

[Shri A. C. Guha]

may not be that the Board will vest only the function of deciding on loans on that Committee. The main intention of the enquiry committee's recommendation was that the Executive Committee or any other Committee of the Board should not be the final authority in deciding the fate of the applications as regards loans and other things. The committee observed that the Board as such should be in charge of deciding applications for loans. The Government have decided to change the name and functions of the Executive Committee. We have adopted the nomenclature Central Committee, instead of Executive Committee. This Bill provides that that the name of this Committee should be Central Committee, and that it will exercise such power as the Board may think proper and vest in that committee. It will be open to the Board to give any power to any of its committees or sub-committees. This Bill does not put any specific limitation on that. It will be left to the Board to determine what power this committee will exercise. Already there is provision in the Act for some other committees, local committees, committees for different categories of industries, to make recommendations on loan applications, to make proper enquiries about loan applications, etc. In addition to these other committees for different regions or different categories of industries, this Central Committee will be the main committee of the Board of Directors and it will exercise such power as the Board may vest in it.

We are taking this opportunity to make certain other amendments which we find necessary. As defined in the present Act, no concern would be eligible for any loan unless it has been in production for some time. It has been found difficult for some new concerns to find money to finance their working. There have been a number of applications from such concerns as have not started working or produced anything; We feel that it would be necessary for them to get some financial help from the Corporation.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri A. C. Guha: Am I to continue?

Mr. Speaker: I think, if the point is convenient, he may stop, so that....

Shri A. C. Guha: It is more or less at one stage. I have just taken up a new point.

Mr. Speaker: Then he may stop.

#### SITUATION IN GOA

Mr. Speaker: Now, we take up the discussion on the Goa situation. Dr. Lanka Sundaram.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): This morning when the Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair, the question was raised as to how long this discussion should be continued, and he had assured us that this matter would be taken up just now.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I think this matter was considered yesterday, though there were no speeches or discussions on the part of Members, and I had stated that the discussion would end by 5 P.M., starting from 2.30 P.M. A voice—perhaps Shri Deshpande—wanted five hours and then I said that it would not be possible to have it for five hours, but 2½ hours would be the probable time, and if necessary we might go further by half an hour. That was the situation, and I believe it was accepted by the House. Nobody raised any point or voice or no further suggestion came in. It is under that impression that we are working now. I think the matter should be treated as closed. We cannot go on revising our decisions and extending times every now and then.

I have seen the proceedings this morning and I understand the matter was again taken up in the Business Advisory Committee. I really do not know how the matter could be taken up in the Business Advisory Committee when the decision was already there and, as I feel it, it was acceptable to the House. Perhaps some Members may have the impression or may want to make suggestions for

further extension, but that is a different matter. I further understand that the hon. Prime Minister also has important engagements fixed on the assumption that the business would be over at 5.30 P.M. and is therefore thinking of replying at 5 P.M. All these considerations have to be taken into account and then we have to proceed further. I am, however, entirely in the hands of the House. I would like to know whether my statement about the engagement of the Prime Minister is a correct one. This is what I have understood.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** It is so, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then, of course, we stick to the original decision, and looking to the time at our disposal if there is a desire on the part of a large number of Members to speak, I think, from the beginning, I should fix up a time-limit of 15 minutes for each Member. That will be the best course.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I beg to move:

"That the situation in regard to Goa be taken into consideration."

I do not propose to say anything more at this stage. Yesterday I had occasion to make a statement on behalf of Government before the House and I should like to hear hon. Members in this House speak so that we may have the advantage of hearing their views and their suggestions. After that, I shall venture to say something.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Vishakhapatnam):** Yesterday the Prime Minister gave this House a very important statement on Goa. I have no doubt that this statement is of profound national and international significance. The most important announcement in that statement was with reference to the impending closure of the Portuguese Legation in New Delhi. This decision should have taken place nearly two years ago when we withdrew our Minister from Lisbon. In fact, our Government and this country have

exercised the greatest amount of patience in dealing with Portugal, to the extent that even though we found it was of no use to us to keep our Minister in Lisbon, we have allowed the Portuguese Legation to continue till now. But it is clear now, with the statement of the Prime Minister, that this patience is completely exhausted. I am sure everybody in the world will take notice that there is no longer any possibility for Portugal to deal with India in the manner in which she has sought to deal with us all along.

I would only make a reference to one important point in the statement of the Prime Minister yesterday. That is, I am very glad to note that for the first time in our, shall we say, constitutional, legal or diplomatic documents, the word "enclave" was used by the Prime Minister with reference to Portuguese territories here. I am glad he was able to strike upon this particular expression which only shows irrevocably that these enclaves belong to India and that Portugal has no business to be in them. They are no longer the overseas territories or the overseas provinces of Portugal. They are no longer the possessions or settlements of a foreign power in this country, which they used to be before. In other words, the unity of Goa and India has been completely formed by this use of the word "enclave". I am sure the Prime Minister has chosen the word deliberately and, I hope, irrevocably.

I am happy to state—and I am sure each one of my colleagues in this hon. House has noticed it—that this debate has come forward with the greatest amount of goodwill and understanding and co-operation between all sections of the House. Gone are the days when situations like those we are faced with in Goa used to produce acrimonious discussions, adjournment motions and so on and so forth. Nothing of that kind has occurred and this debate is now taking place, and I repeat again, on the basis of prior understanding between all sections of the House that it should proceed with

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

dignity. In fact, we in this House today are going to dedicate ourselves to the cause of Goa irrespective of party or politics, and there is no division as far as opinion goes, as far as major policies are concerned, between the Government benches and the rest of the House. (Interruption) I am sure my hon. friend Sir H. V. Kamath will certainly make his contribution presently, and I hope he will allow me now to proceed. There is no doubt about this that we in this country are now fully dedicated to the cause, the task, the supreme task, of liberating Goa and merging it with our own national territory. And this is notice enough to the world, if notice were needed, that there is no question of any outside agency or power attempting to divide Indian ranks as far as the Goa question is concerned.

I am sure that each one of my colleagues who participates in this debate will proceed with moderation and in a constructive spirit, because I am sure there are difficulties in individual positions. I am not unaware of it. I am sure my hon. friend, Shri Kamath, will bear me out that all the effort we have made in this country during the past two months with our all-parties national convention at Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi have been carried on in the belief that despite the existence of, shall we say, differences in position, the broad objective is clear. The broad desire on the part of every single party to co-operate with each other and to come together on the same platform has been completely fulfilled. I am sure this will be another earnest or indication of the manner in which the country would like to deal with the Goa question.

I know something of this Goa business, with the result that I am prepared to make two very general propositions which I am sure this House would like to examine and accept, possibly. There is no question of any departure in the near future from the peaceful character of this Goa satyagraha movement. There is a number

of misunderstandings on this issue, and I am glad to be able to say that the present pattern of the satyagraha movement will continue. Only, as the tempo is rising now,—as it has risen during the past two weeks in particular—there will be more people going in, but the pattern will not be departed from, and I am sure that once this is understood, there will not be any difficulty between the various political parties represented here to come together on a general platform of approach to Goa. The freedom movement inside Goa is developing. I am glad the Prime Minister, for the first time, if I am not mistaken, has emphasised this aspect of the question. 2,500 Goans have gone under the jack-boots of the Portuguese, or shall I say, the Fascist authorities in Goa, Diu and Daman. And what is 2,500 to 6,38,000 people? It is a proportion which is, I think, very honourably comparable to the jail-going we had been able to demonstrate for 36 crores of people when the British were ruling over us. In fact, I am here to say, and I am glad I have this opportunity of saying it, the internal movement inside Goa is strong, is growing, and it is time that this aspect of the question is completely recognised both in India and abroad.

