as between the Jews and the Arabs, and the story is not ended. The stage is being still occupied for exploitation.

Now they have come to Pakistan with their military aid, as the self-appointed custodians of collective security, to fan up the fire and thus render the frontiers of India insecure. This is in short a bird's eye-view of the military and economic aid given by the custodians of collective security

to the world. Let us understand now, that we have already gone some distance in the economic aid. The Technical Co-operation Administration is working for American infiltration in India, to poke their nose into internal administration, and that they are trying to do in any own State in a different manner.

I warn this Government that we have shed our blood and fought for this country's liberty; I warn them that this liberty so dearly won should not be on brink of another colonialism. The immediate repercussion of the military aid to Pakistan was a threat from the Prime Minister of Pakistan to use this as a background in deciding the Kashmir issue. Subsequently, he denied it. This background in the decision of the Kashmir issue is not so dangerous as the American personnel in the UNO as observers; it is they that are really dangerous in deciding this question, and as the Prime Minister has rightly pointed out, there cannot be an impartial decision as long as American personnel are there.

Madam, just a few words with regard to that question. The American personnel, the Secretary-General of the UNO said, were in no way a hindrance to the settlement of the question for they belonged to a 'neutral nation', the UNO. I am asking the Secretary-General of the UNO whether he gave that explanation in consonance with the precedents that UNO has established on previous occasions. On November 14, 1947, it made a decision on the question of Korean unification, and then Korea had military aid from America and military aid from Russia. But in appointing a Commission, they said that the U.S.A. shall not be represented thereon. In October 1948, the Berlin blockade question came up before the U.N. Assembly for decision. Then America, as one of the participant countries in German unification, was not allowed to send its representative. The Commission was composed of neutral nations. In the light of these two decisions, I ask the Secretary-General of the U.N.O.—what is the

secret of giving this explanation which is not convincing to us?

Madam, I invite your attention to a statement made by John Foster Dulles in his book *War or Peace* on page 41. He says:

"The United Nations cannot do everything. Its uses are limited by its nature. It is not a substitute for United States foreign policy and its activities cannot relieve the United States of major responsibilities of its own. But, as we shall see as we go on to discuss the United Nations in operation, its possibilities are such that the United Nations can be, and should be, a corner-stone of United States foreign policy."

The United Nations can be, and should be, a corner-stone of United States foreign policy! The cat is out of the bag. Now we know why they have made such a decision. Will our representatives in that august Assembly consider this question and fight it out for India?

Now, with regard to the Asian question, I remember to have said in this House during the last two sessions that India should take the leadership in forming an Asian League. It is a regional association. It is this prospect of a regional association with India taking the lead, with Pakistan as a friend, that has driven the U.S.A. to nip it in the bud and give this military aid, thus creating a cleavage between India and Pakistan. Regional association has a history of its own. We have the Pan-American union crystallising into the North Atlantic Pact—a regional association. We have the Commonwealth relationship—a regional association. We have the Arab League—a regional association. All these associations are formed either for self-defence or for the propagation of peace or for economic development. In the face of this, I wonder why military aid was given to Pakistan. Further, they have created a strange bed-fellow for him in a Turkish Pact, so that the whole Asian League may be frustrated and dashed

to pieces and exploited for the American domination.

I have not much to say except that India should keep awake and in deciding the foreign policy the whole nation is one, unlike the situation in Europe when Hitler came and the fifth-columnists were working against nationalities. But, in India, as it was in Russia that taught a lesson to Hitler, there shall not be fifth-columnists. The whole nation shall stand as a solid block behind the Prime Minister and the Government to form security for India as well as the whole world.

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): Madam, I had no desire to take part in the debate, but having listened very carefully to my hon. friend Mr. Anthony, who is not present now, and having observed during the last few occasions, Members of Parliament debating very hotly either in favour of communism or in favour of the so-called American democracy, I believe our Parliament should neither be a place chosen for talk against communism nor should it be a place chosen for either praise or condemnation of the so-called American democracy. As a matter of fact, when we have to judge our foreign policy, it should be judged only and solely from the point of view of the maintenance of the freedom of our country. As my sister Annie Mascarene just rightly pointed out, as a matter of fact, our achievements in the last six years are gratifying and our policy should be judged not by what the Americans at one stage say or what the Communists may choose to admire at another and subsequent stage. That is immaterial. As I said sometime ago, we have just got our freedom and we are trying to develop our nation and our resources at a time which is very critical in the whole world. Though America may be talking of democracy, we are not forgetting the history how that State rose and where a doctrine—very noble as they call it—was adumbrated that civilisation progresses by the extinction of inferior races. It was said years back, I know. When they were asked