The result of that position is this. There is a movement of Goans' resistance inside Goa. Recently Indian satyagrahis have been entering Goa. Goans in India are also entering Goa, with the result that the confluence of this triune movement of internal resistance, of the marching of Goans in India into Goa, and the marching of Indian nationals into Goa, is of tremendous importance; and I would emphasise only one point here, namely that as regards Goa, there is no difference between Goa and India or Goan and Indian. I am sure, once this point is established—as the Prime Minister was very clearly establishing yesterday through his staff—all the propaganda that Dr. Salazar is making that this is something like an invasion from India into Goa will be completely demolished.

I am glad to note that the great Congress Party in the resolution which it passed last Friday has been able to take up a position which is a tremendous advance on the position so far available to this country. For the first time, the Working Committee of the Congress has committed the Goans, the Indians and the Government of India to this liberation struggle. I consider this is a position of paramount significance to our country. Secondly, it has enabled Congressmen to go into Goa in their individual capacity. Not being a Congressman, I do not know the mechanism of approach to this question. But from what I know, and I think I know fairly a good amount of information about this particular aspect, the time has come when Congressmen will march into Goa. And I am glad to say...

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna):  
Hear, hear.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I am glad to say my hon. friend Shri V. G. Deshpande has gone through the baptism of the fire, of being mauled in in Goa. One of our hon. colleagues Shri T. K. Chaudhuri is inside Goa today in Portuguese jails. Some of us from this House have already announced our intention to go into Goa. And I am glad to say—but I will not be in a position to reveal names today—some Congressmen, very senior Congressmen, have offered to go with us into Goa, with the result that the satyagraha movement which has so far been going on will have an all-parties character, and the principle of non-violence and the satyagrahis going to Goa completely unarmed will be maintained.

I would like to make a few points with respect to the satyagrahis. There is now an all-party Goan Vimochan Committee, which has come into existence with that veteran Congressman Shri K. M. Jhade as chairman, and which is doing everything that is possible for not only placing the satyagraha movement properly, i.e. sending

out satyagrahis into Goa, but more so for receiving those returned satyagrahis who are beaten up and thrown back into our territory and looking after their comforts and medical treatment. I consider I must raise my voice in this forum and say that now that the satyagraha question has been completely regularised, so to speak, on a national basis, greater effort must be forthcoming in this country to ensure that the comforts and medical treatment of satyagrahis who are going to enter into Goa in larger numbers in the near future will become possible; and I hope that something will be done in this matter. I am not suggesting official agency for obvious reasons, but there are so many non-official agencies which can be harnessed to discharge this task.

Here, I would like to address two or three points to the Prime Minister. Apart from the steps taken so far, I am here to suggest very seriously that the time has come for the stoppage of trade relations with Portuguese enclaves in India, and between Portugal and India, and it should not be delayed. You would recall, Mr. Speaker, that even when the British were ruling over us in undivided India, for the sake of our national prestige and our honour, we had severed trade relations with South Africa, and I may say as a broad estimate Rs. 125 lakhs worth of favourable balance of trade had been thrown into the Arabian sea, all for the sake of maintaining our national honour. I need not quote that as a precedent, for we do not require any precedent as regards Goa. I would only suggest that trade relations must be stopped forthwith. And this is a matter for consideration by Government.

The second point which I would like to make is this. On all accounts, Portugal is now digging in in Goa, Diu and Daman. There is considerable amount of gun-running, international gun-running, into Goa. Our security services naturally keep an eye on these things. But we have no adequate possibility or adequate opportunity

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

of knowing the extent of war preparations, the amount of material, conventional and other weapons and stores, material etc. which are imported into Goa, Diu and Daman, which have access to the sea, as you know well. The result is that the time has come when our navy must be able to patrol these areas and find out what is happening. The question of a naval blockade or something like a naval blockade etc. are matters for decision by Government at the highest level. Our defence services, our Chiefs of Staff, will certainly say what they have to say. But at the moment I am not going into that question in detail. I would only make one point in this connection, and that is this. Our navy is going for manoeuvres all over the world. The right of the sea is available to us. Since we do not know what is happening, let our navy move about outside the territorial waters, three miles and a few yards away, so to speak, and let us know exactly what is happening. We know, and we have information, that some of our neighbour countries are actively giving assistance in provisioning Goa not only with food supplies but also with materials of war and weapons. This is a matter which has got to be examined carefully, and I am sure the Prime Minister would look into it.

I would make an appeal to the Prime Minister to keep in touch with the International Red Cross, an organisation to which this country belongs, to find out what is happening to our prisoners in Goa. This is a matter which, on humanitarian grounds, on grounds which are accepted by all civilized nations—I am sure Portugal also is a member of the Red Cross Society, as far as my knowledge goes—has got to be tackled immediately.

Finally, I would like to know whether the Prime Minister is in a position to secure for our prisoners inside Goa treatment as prisoners of war. The House would recall that during the second world war in particular, when commandoes were poured into enemy territory, when commandoes carried

lethal weapons on their bodies both for offence and for defence purposes, they were also treated as prisoners of war, whereas we from this country, sending our satyagrahis unarmed completely, were unable to get treatment as prisoners of war. This is a matter for discussion at the diplomatic level. I am sure the Prime Minister would look into this question too.

The recent visit of the Prime Minister to His Holiness the Pope has clarified once and for all the question relating to religion in Goa. Now I would like to know, if possible, from the Prime Minister what has happened to his talks with the British Prime Minister and others, belonging to the NATO group of Powers, whether their good offices have been sought towards the solution of this Goa question on a peaceful basis, what exactly is the attitude of the NATO Powers which are supposed to be friendly to this country, whether they still cling on to that clause 14, I believe, of the NATO agreement and things of that sort, and whether our diplomatic offensive—I am using the word rather generically—has yielded results, and whether we can look to some sort of intervention from these friendly Powers towards securing the liberation of Goa and its integration with India.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan** (Cannanore): Yesterday we heard the Prime Minister's statement on Goa. The unanimous feeling of the people of this country, belonging to all parties and persuasions, that Goa is a part of India and that it is the duty and the right of the people of Goa, the people of India and the Government of India to strive for the liberation of Goa, was very well expressed in that statement.

The issue of Goa today is a national issue. No Indian can remain quiet till Goa is liberated. That is the reason why there had been so much of national unanimity on this question. A very strong movement comprising all thoughts and creeds has grown up in this country for the last one year,

and it is becoming stronger and stronger every day. Names of hundreds of men and women who are ready to fight, to take part in the liberation movement, are coming every day.

In spite of the terrible repression in Goa, these names are coming every day; it is a national pride and it also shows our glorious tradition. The Government have gone to the last limits of their patience. For over a year now, Parliament and this country have heard with rising indignation of the repression in Goa and the treatment that has been meted out towards the satyagrahis by the Portuguese Administration. In spite of the request and the declaration of the Government, the Portuguese Government did not even try to negotiate, and banged the door of negotiation. Under these circumstances, we fully endorse the Government of India's conclusion that the existence of the Portuguese Legation in New Delhi serves no purpose, and we welcome the Prime Minister's announcement that the Portuguese Government has been asked to close it by 8th August. This is a serious warning to Portugal; it also shows that the Government of India's patience has reached its limit and they are now preparing to see what further action can be taken. The people of Goa and India are watching to see what is the next step that the Government of India would be taking in this matter.