[Shri Pataskar]

for an explanation as to where those red Americans who once lived in the land were, their explanation was, 'Very sorry; civilisation has progressed' with the extinction of that inferior race. I do not want to condemn them and to make enemies of them but to remind our other friends who are so much against communism not to forget the fact that we are also persons who take stock of the previous history of what is going on in the world. Similarly, I think, we should neither be friends nor enemies of communists or others. We are a nation which is trying to develop its own strength and in that context our foreign policy has to be judged.

I find that not only my friend Mr. Frank Anthony, but certain other people honestly believe that our Government, somehow or other, is the protagonist of communism, or propagandist of communism as they say. I do not understand it. The argument that I heard Mr. Anthony advancing was that we do not take sufficient action against the communists and their policy—not communists in India but generally against international communism. Why is it necessary? We should be concerned with only what they are doing here and why should anybody take it upon himself to make any assumption that this Government does not know or does not care to know what is happening here or in the world as a whole. We are not at all misguided. Supposing if it is proved that communism is very bad, that international communism is worse, does it automatically follow that something worse is going to befall us! If my friend Mr. Anthony were here, I would have put a question to him: what is the use of saying that communism is bad? Merely saying that communism is bad does not mean that the other side is good. I fail to understand him, for he himself has reiterated that America has done something very dangerous for the security and solidarity of this country by giving military aid to Pakistan. I think—and I have also come to that conclusion—that the foreign policy of

our Government to keep aloof from both these blocs is the right one. It was also pointed out by Mr. Anthony that we condemn the colonialism or the racialism in South Africa and the colonialism practised by European countries in some parts of Asia, but we do not take sufficient interest what is happening in Soviet Russia, in Tibet and in some other places. Our conduct is always that of an impartial person and we know what is happening here and at other places, but at the same time we wish to keep ourselves out of the trouble. As our Prime Minister himself has said, there are two forces at work, one of which is dominated by the United States and the other by Soviet Russia, and both of them have got their hydrogen bombs and other terrible weapons of human destruction. What does it all mean? It means that a time may come when, if there is no peace in the world, they might destroy at least half the world. What are we to do? Are we to side with one bloc or the other? We are doing our duty to humanity and it would be wrong to say that we are merely neutral. Our policy is a positive policy of trying to maintain peace in the world and prevent war. You should judge our foreign policy on that basis. Whether at one time the Americans do not like it or at another time the Soviet bloc does not like it the only method that we are pursuing is to try and do our best not only for protecting ourselves but for protecting humanity at large. Tested that way, I am sure that every reasonable man, not actuated by partiality towards this doctrine or that, will agree that we have done the best that we could. Then, it was asked: if we condemned South Africa, what else have we done? We are not as big as the U.S.A. or the Soviet bloc, but we have to develop

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): In population we are bigger than both.

Shri Pataskar: Population does not come in here for the simple reason

that present-day methods of destruction are so vast that the world has to be saved by something else. Of course we have got a very large population and China has got a very large population, but we know that mere population at the present moment does not take us for in this matter. One side talks of cultural freedom and the other talks of democracy, but what about the secret preparations of these two blocs which constitute a danger to the world? The main question, therefore, is whether we should or should not enter into this picture. Because we neither condemn nor praise one side or the other, it does not mean that we are simply neutral. We know the position and we know what our foreign policy should be. I find that whenever something is said against the motives of the Americans, there is a row raised and similarly if we say something against communists or international communism, a row is raised. We Indians should concentrate on what we should do by way of our duty to humanity so that the world may be saved from a catastrophe. My friend Mr. Anthony asked what we have done in Indo-China. We have been doing the best that we could do there. Mr. Anthony said that communism is a forced thing on China which is now in the Soviet bloc. I am not much in the know of things there. He seems to think that China is held by Russia. Probably some documents to that effect might have been found; it may be true. I have nothing to say about that. But if China is supporting one section in Indo-China to carry on the fight, it is equally true, as is reported in the papers, that America is supplying not only arms, but also money to the French to carry on their fight. What should we do in this matter? What should be the position of India? Only the other day I read that in the French Parliament it was stated that France is fighting because America is meeting three-fourths of their war expenditure in Indo-China. The best course for us to adopt in this situation is to try to create an atmosphere of peace, by whatever means in our power, by appealing to their

sense of humanity and similar means. We should at the same time try to set an example to the world.

As hon. Members must be aware there is a fear psychosis prevailing both in the Soviet Union as well as in America. They have created all possible means of destruction; and having done that, one is afraid of the other. If there is to be a war, there will not be any declared war between them. You will one day hear that somehow surreptitiously one bloc went against the other and caused huge destruction by dropping of bombs. If something is left, the other side will try to do the same thing. That would be the only thing that we will hear. There will not be any protracted war. Unfortunately, Pakistan has also come into the picture. So far as we are concerned, we shall try our best to avoid a war. We want to be friendly to that nation.

Though atom bombs may be in the possession of both the blocs they are not going to give it to Pakistan, or Korea or Indo-China. To my mind the wisest course for India to adopt is to be neither on this side nor on the other. I do not understand the meaning of praising the one and condemning the other. I find some people always raising the bogey of danger from communism. If there is danger from communism, there is as much danger from American Military Aid policy. America having learnt the lesson from Korea, as I said, wants to create cheap soldiers in Asia. As I quoted a Congressional report the other day, America feels that for the expenditure involved in maintaining an American soldier, she can create 25 Pakistani soldiers in their fight against communism. I would, therefore, appeal to my hon. friends that it would not only be sheer unwisdom, but something injurious to the cause of our country if we try to unnecessarily interest ourselves either in communism or in the so-called American democracy. Some people think that because communism is bad, automatically American democracy is good. That is wrong. There are some others who

[Shri Pataskar]

believe that because American intentions are bad, in some respect, as is proved by some past events, communism is the only other alternative. So far as I can think, I think the danger to our country is from both sides and therefore, I would submit and appeal to all hon. Members of this House to approach the question of our foreign affairs not from the point of a discussion on communism and its drawbacks, vices and dangers nor of the other side but from the point of what is in our interest. The hon. Member himself said now, that some people are very much affected because communists say that India's policy is good; even Molotov has chosen to approve of it. It is all good. So far as the present aspect is concerned he approves of it because it is in his interest. We know why he has approved it. Similarly at one time America may have approved of something we did. Therefore, the question is not what they approve or what they do not approve but what is in the interest of India. I would, therefore, appeal to all hon. Members to have our own interest always in our hearts and not to be swayed by what one side or the other says. We know that both sorts of 'isms' which have any loyalty to anybody outside India are bad and dangerous to our country. There is no doubt on that point. We should try to realise the dangers through which the world is passing; very few realise the critical moments through which we are passing. We should try to take all steps which we Indians can take to sink our differences and to be one so far as the security and freedom of the country is concerned, whether we belong to this party or the other. That is the necessity of the moment and judged from that point of view I believe our foreign policy is correct. I do not find any substance in what some people say that this policy is wrong; I ask, why should we go on indulging either in tirades against this Bloc or the other when we are helpless to do anything in the matter? There is a manner in which we can act and all that is possible is being done so far as our foreign

policy is concerned.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: After listening to a rather confused debate from the previous speakers I disagree with this contention that our Prime Minister's foreign policy has been a very successful one and India's prestige has been heightened by the pursuance of this policy. (An Hon. Member: Question). With all respect to the Prime Minister I will say that the policy has failed; if it had succeeded, would you have America here driving a wedge between India and Pakistan and the other Middle East countries who are protesting against the U.S.-Pakistan aid? It is not proper at the present time to be self-complacent about our foreign policy, particularly with regard to United States-Pakistan Military aid. I wish to state here that the United States of America is not an imperialism as many of our friends say here.