One does not understand why Portuguese imperialism is behaving so insolently. We cannot understand why it is incapable of studying the course of history and understanding the drastic changes that have been taking place in this country for the last so many years. It might have forgotten the history of our country when we fought against the British and the French lately. Does the Portuguese Government think that we who have fought against the British and the French have become so weak today that it is impossible for us to liberate Goa? It is only a very very small area compared with the other part of India. The recent Bandung Confer-

ence is the best example of the determination of the Asian people to see that colonialism will not be tolerated. Even today those powers who have colonies under them, and who are even fighting against those who are fighting for freedom in those places, even they will not openly say today that they are supporting colonialism. The world has changed, people have changed and the outlook has changed, but the Portuguese Government has not changed at all and it is even today blind and deaf to the realities of the situation and to the changes that are happening and that have happened all over the world.

I do not want to explain what is happening in Goa because everyone of us knows that. It shocks all civilised nations in this world. There are barbarous attacks on satyagrahis. When they fall down, soldiers with nails on their shoes jump on them; they shave their eye-brows and also their heads. This is the treatment that is meted out to satyagrahis. One would be surprised to see that in 1955 such things are happening and such is the treatment meted out to satyagrahis. Not only that. They say that it is the Indians and the satyagrahis who are violent. It is the Portuguese Government that is responsible for everything that is happening in Goa today and if it continues to treat the satyagrahis like this, if it continues to behave like this, certainly many more things will happen and it will be the Portuguese Government who will be responsible for all that and it will be blamed by the whole civilised world.

While paying a tribute to the freedom fighters and those who are inside jail—an hon. Member of this House also is inside jail—we wholeheartedly and sincerely support all actions now taken by the Government which strengthen the Goa liberation movement. At the same time, we appeal to the Government not to tie the hands of those who fight for freedom. Nothing should be done, directly or indirectly, which would discourage the liberation movement and demoralise the people, who are coming in thousands to take part in this struggle

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

and even to sacrifice their lives for this cause. Whatever may be the intentions of the Government, we regret to say that the restriction on mass satyagraha is a denial of the right of the people of this country to take part in the struggle for freedom, and such restriction on mass satyagraha will certainly weaken our movement, and only strengthen our enemies. We request the Government to march forward taking stronger and more effective measures, including economic sanctions. We also feel that if a situation arises, and if the people of this country desire that it is necessary, the Government will even have to resort to police action in order to vindicate the honour of our country. I am sure the people of Goa, the people of India and all civilised nations in the world will rally behind this Government so that Goa may be liberated and that part of the country merged with India. The will and determination and the united action of the people of Goa and India, as well as of the Government of India, will certainly grow stronger, and it will be a mighty, irresistible force which will liberate Goa in the immediate future.

**Acharya Kripalani** (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Yesterday the Prime Minister in his statement on Goa gave a very clear and lucid exposition of what is happening there and what is likely to happen. This is good so far as it goes, but I am sorry the Prime Minister gave us no indication of what the Government propose to do to solve this problem or what the Government want the people to do. I am not here to advise the Government; I can only analyse the situation.

It has often been said that the question of the independence of Goa or the Goan struggle is primarily the concern of the people of Goa. This may be true if the Goans wanted their independence apart from India as an isolated piece of territory. But what the Goans want is integration with India. Therefore, I submit that the Goan struggle is only the last stage in the national struggle for

independence. We fought for the freedom of the whole of India and not any part thereof, and we cannot allow any part of our territory to remain under foreign yoke, under colonial rule and think that we have attained complete freedom.

It is a fact which nobody can deny that geographically Goa is in India and our interests—political, social and economic—are identical; even our cultural interests are identical. How then can this portion of territory be allowed to remain outside India? Moreover, the Goans themselves find opportunities for their fulfilment and advance more in India than in Goa. Talking about the Catholic Church, there is no high dignity in the Church in Goa who is a Goan, but in India, 25 per cent. of the bishops of the Catholic Church are Goans, and recently we had the only Indian Cardinal of the Catholic Church, and he is a Goanese. Goanese occupy high positions in the administration of India and also in the economic and industrial life of the country.

3 P.M.

The whole economy of Goa depends on the remittances that are sent from time to time from India. Therefore, the question should not arise whether we are as much interested in the freedom of Goa as the Goanese themselves. I think occasionally the Government themselves have admitted that the independence of Goa is a problem not concerning the Goanese alone but also the people of India and the Government of India as representative of the people of India. This identity of interest was very powerfully expressed by the Prime Minister a few days back in a Press conference; in great indignation and almost in disgust he said that "there is nothing more scandalous on God's earth today than the Portuguese occupation of Goa. They cannot and will not hold on to Goa; let the whole world take notice; let the Atlantic Powers take notice that we will not tolerate any nonsense about Goa from whatever quarter it comes." This shows that Goa and

India are one and also shows the determination of the Government of India to bring about this oneness in the political field.

What then is the hitch? I am afraid the hitch is the one that has existed throughout the centuries in the minds of the sensitive, in the minds of high-minded kings, rulers and politicians. It is this—whether even in the interest of justice, in the interest of the rights of the people, violence can be used and war can be made an instrument of state policy. This is the same dilemma which is presented to us in the *Gita* when Arjuna was faced with the problem of killing his kith and kin and his revered gurus. This is also the problem that has been dramatised by Shakespeare in *Hamlet*—‘to be or not to be’ was not the question. There was a previous question. The question of to be or not to be was a question that arose after. The first question before Hamlet was whether, in the cause of justice, in the cause of the rights of the people, in the cause of his own rights, he was to kill his step-father; that was the question. From that arose the second question because he was confused and could not solve the first question properly. From that arose the question of being or not-being. The primary question was, and will remain, I am afraid, as long as the world lasts, whether we can use violent means and war, with all its terrible consequences, for righting wrongs.

We know the solution that was offered by the *Gita*. It says that we cannot but carry on the work of the world; the organisation of the people must continue and a person placed in a high position has got to do his painful duty, but his attitude of mind towards the performance of his duty, has to change. That attitude has to be one of unattachment; that attitude has to be that whatever happens he has to remain calm, neither elated by success nor depressed by failure. This is the solution of the *Gita* and I suppose no better solution can be offered.

In India are we as a nation pledged to non-violence? Is the Indian Gov-

ernment as government pledged to non-violence? So far as I know, the Indian Government maintains an army and it wants it to be more and more efficient. Not only that. It encourages the citizens to learn the art of war for any emergency. Further when occasion has arisen, we have used our armed forces as we did in Kashmir and in Hyderabad. We also participated in the U.N.O. discussion about North Korea and South Korea, and we had no hesitation to declare that North Korea was the aggressor, knowing full well that that would lead to war and that war might develop into a world war. Therefore, we cannot say that we as a nation are pledged to non-violence.

But often our Prime Minister has told us that war solves no problem. He is a student of history and he has written a book on world history, a comprehensive book. I do not know how it can be said that war has solved no problems. War has solved many problems in the world. The unification of nations was due to civil and external wars. Independence movements throughout the world had to use weapons of war and violence. Except for the Indian struggle, all the previous struggles for independence have been violent. (*Interruption*). To say that war is no solution to any problem, I am afraid, is a half-truth. It is just like a proverb. It is true that war as it is fought today with atomic weapons, total war and global war are no solution to any problem. But to say that there are no distinctions between war and war is to say that there are no distinctions between what we eat and what we refrain from eating—the vegetarian knows that vegetables have life, but he does not make logical divisions but makes practical divisions; he takes vegetables and does not take meat. The meat-eater does not go to his logical conclusion but makes practical divisions. He takes meat of animals and not of men. The world has to make practical distinctions between war and war. What kind of war are we thinking of here? We are thinking of a little pocket, Portuguese pocket, of Goa. Are we

[Acharya Kripalani]

thinking of a global war? Are we talking of a war to be carried on with atom bombs or hydrogen bombs? We are talking of a war that will be in its limited scope, that will be fought with orthodox weapons; and we know, there is no possibility of its extension. Even if there was a possibility of its extending beyond its scope.....