America certainly has a way of life of its own; I was acquainted with it; many years ago, for a long period of eleven years, I have lived there. As a matter of fact there was a time when I thought I would be a citizen of America and settle down there... (An Hon. Member: Hear, hear.) Consequently, I know about the way of life of which the Americans are so proud. If some party or some individuals try to subvert it and lead to an opposite way of life, then the Americans get awfully upset. They had done this after the First World War.—Red-hunting—they had done for some years. In those days it was the anarchists particularly that they were after. After the Second World War, it is the communists because the Communist party was found in the United States between the two wars. It is not for me to criticise what they do in their own country for their own interests; what we are concerned with is Asia. During the second World War, when America entered the war, it was President Roosevelt who said that their first line of defence was in Europe. They wanted to finish Hitlerism. Mussolinism and all that in Europe, so that these evils—this totalitarian rule—could never reach their country. At

the present time what they want is to make Asia their first line of defence. This is where I disagree. We do not want to be the cannon fodder in order to protect the United States or any other country. We want to protect our own country and we are able to protect ourselves. We do not need any help from outside. At the same time, when so much has been said about economic aid and technical assistance that this country has been taking, there have been some people in our country who have always been against getting any help from outside. I myself, as far as I remember, some three years ago, had stated that it is not right for us to take this aid from outside. But, we have gone very deep into it. On one side I must say that there are people in the United States who are not warmongers, who have a social conscience which prompts them to give any aid to under-developed countries. But, it is that Government that gives the aid to this Government, and that Government's intention—as I can see now—is that, after taking American aid for some years India might line up with the Atlantic Power Bloc. In future, I would say, it should be the policy of our Government to think twice before going in for these aids from outside.

In this connection I want to say one or two things. By depending on aids from outside, whatever it may be, financial or military, we are forgetting the wealth that we have in our own country—I mean the man-power. Many of my friends have spoken about man-power, how that can be utilised to the fullest extent and in which case it will not be necessary to go with a begging bowl to any other country outside India. Therefore, we do not want any American aid to come to our assistance to fight communism or world communism, whatever danger it may be. After we have refused to be the cannon fodder with a view to protect America, I must also say, that there is another kind of menace—I do not want to call it imperialism because I have already refused to call American aid as American imperialism—which jeopardises the liberty and freedom of the

people of India. This is a real menace, and no matter what my friends Mr. Venkataraman and Mr. Pataskar might say, you cannot ignore it. You cannot ignore how your criticism on certain action of the Anglo-American bloc and in certain cases your criticism of the people of other areas—for instance the Chinese aid to Viet Minn, that is only one example—affect the people outside, whose opinion we have to value. We do value their opinion. Because of their opinion we say India's prestige has gone up by several degrees; it is their opinion, whether of Soviet Russia, or America, or Britain. I do not see any way in which you can deny this.

But at the same time I have to say that there is another menace at our doors, and I also make bold to say that the present Government is patronising that.

Shri Pataskar: Menace at both doors: we are aware of it.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I want to mention within the little time at my disposal one instance. Will Government assure me that they are not running the Kashmir Government with communist help? Will Government tell me about Dr. Ashraf who used to be a British subject in India before Independence and then went over to Pakistan; as far as I know he has been disowned by Pakistan; he left Pakistan and lived in London for five years; he came here; he has gone to Kashmir on an Indian passport or visa which was originally granted for three months, but which must have been extended from time to time, because he must have been there now for about one year—will Government tell me if Dr. Ashraf and his wife are not advisers to the Education Department of Kashmir? Are they not attending meetings of the University Syndicate or Court, whatever authority of the University it may be? This is an instance where the Communists are being patronised. And yet we pass all kinds of laws to detain the Communists. At the time of the debate on the Preventive Detention Bill it was always said the Communists are the danger. Therefore, when I say

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

'menace' I do not criticise the Indian Communist Party. But, it certainly has connection with Soviet Russia. Last year or the year before, on one occasion I had said about the Annual Congress of the Soviet Party or the Cominform in Moscow where our friend the Communist Party Leader, Mr. Gopalan had gone. In that Congress Stalin had talked about liberating people all over the world—the liberation that has been done in China, in Czechoslovakia Roumania and also all Eastern European countries.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Travancore-Cochin.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Liberation of the Asian countries was referred to there and he said that the Russian Communist party would give all help to these movements in Asia. Our friend Shri A. K. Gopalan had said that they would abide by the decisions of the Congress and accept Mr. Stalin as their leader and give all assistance to the Russian Communist Party.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of order, may I ask the hon. Member who has referred to certain statements having been made by Shri A. K. Gopalan who is a Member of this House, where he has got his facts from, what are the sources, and if he is prepared to lay on the Table any documents where Shri A. K. Gopalan has said that he is prepared to abide by the decision of the Russian Communist Party, etc.?

Shri K. B. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—West): Shri A. K. Gopalan has himself an opportunity to contradict it.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: As far as I remember, when I had said it last time, I had a paper. I think it is the Crossroads when it was being published from Madras in which the report was there.

Shri Pataskar: May I ask a question? Supposing that is true, are we to start McCarthyism here in our country?

Shri S. S. More: Declare the Communist Party illegal.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I am not going into McCarthyism. I do not want to go into the internal affairs of the United States or any of the South American countries or of Soviet Russia. I am not concerned with that. Just like Shri Pataskar, I am concerned with India. Only he has misunderstood me. It is necessary that if we have to protect ourselves from inroads against our freedom by America, we have to protect ourselves against any inroads by any other country, by any other method that may be adopted in India. That is my point in saying that there is another menace that the Government should be careful about and keep watch as to how things are taking shape.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): What are those methods?

Shri S. S. More: Do not ask for details.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: At the same time, although it is not a matter of foreign policy, I come now to say a few words in reply to Shri Jaipal Singh's remarks yesterday. I was so much astounded when Shri Jaipal Singh said that he welcomed the U.S.-Pakistan Pact of alliance and aid. He was brave enough to say, why should we be afraid of this aid to Pakistan; we are prepared for any emergency.

I should like to remind him and remind the House that during the last World War, in 1942, the Governor of Hong-Kong, the Governor of the Straits Settlements in Singapore, and the Governor of Burma, had all said: "We are prepared for any emergency", and I must remind the House that that Governor of Hong-Kong after a few days was taken to Formosa and he became a shepherd tending sheep for the Japanese. So, we must not be complacent that we are prepared for any emergency. I must admit that a few men like the Prime Minister and, maybe, my friend Mr. Jaipal Singh,

are prepared for any emergency, but one Prime Minister or one Member of Parliament cannot protect this country. It is the people, the 360 million people, who have to be prepared, and in that connection I do not say that everybody must shoulder a gun and drill. It is not that, I am very glad that during the last couple of days a report has been published that the Defence Department is going to make it compulsory for certain grades of public servants to go into the Territorial Army. I believe that is a very good thing. The next step should be the Ministers and the Members of Parliament. And it does not end there. With as little expenditure as possible this should be done to bring the whole people into a life of discipline and activity and alertness which comes from military life. But situated as we are, with two or three cardboard cruisers, no submarine, to talk about arming ourselves and getting ready to fight Pakistan is all useless. Nothing will be gained from that, and as the Prime Minister said this morning, this is all useless labour. No result will come out of it, but result will come out from organising the people in discipline and in camp life where, if I may say so, a sort of strengthening of the soul will come, because, I believe that under the present circumstances, when one of the countries has exploded a hydrogen bomb, the death ashes of which have gone as far as hundreds of miles, we cannot arm ourselves to withstand this kind of attack, but we can steel ourselves without arms on our shoulders to die when necessary as men. And that is why this kind of discipline is very much necessary, and it should be taken up very seriously by the Government. Time is running out and it cannot be delayed any further.

I had once before said about the Territorial Army—how cheaply it can be done by having retired officers to be commanders of these units and in various other ways. But it should go to the interior villages and prepare the people to meet any emergency. Otherwise, we will have the sight that I saw in Kumbh Mela. When some

people were trampled over, lakhs of people stampeded to the City of Allahabad. If they had gone to the other side, they might have been better off, but they stampeded and the city was congested. I also wish to remind the Deputy Minister, who might give this to the Defence Minister, that during 1942 when the Japanese sank some ships in the Bay of Bengal off the Orissa coast, the people there were going from one town to the other, and the people from the other town were coming to the first town. The people got frightened and instead of staying in their homes, they started running about. This can be avoided by preparing the people to meet that sort of an emergency, if it ever comes.

Mr. Chairman: A point of order has been raised by the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party. I did not want to interrupt the speaker, but I think his point has already been met by the speaker himself.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I raised that point when the hon. Member referred to a journal, which I expect he would produce tomorrow. As far as I am concerned, I shall convey to Shri A. K. Gopalan what has been said about his reported statement in Moscow, and if Shri A. K. Gopalan has anything to say in the matter, I am sure, he will ask the permission of the Chair to make a statement on that point later on.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: On a point of order. The point of order ought to have been raised by the hon. Member standing in his seat.