**Mr. Speaker:** He has got two minutes' time left.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I cannot finish within two minutes. I rarely speak in the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** He can just give his suggestions for the solution of the problem.

**Acharya Kripalani:** The Prime Minister must be given credit that he has seen to it that this war will not spread and that the Portuguese are isolated. He met the Pope and he got from him the declaration that religion had nothing to do with the question of Goa. Russia and China have already declared in favour of our rights in Goa. Then, the United States Congress has declared that in future their policy will be for the liberation of the colonial people. France has already declared herself in our favour by renouncing in India its possessions. The only big power that has said nothing as yet is our friend, the English. And we are in the Commonwealth. But I am sure that the English will not disturb themselves so far as Goa is concerned.

Let us leave aside this question of war. The problem that rose in the minds of sensitive rulers, kings and politicians in past centuries exists no more today. It was solved by Gandhiji in such a way that this question need not arise at all in any sensitive mind. He gave us a substitute for war. He gave us the technique of satyagraha. If we use this technique of satyagraha, if we use this technique of non-violent resistance, the question of the evil consequences of war need not arise in any sensitive soul. We have a method for righting wrongs. Last year the people wanted to use the weapon of mass satyagraha. The peo-

ple of India did not want individual satyagraha. When all preparations were ready, the Government at the last moment prohibited mass satyagraha. Therefore, the present symbolic satyagraha was organised and has been going on. But I say this symbolic satyagraha must go further if it has to prosper and if it is not to fritter away, as every such symbolic satyagraha fades away. I suppose the Government wants, even for diplomatic purposes, the satyagraha movement in Goa to continue and not altogether to stop. If they do not want it to stop they have no choice but to allow the people to expand the movement. Not only should they not stop the people from going but they themselves should be the leaders of the satyagraha, if they want to eschew war. I say, either you have a limited war with orthodox weapons—it will be just as in Hyderabad—or you have satyagraha. There is no third way that I can see. But I tell you that even a limited war would be as near satyagraha as possible, because, I remember Gandhiji saying that the fight of Poland against Hitler and the fight of the Chinese against the Japanese, were the nearest approach to satyagraha. I know today it is possible to quote Vinobha against Gandhiji as it is possible to quote Gandhiji against Vinobha as was recently done by the Governor of Bombay. But the words of the Master are quite clear. He considered legitimate violent resistance as near to satyagraha as possible.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member will realise that there are a large number of people anxious to speak. He had already exhausted his time and I have allowed him four more minutes.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Government themselves said that Gandhiji had sanctioned the use of force for driving away the marauders from Kashmir. Dr. Salazar and those who are acting under his instructions are no better because of the atrocities they had committed and they are likely to commit. The Goa problem must be solved and its solution brooks no delay.

Government have to make their choice and mobilise public opinion. It is not fit for a mighty Government to shirk its responsibility. If it does the result will not be peace, but rather greater violence. It may be that the Goan movement will go underground and conspiratorial violence is worse than war because it is unregulated.

The Prime Minister thinks that it is not consistent with our dignity that a mighty kingdom like India should crush a fly like Portugal. But this fly is a very poisonous fly; it attacks innocent people. I shall give here what they have done in this one year. They have imprisoned 2,500 people and 110 people have been awarded punishments of 900 years' imprisonment—the maximum punishment being 38 years. There is no end to lathi charges and there is no end of beating of our people; even women have been molested. Therefore, I say that the Government has to make up its mind and whatever it does whether it is a limited war or whether it is a police action, whether it is satyagraha—I can assure them that the country will be with them. The country cannot be with them if no action at all is taken and they rely merely upon diplomacy.

**Shri Gadgil (Poona Central):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to note that there is perfect unanimity in the objective so far as the Goa question is concerned, and I am hoping that there will be some understanding in the methods by which this problem has to be solved. Acharya Kripalani referred to violence and non-violence. I shall deal with that later on not from any theoretical or dogmatic point of view because he is in a way wedded to the dogma of non-violence and I am not. But I shall give my reasons in a very practical manner why I consider resort to violence at this stage or at least for a pretty long time to come impractical. Meanwhile, I would like to let the world know this. Dr. Salazar in November said that Goa was not a matter of reasonable aspiration or an imperial necessity for India but of personal ambitions or party whims in which the Prime

Minister let himself be involved. One who had listened to the discussion just now will be convinced that it is not for any party purpose or for the advancement of any political party that Government has taken the attitude it has taken. In fact the movement for liberation of Goa is itself a step in the process of evolution of history and if anything was done in 1946 it was in anticipation of that evolution. Today the process of evolution, of completely freeing this great land, will continue and the struggle that had been started in Goa will not stop till it is crowned with success. As to that, I have not the slightest doubt.

Now the attitude taken by the Portuguese Government is very difficult to understand. But there is some logic in it none the less. In November 1954, Dr. Salazar said that either they must transfer sovereignty or the situation in the Portuguese territory in Goa must be such that the unanimous, strong and unbreakable will on the part of the people of Goa should make it impossible for the Government to be carried on there. That situation is growing fast and it is wrong to say that this movement is being sponsored for any political reason or for party purposes. It is spontaneous as has been made clear by the resolution of the working committee it is the duty of every Indian to support its cause of freedom because Goa is part and parcel of this country whether it is from the point of history, geography, culture, this, that and the other.

Now, the question is: how is this problem to be solved? There is no need to convince this House or any Indian that Goa is part of India. Dr. Salazar has said, there cannot be any negotiation if India wants to discuss the question of transfer of sovereignty. I should like the Government to make it clear when the stage for negotiation comes that the question of sovereignty is not a question to be argued; it must be assumed. The point for negotiation is, in what way, in what stages and with what safeguards sovereignty is to be transferred. In this con-

[Shri Gadgil.]

nexion I remember what late Shri Motilal Nehru said when he was told by many people that he should go before the Parliament and plead the cause of Indian freedom. He said, "Indian freedom is not a matter to be argued. It is a matter that must be assumed to be true; assumed to be valid and the only question that is open for argument is in what way and in what manner it is to be transferred." Therefore, when the stage comes for negotiation—it is bound to come—at that stage the point must be made clear that there cannot be any argument about sovereignty. The sovereignty of Goa belongs to the people of Goa who are part and parcel of the Indian people.

As regards how the Government of India will act in those circumstances, evidence has already been given when French territory in India was transferred. Whatever legitimate rights as regards culture, language and religion have been guaranteed there—and I have not the slightest doubt because the Prime Minister has made that abundantly clear—will be guaranteed here. Now, so long negotiations do not start the struggle that has been started must continue and I am of the view that it would be wrong at this stage by any scale or manner of that struggle to give an opportunity for the possibility of that satyagraha being changed into something which is not peaceful. Therefore, we must move with caution. Truth is on our side. The whole course of history is on our side. And, what is far more important is that what is happening in the world today is also on our side. Acharya Kripalani said that no problem was solved by war. I am sorry, what he said was: that no problem was solved by war was the statement by the Prime Minister with which he disagreed and I am surprised because he is a great authority on Gandhism. If there is anything which distinguishes Gandhiji's contribution to world philosophy it is this: that all problems can be solved peacefully. Today the world opinion has taken a revolu-

tionary turn. Up till last week everybody thought that there was nothing like an alternative except a decision on the battle field. I do not go to the length of saying that those people who have been doing all sorts of violent things and indulging in war have suddenly become saints. No. But, a consciousness is gradually growing in them that there is a better alternative which will give far more enduring results. And, when at this moment this psychological change is taking place, will it be wisdom, will it be even good from the point of view, not of principle but of expediency, that we should go in recklessly for something which is not a peaceful method? Therefore, I suggest that we should continue in the non-violent manner in which the satyagraha is being conducted and I am glad some of the Members have spoken very appreciatively about what individual Congressmen have been doing. I am also glad that some of them have for the first time in their parliamentary life in this period spoken something appreciative about the Government.

Shri S. S. More: That is Geneva atmosphere.

Shri Gadgil: What I want to say is that you watch the actions of the Government and suspend your judgment for some time. The Vidur Niti has defined a pandit as follows:

"यस्य कृत्यं न जानाति मनश्च न मीचनं परं ।  
कृतमंवाप्त्यं जानाति स वै पांडित उच्यते ॥"

"whose future actions, advice or consultation is never published, but who is known to the public by the act he does."

And, when this Government is headed by a 'Pandit' we should naturally expect that—leave aside the words and statements, take the deeds—something good will be done. In the course of the last few days what the Government has done with respect to the transport and with respect to the closing down of the Legation, do constitute something of a new trend;

something of a review of the policy which has been followed so far.

But, the main point I want to urge, Mr. Speaker, is: let us not be provoked into wrong action or a wrong step. If that is done we will put ourselves in the wrong box not only in connection with the small problem of Goa, but with respect to the great and high work we have been doing in the international field. Not, that I claim that India is the author of the entire policy, but the contribution of this country through our great Prime Minister is not small. Therefore, let us see that what we do is consistent with what we preach and practise and consistent with the trend and tone of the public opinion as has recently expressed itself. Let our enthusiasm not exceed our judgement and our actions, our principles. And, when for a long time we do not succeed, do not believe that success is not available. One fine morning it is not impossible that we will read the news that Goa is even juridically and legally part of this country. Till that let us do whatever we want to do calmly with a perfect understanding and with the unanimity that has been shown today. If that continues that itself is a guarantee of our ultimate success.

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** Where is the unanimity?

**Shri Gadgil:** In the end I want to say this that there are other powers as appears from the press reports who are trying to take undue advantage of the situation. Let me not warn them, but let me tell them that they will be acting very short-sightedly and in a very unstatesman-like manner if for a little temporary advantage they lose what is far more important from their own point of view and from the point of view of the world. Let us mobilise the world opinion and if at all after quite a long time—I do not want to specify years, months or weeks—we come to the conclusion—I mean the people of India come to the conclusion—that there is the necessity to depart from our policy of peaceful approach,

negotiation, this, that and the other, and if any such step is taken then the whole world opinion must say: "What else India could do because Portugal was so stupid, so blind and so out of tune with the world opinion?" Till that position comes and that position is nothing new to Indian philosophy, we should wait. We have it exemplified in Mahabharata. The Kauravas refused to give Pandavas even so much as a grain and in the end what happened, everybody knows. Therefore, if we believe in our national motto सत्यमेव जयते then I have not the slightest doubt that victory is certain and is assured by the unanimous support that has been given by the Members of this Parliament.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Sir, on a point of explanation. I did not want to interrupt the speaker at the time he was speaking. I never said that violent action should be undertaken. I only said that there are two courses of action—either violent action or satyagraha—and if satyagraha is to prevail the Government itself should lead the movement.

**Shri Kottukappally (Meenachil):** Sir, the Portuguese possessions in India should merge with the Indian Republic in the interests of the people of Goa, Christians and Hindus. The Goans will thereby get a fresher, freer and fuller life and wider scope for association with the Indian people. They will have opened up before them larger opportunities of Government service and employment in Indian industries and trades.

With Goa's broken coast-line and inlets and facilities of communication, Goa can certainly develop in shipping and commerce much more under the Government of India. Goa has rich resources of iron and manganese ore. It can grow as a centre of steel industry. There are also there wider possibilities of developing the fishing industry. In the matter of agriculture, Goa has remained backward and has been a deficit area so far as food is concerned. The people of Goa and the other two Portuguese possessions depend for

[Shri Kottukappally.]

their foodstuffs and their finance mostly on India. With the help of the Indian Government agriculture can expand in these territories and the people at large become more prosperous. There are already large numbers of Goans in the Government of India service and in business in Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi and Madras. Estrangement of relations between the Government of India and the Portuguese Government will be disadvantageous to the people in the Portuguese possessions. It would profit little the people of these areas to be united with a country 5,000 miles away.

Even during the reign of the British, Goa was not considered as a foreign territory. The identity of the people of Goa with the citizens of India was fully recognised even at that time and the people of Goa enjoyed the same privileges in India as Indian citizens themselves. In a way, the people of Goa enjoyed greater advantages in India than even the citizens of the Indian States. Indian nationals of Goan origin were eligible to apply for all Government posts including posts in the Defence Department. That position continues even today. We have in our services, particularly in the Defence Services, Indians of Goan origin in large numbers, some in key positions. There has never been a suggestion in any quarter Indian, British or Portuguese, that they are aliens. Goa is part of India geographically, historically and racially and the people of Goa are as much Indians as any in other parts of India. Any argument that people in Goa are European Portuguese nationals is ridiculous, absurd and unbelievable on the face of it.

We repudiate Dr. Salazar's stand that Portuguese armies and armaments are required to sustain Christianity in Goa or India. Christianity was preached, spread and flourished in this land 1,500 years before the Portuguese people heard of us. The fact that Christianity existed in this land for 1,900 years is the guarantee that for another 1,900 years after

Dr. Salazar and his men have gone from this land, Christianity will grow and flourish here.

It is a sacrilegious insult to the religion of Lord Jesus Christ that it requires Portuguese arms and armaments to uphold it. The gospel of Jesus was not based on armies. It preached peace to all men. In the last hours of his life Jesus declared to his chief disciple, St. Peter, that those who take the sword shall perish by the sword. Christianity conquered Rome and Greece and many places on the earth not by the sword but by the virtues of its saints and the blood of its martyrs. Christianity shall endure, Portugal or no Portugal, so long as men and women on earth seek God, truth and light and peace of soul.

In the Indian Republic there are more Christians than all people in the European Portugal put together, for the population of Portugal is just eight and a half millions. The entire population of Goa which is only six lakhs does not number as many Christians as in Travancore-Cochin. If the Christians in India can live in peace and harmony with the rest of their fellow-citizens, why not the small number of Christians in Goa, after the Portuguese are gone?

Portugal has not kept all its possessions it had in India. Cochin was at one time under them. So was Bombay and Bassein. In the period 1580—1640, Portugal itself was absorbed into Spain and so was Goa. Even Goa, itself, since the days of Albuquerque, has changed hands several times. It went into the hands of Spain in 1580, of British in 1800 and then again of Britain in 1808 on the invasion of Portugal by France.

The Catholic Church saw early enough the events that were coming. It removed the right of Portugal to have its ecclesiastical patronage over some of the dioceses in India by a treaty entered into between the Vatican and Portugal in May, 1928.

Portugal had to agree to forego this right known as "Padroado". His Holiness the Pope has told our Prime Minister that the merger of Goa into the Indian Republic is no religious issue and that it is absolutely political.