An Hon. Member: He cannot raise it by whispering.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member raised the point of order, while Shri Sarangadhar Das was speaking, but I did not want to interrupt then.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Sardar A. S. Saigal was not present at that time.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I had spoken the same thing, about two years ago, and I shall look up the debates of that

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

time, but I cannot promise that I shall produce it exactly tomorrow.

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): I very rarely speak in this House, and therefore I would crave the indulgence of the House at this late hour, when there are only six or seven minutes left. I hope the Chair will allow me some time tomorrow also.

I have heard with rapt attention the speech delivered by the hon. Prime Minister, and I thought there was not much for anybody to dissociate himself from that speech. But having heard the Opposition in the House, I feel that there are two divergent views which have been expressed here, one the pro-American view—if I may so call it—and the other, the pro-Communist.

So far as the pro-American view is concerned, that feeling was expressed by Shri Frank Anthony very strongly. But our Prime Minister has already told us that we must be very careful in using our words on an external affairs debate like this, because otherwise an impression may be carried outside, which may not be very good to our country. Shri Frank Anthony gave us to understand that we are playing into the hands of communists and so on. All that, in my opinion, is a very wrong statement of the things that exist.

Coming to the subject on hand, that a critical situation has arisen in international affairs is beyond doubt. Very many factors have contributed to this critical situation, and the Military aid given by America to Pakistan contributes a major share. Apart from these things, the racial discrimination that is pursued in some parts of the world and also the economic disparity that exists between the different parts of the world are also major factors that contribute to this international crisis. Therefore, the kind of policy that is pursued by every nation, every country, becomes very important. So far as India is concerned, we have made it clear beyond doubt that we mean what we

say, unlike others. So far as the international situation is concerned, our policy of dynamic neutrality, on the whole is a successful one, I must say. Somebody may say it is neither neutral nor dynamic, but I am convinced that it is both dynamic and neutral. It is neutral in the sense that we want to follow an independent policy. That is why so many people are taking objection to our being neither on the one side nor on the other. We do not want to be on either of these two sides because these two blocs represent different kinds of societies altogether and it is a very dangerous thing to enter this bloc or the other bloc. The critical situation, the Korean situation, the South African question, all these show that we have to be very careful in shaping our policy. In this respect, the United Nations Assembly has to contribute a great deal to have peace in this world. If we examine the working of this big international organisation, we must say that although it is doing something, it finds itself helpless in many respects, because it has not been able to implement all the terms of the Charter, as it is not sufficiently representative. Therefore, we have been saying that important countries like China should also be included. Of course, some questions are raised in the Assembly and some resolutions are passed in various Committees, but how far it has been able to implement all those things is very doubtful. Therefore, if this United Nations Organisation really wants to establish peace in the world, it must take greater interest and decide these important questions.

With regard to the foreign pockets, much has already been said. We have to be very careful. The policy we have been pursuing is a very correct one, because there is an impression that India wants to 'knock off' these foreign pockets. That impression must go. Whether there is a desire among the people of those parts to merge with India is the most important question. And, therefore, if our Government has not taken a lead in

this respect, it is to give the world the real, correct impression that, after all, the desire of the people of those parts is the thing to be considered. Now it is beyond doubt that the will of the people has been expressed very correctly and boldly. We have seen what developments have taken place in Pondicherry; we have also seen what things have happened in Goa. Important leaders have been deported from Goa and many people have been arrested in Pondicherry. Why? Because they have expressed a desire to merge with India. The Prime Minister has already told us that some of the Ministers have also given expression to this view and that the Municipal Councillors everywhere have told the French Government that they want to be with India. Hence, the stand we have taken in this respect is correct and is going to bear fruit within a very short time. (*Interruption.*)

7 P.M.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): Let him continue tomorrow.

Shri Basappa: I do not want to say much on that. But the main question is about the relations between India and Pakistan. Of course, I know I am traversing.....

Mr. Chairman: How long will the hon. Member take?

Shri Basappa: I will take another six or seven minutes—ten minutes at the most. Tomorrow I may be given that time.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow. The House now stands adjourned till 2 P.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Wednesday, the 24th March, 1954.