The Christians and Catholics in India stretch out their hand of fellowship to people in Goa and offer them all help and best wishes in their fight to free themselves from foreign yoke. The Goans are a people devoutly religious and well-known for their refinement and their exquisite taste in all arts, especially music. We offer them our cordial greetings and long and pray for the day when they will be one and united with their brethren across the border.

The Western nations like Holland, France and Britain had territories in India. But Portuguese possessions alone remain. It was thought that as the British and French left India, Portugal will also quit this land in good grace. I still believe that wisdom will dawn on the people of Portugal and their rulers and that they would follow the foot-steps of Britain and France.

Goa is dear to the Christians in all lands and particularly to the 400 million Catholics in all countries on account of the sepulchre of St. Francis Xavier. But Portugal should not forget that we have in Madras the sepulchre of St. Thomas, one of the twelve disciples of Christ intact and honoured for nineteen centuries and that St. Xavier himself while living prayed long for light and guidance at that tomb of St. Thomas.

His Eminence Valerian Gracias, the Cardinal of India and His Grace Archbishop of Delhi Monsignor Fernandez have stated in unmistakable terms where the Christians in India stand on this issue. I call upon the people in Goa to stand by India as the ancient Christians in Kerala did during the Gandhian days, and hold high the banner of freedom. May the grace of God be with them during the difficult days ahead and at all times.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram referred to the fact that there had been an all-party convention on Goa and that there has been a resolution adopted unanimously by that convention at Bombay, Madras, Calcutta and finally Delhi. But he did not disclose the contents of that resolution. That resolution asked the Government of India to make a final attempt to negotiate with the Portuguese authorities for the peaceable integration of Goa with India failing which it further asked the Government to take suitable sanctions in order to remove the last vestiges of colonialism from India. I know that there have been many persons who have been critical of that resolution as being somewhat weak and halting. They have felt that it was purposeless for the Government to attempt to negotiate with an administration which refused to negotiate or even to sit around a table and to discuss the matter. The same people are critical of the attitude and the policy of the Government of India. They feel that the policy of the Government is hesitant, is halting and is weak. But I believe that all these critics have failed to see the whole problem in its proper perspective and setting.

The problem of Goa is comparatively a small problem. As my hon. friend, Shri Gadgil, has pointed out, because of India's policy of seeking solutions to international problems by friendly, peaceable methods, I believe with him that India has vastly increased her national prestige. Not only that; because of her policy of seeking solutions in a peaceable way, it has been given to India to play an increasingly vital role in lessening world tensions.

I believe that the policy that the Government is pursuing today is consistent with the policy of restraint and dignity and is in consonance with the position of a great power. Unfortunately there is a likelihood that India's restraint, her patience and her

[Shri Frank Anthony]

dignity may be mistaken for weakness in certain quarters.

May I in passing make a reference to the role of the Prime Minister in this matter? I have seen comments in the Portuguese press and I regret to say in certain sections of the Western press, the Prime Minister has been not only vilified, but perhaps abused. He has been accused of inciting Indian public opinion unnecessarily on this issue. On the other hand, I believe that the Prime Minister has held Indian public opinion on the leash in this matter. I believe that he alone has the necessary stature and commands the necessary respect to contain Indian public opinion. If the Prime Minister released his hold Indian public opinion would overflow into and over Goa. As I have said I believe the problem could be solved if Indian public opinion was left to itself. Goa, I believe, is too small a territory and the Portuguese too puny a power to require a country like India to resort to police action. For anyone to believe that Goa can continue to remain a Portuguese enclave on Indian soil is to live in a world of wild and hopeless illusion. I had the privilege of presiding over the All Parties Goa meeting at Bombay and I know how the Goans themselves feel about it. They regard Goa as a symbol of colonialism. The Goans themselves realise that for anyone to believe that the Portuguese rule can be perpetuated in Goa is to attempt to fly in the teeth of history because everyone including the Goans knows that history is on the march in resurgent Asia today. And in a resurgent Asia which includes a resurgent India colonialism cannot and will not be tolerated. I feel that the only path not only of statesmanship but of sanity is for the Portuguese, and perhaps to a certain extent for the Western democracies, to negotiate with India. I feel that it is the duty of the Western democracies to bring pressure to bear on Portugal in this matter, unless of course both America and Britain have forgotten the recent

lessons of colonial history. I believe that the longer the Portuguese remain in Goa, the longer they resort to repression, the longer they create bitterness the greater the injury will they do to the cause of democracy in Asia. And I say this with regret that American diplomacy has not sufficiently appreciated Asian psychology. The tenderest part in Asian psychology today is its instant and indignant reaction to all forms and expressions of colonialism and racialism. There is a feeling, it may not be justified, that the Portuguese are behaving stupidly and arrogantly because they are receiving *sub rosa* encouragement from some of the Western democracies. I do not know whether that feeling is justified, but the longer the Portuguese continue to be arrogant and stupid, the greater will that feeling spread in India and it may take the form of a certain amount of hostility to the Western democracies.

Sir, it is a cynical perversion of facts for the Portuguese to say that they are staying on in Goa in order to protect the Goan Christians. If the Portuguese were really sincere in their professions of solicitude, they would have been the first to start negotiations for the integration of Goa with India. If the Portuguese were really interested in the wellbeing of the Goan Christians, they can negotiate with India and get the most ample guarantees that India would be prepared to give to the Goan Christians. So long as the Portuguese hold on to Goa and continue to leave an increasing trail of bitterness, so long will they do a disservice to the Goan Christians, because there will always be the danger of that bitterness spilling over and reflecting on the Goans. A deliberate canard in the Portuguese press and expressed in some sections of the Western press is that the Goans are not only not in favour of integration, but they are against it. The Prime Minister has already given us details of the fact that there is a reign of terror in Goa and in spite of this reign of terror, some two thou-

sand Goans have faced jail with all its concomitant horrors. Another which I wish particularly to nail to the counter is that, the Goan christians are not only indifferent to, but are hostile to integration. I had the opportunity about two years ago of touring Goa and met a large number of Goan christians. Recently in Bombay I met the leaders of the Goan people, particularly the Goan Liberation Council consisting of the most responsible, well-placed and highly educated Goans. Not only that, I also met a large number of Goan priests and they were all unanimous that the sooner the integration of Goa with India takes place, the better it would be for the Goans and the Goan christians. They gave me the names of those who have suffered under Portuguese rule and they showed me that it was the Goan christians who had imposed on them the most savage sentences, sentences ranging from 20 to 28 years. Every Goan that I have met has told me very clearly that he is under no illusion as to the status of Goa, he knows that it is part of India and they are Indians. He also understands that in the present scheme of world racial values, no Asian can ever expect to be treated as an equal with an European under a colonial regime. That is why the Goan people are anxious to see this problem resolved as early as possible. There are certain anxieties that they have. But, those anxieties do not stem from any doubts as to whether they are Indians. Their anxieties are purely at an economic level. The Goanese economy is poor and undeveloped. They manage to scrape out a living from their poor economy. As I told them, the Prime Minister has given categorical guarantees. Not only that. The Indian Constitution contains categorical guarantees in respect of culture and way of life of every section of the Indian people. When they become part of India, they will automatically be the beneficiaries of those special guarantees. But, there are Portuguese agents who tell the poor and the more ignorant sections that this movement is being headed by certain communal bodies in this

country, that their motive is to merge Goa with Maharashtra or with Bombay. They ask, if this happens, what will happen to our economy and to our meagre livelihood. That is why I would request the Prime Minister, apart from or in addition to the guarantees that he has given in respect of culture and way of life, to say categorically, as he did with regard to Pondicherry, that the policy of the Government is not to merge Goa with Maharashtra or Bombay, that we do not intend to introduce any abrupt policies, even prohibition which would disturb their economy and means of livelihood.

As a last point, may I say this? In framing their policy for the future, the Government will have to remember that they are dealing with an administration which is hardly civilised from our point of view in that it is not responsible to the people, that it is not responsive to public opinion; not only in Goa, but in Portugal. I was talking to a Goan gentleman who has just come from Portugal. He told me that on this very issue a European Portuguese had attempted to write to the press questioning the wisdom of the Portuguese Government's policy. Not only was his letter intercepted and not allowed to be published, but he and his wife and his family were clapped into the jail. We are dealing with a Government which is not responsive to public opinion. There is no expression of public opinion. The Government will have to make it very clear, I feel, to the Portuguese authorities that their restraint and dignity should not be misinterpreted for weakness, that while they are committed to this policy of peaceful negotiation and settlement as far as possible, they will not allow to go unchallenged any attempt to perpetrate medieval barbarities. My own fear is that the policy recently announced by the Government may encourage the Portuguese people to believe that they can fire on Indian satyagrahis. I think it should be made very clear to them that the patience of the Government will go up to a

[Shri Frank Anthony]

certain limit and not beyond that, and that any attempt by the Portuguese to indulge in barbarities will not be accepted by this Government, at any rate on Indian soil, so far as Indians are concerned.

श्री श्री० जी० वृंशपांडे : गाँजा के प्रश्न पर इस सदन में और बाहर जो एकताव्यता आज दिखाई दे रही है, इसके लिये मैं सर्वदलों को बधाई देता हूँ। गाँजा भारत का एक अंग है, इस विषय पर आज किसी का मत-भेद नहीं है। गाँजा में जो आन्दोलन चल रहा है—जो संघर्ष चल रहा है, उसमें भी जिस प्रकार सर्वदल अपने मत-भेद दूर कर भाग ले रहे हैं और एक ही उद्देश्य और एक ही भावना से प्रेरित हो कर, किसी भी प्रकार के भेद-भाव न रखते हुए काम कर रहे हैं, उसके लिये भी मैं उनको बधाई देता हूँ। आज यह बात भी माननी पड़ती है कि हमारी भारत सरकार आज जिस प्रकार से काम कर रही है, उसके कारण भारत की पूर्ण जनता का हृदय उसके साथ है। मैं यह भी कहूँगा कि आज भारत सरकार जो जो घोषणाएँ कर रही है, उनमें वह भारत की जनता का पूरा पूरा प्रतिनिधित्व करती है। वह ठीक है कि उसका वह प्रतिनिधित्व जरा संघर्ष है—उसकी तरफ से भारत की जनता के हृदयों का प्रतिनिधित्व संघर्ष के साथ हो रहा है। मैं यह नहीं समझता हूँ कि सालाजार की तरफ से दुनिया में जो प्रचार चल रहा है, भारत सरकार की तरफ से उसका कोई उत्तर देने जाने की आवश्यकता है। सालाजार के प्रचार में जिस प्रकार की उद्धृष्टता और मस्ती हमें दिखाई देती है, उसका उत्तर हमारी सरकार बड़े गम्भीर और गौरवपूर्ण शब्दों में देती है। इसके लिये भी कोई उसकी मुलाजकत करेगा, मैं समझता हूँ ऐसी बात नहीं है। वहाँ पर इन समय जो सत्याग्रह चल रहा है, उसके साथ भी सब की सहानुभूति है। यह सत्याग्रह पूर्णतया अहिंसात्मक मार्ग से चल रहा है। इसमें हिंसा की जगह भी दू न आये, इसकी भी चिन्ता रख कर रहे हैं। इसी प्रकार से भारत में सम्मिलित होने के परचाएँ वहाँ के

अल्पसंख्यकों के साथ न केवल अन्याय नहीं किया जायगा, बल्कि उनके साथ उदारता का व्यवहार किया जायगा, इस विषय में भी भारतवर्ष में मैं कोई मत-भेद नहीं देता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह भी बड़ी बधाई की बात है।

इसके परचाएँ मैं वहाँ यह बता देना भी अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ कि आज गाँजा में सत्याग्रह किस प्रकार से चल रहा है और जिन पाँच उद्देश्यों को लं कर हमने वह सत्याग्रह प्रारम्भ किया था, उनमें से कौन कौन से उद्देश्य सफल हुए हैं और आज हम अपनी सरकार से क्या अपेक्षा करते हैं। यह सत्याग्रह करते समय हमारा पहला उद्देश्य यह था कि हम गाँजा की छः लाख जनता को यह बतायें कि पुर्तगाल सरकार के खिलाफ आप जो संघर्ष कर रहे हैं, इसमें आप केवल छः लाख नहीं हैं, अपितु हिन्दुस्तान की पैंतीस करोड़ जनता आपके साथ है। यह बताने के लिए सत्याग्रही उत्थे भारत से वहाँ जा रहे थे। इस उद्देश्य में हम सफल हुए हैं। हिन्दुस्तान से लांग सत्याग्रह करने के लिए गाँजा न जायें, इस उद्देश्य से सालाजार की सरकार ने किस प्रकार के अत्याचार किए, यह मैं आज अधिक शब्दों में बताना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं तबसे उनके अत्याचारों का शिकार हुआ हूँ, परन्तु वह रौंदा वहाँ आपके सामने रौंदा में मुझे कोई अभिमान मालूम नहीं होता और मैं वहाँ से मार-का कर वापिस आ गया हूँ, इस लिए मुझे बहुत बड़ा आदमी समझा जाय, यह अभिमान रखने की भी मेरी मनावृत्ति नहीं है। हमने देखा कि सालाजार की सरकार ने लोगों को इनमें का पूरा चल किया, लेकिन उसका उम्दा ही अन्तर हुआ और भारत के हजारों लोग वहाँ जाने के लिए कतिबद्ध हो गए हैं।

हमारा दूसरा उद्देश्य था भारत की जनता में गाँजा के विषय में जागृति का निर्माण करना। आज हम देखते हैं कि दुँस के एक कोने से दूसरे कोने तक गाँजा के बारे में जागृति का निर्माण हो गया है।

हमारा तीसरा उद्देश्य था भारत के बाहर सिविलाइज्ड पब्लिक ओपीनियन—सुसंस्कृत जनमत—के हृदय में परिवर्तन करना। मैं समझता हूँ कि हम इस उद्देश्य में पूर्ण सफल नहीं हुए और मैं बड़े अदब के साथ, बहुत नमृतापूर्वक यह कहूँगा कि सरकार ने इस विषय में अपना कर्तव्य पूरा नहीं किया है। यहाँ हिंसा अहिंसा का कोई वाद-विवाद नहीं है। हम देखते हैं कि पाश्चात्य वृत्तपत्रों में—अमरीकी और ब्रिटिश वृत्तपत्रों में—हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ प्रचार हो रहा है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री दुनिया भर के देशों में हो आए। उनका बड़ा स्वागत हुआ। हमारा भी दिल यह देख कर बड़ा प्रसन्न हुआ। परन्तु हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ जो प्रचार चल रहा है, उसका प्रतिरोध करने के लिए कोई भी प्रभावशाली कदम हमारी सरकार ने उठाया नहीं है। हमारी सरकार का प्रचार-तंत्र असफल रहा है, वह आक्षेप मैं जरूर करूँगा। मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि वह अपना प्रचार-तंत्र ज्यादा तेजी से चलाए और साथ ही उस प्रचार-तंत्र में परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है।

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

यह हमारा तीसरा उद्देश्य था, और चौथे उद्देश्य पर मैं आह्वित मैं आऊँगा। पाँचवा उद्देश्य यह था कि पुर्तगाल सरकार गाँजा पर जो अत्याचार कर रही है, उनको रोकने के लिए उस पर दबाव डाला जाय। हृदय-परिवर्तन पर मेरा विश्वास नहीं है। सत्याग्रह और अहिंसात्मक सत्याग्रह पर मेरा विश्वास है, परन्तु किसी सरकार का भी हृदय होता है और उसका परिवर्तन होता है, विशेषतया किसी साम्राज्यवादी सरकार का भी हृदय-परिवर्तन होता है, यह मैं मानता नहीं हूँ। अंग्रेज सरकार का दिल भी बदल गया था, वह मैं मानता नहीं हूँ। हाँ, एक बात ठीक है कि अंग्रेजों का दिल नहीं था, लेकिन दिमाग था और उन्होंने समझ लिया कि हम हिन्दुस्तान पर अब राज्य नहीं कर सकते, इस लिए हिन्दुस्तान छोड़ कर चले गए। लेकिन सालाबार सरकार के पास न दिल है और

न दिमाग। इस लिए केवल आपके दुख-भाग से सालाबार सरकार हिन्दुस्तान छोड़ कर चली जायगी, इस पर मेरा विश्वास नहीं है। मैं नहीं चाहता कि लड़ाई हो। बी आर नाट वास्-मोंगर्वे। लड़ाई जरूर होनी चाहिए और वह एक बहुत अच्छी बात है, यह मैं मानता नहीं हूँ। दुनिया में शान्ति होनी चाहिए और हमारी सरकार को भी शान्ति से कार्य करना चाहिए, यह भी मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जिस प्रकार से नीति चला रहे हैं, उसमें देखते हैं कि मेरा उद्देश्य नहीं है। दुनिया के बड़े कामों में आप किस प्रकार से चल रहे हैं, उसमें भी कोई देखते हैं कि मेरा विचार नहीं है।

4 P.M.

परन्तु एक बात मैं बड़ी नमृता के साथ आपसे जरूर निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। आचार्य कृलानी जी हिंसा, अहिंसा, नीति, अनिहित, सत्य और असत्य, इस पर अधिकात्युक्त भाषी से बात कर सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं इतने बड़े अधिकार से बात नहीं करूँगा। परन्तु इतिहास पढ़ने के बाद मैं इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचा हूँ कि पद दलित राष्ट्रों को साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई करने का जन्म सिद्ध अधिकार है। मेरा इस पर विश्वास है। इसी कारण मैं गाँजा के लोगों का वहाँ की सरकार से लड़ाई करना या हमारी सरकार का लड़ाई करना वैसा नहीं समझता जैसा कि अमरीका या रूस से लड़ाई करना या सीलोन या पाकिस्तान से लड़ाई करना। मैं इन दोनों की तुलना नहीं कर सकता। पहले पहले हमने ही सत्याग्रह किया। मुझे अभिमान है कि हमारे लोगों ने अंग्रेजी सरकार के विरुद्ध सत्याग्रह करके देश को आजाद कराया। उसके मतभेद में मैं आज नहीं जाऊँगा। परन्तु हमने इस देश में एक सार्वभौम सरकार की स्थापना इसलिए की है कि इस देश के आन्तरिक और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न सरकारी स्तर पर हल किये जायें। आज हम यह देखते हैं कि हमारे देश की जनता की यह भावना है कि गाँजा की मुक्ति के लिए वह जाँ कूड़ करंगी वह इस

[श्री वी० जी० दयाल] ]

सार्वभौम और साविरन सरकार के मत्व में करंगी। यदि हमारे राष्ट्रनायक यह समझते हैं कि बार से कोई प्रबलम हल नहीं होता तो वे इस प्रबलम को शान्ति से हल करें। बन्दूक ले कर जानें वाली फौज के स्थान पर सत्याग्रह की संज्ञा बनायें। दुनिया में यह एक नया प्रयोग आप बनायें और शान्ति की फौजों को लेकर गाँवों के प्रश्न को हल करें। यदि आप ऐसा ही चाहते हैं तो ऐसा करें लेकिन अपने लोगों के साथ डिपलॉमैटिक बातें करें ऐसा मैं नहीं चाहता।

मैं जानता हूँ कि कांग्रेस दल के बहुत से नेता श्वाश्वतगत रूप से हमारी सहायता कर रहे हैं और आज मैं इस विषय में किसी दलगत राजनीति को नहीं देख रहा हूँ। आज मैं देख रहा हूँ कि जनता के लोग गाँव सत्याग्रह करने जा रहे हैं, उन पर यहाँ अत्याचार होते हैं तो उनको बचाने वाला कोई नहीं है। लोग उन पर तालियाँ बजाते हैं। वह मार खाते हैं और आप की तरफ मुँह मोंड़ कर कहते हैं कि पुलिस कार्रवाई कीजिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश की सरकार की इसमें शान नहीं कि हमारे देश वालों पर गाँवों में अत्याचार हो। आपकी सरकार, जब गाँवों हिन्दुस्तान में शामिल हो जायगा, तब बहुत सी अच्छी बातें करंगी इससे आज मुझे समाधान नहीं हो रहा है। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि आप आज ही बन्दूकें लेकर वहाँ पर युद्ध शुरू कर दें। लेकिन मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि आप यह न समझें कि हमको कभी ऐसा करना नहीं है। मैं भी चाहता हूँ कि आप इस प्रश्न को शान्तिपूर्वक हल कर सकें। अगर आप अमरीका या इंग्लैंड का दबाव ला सकते हैं तो आप लायें। परन्तु मैं नहीं समझता कि ये देश आपका साथ देंगे। मैं ने देखा कि उन देशों में एक तरफ जहाँ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का स्वागत हो रहा था वहाँ दूसरी तरफ वहाँ के पब उनके विरुद्ध लेख लिख रहे थे और चीर्चित ने भी उनके खिलाफ आवेदन दिये। अगर आप और देशों का दबाव डालवा सकते हैं तो आप ऐसा करें

और इस प्रश्न को हल करें, या अगर कर सकते हैं तो पंचशील के मार्ग से इसका हल करें। परन्तु यह निश्चय समझें कि इस देश में पुर्तगाल का और हमारा सहजीवित्व नहीं हो सकता। जैसा कि काका गांधीगल ने कहा है, अन्त में गाँवों पर पुर्तगाल का प्रभुत्व नहीं रहेगा। सालाजार ने तो आज भी अपने स्टेटमेंट में जो कहा है वह ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि महाभारत के एक अंश का भाषांतर है। जैसे कि दुर्योधन ने कहा था :

‘सूत्यागं न प्रदास्यामि विना युद्धं क्वाह’

जैसे ही आज सालाजार कह रहे हैं :

‘सूत्यागं न प्रदास्यामि विना युद्धं क्वाह’

दूसरी बात तो सालाजार कर नहीं रहे हैं। जब वह इस प्रकार से कह रहे हैं तो कैसे समझा जाय कि उनका हृदय परिवर्तन होगा। मुझे इस पर शिश्वास नहीं है। हमको यह समझ लेना चाहिए कि अन्तिम रूप में हमको शक्ति का प्रयोग करना पड़ सकता है। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि हमारी सरकार आज जानबूझ कर लड़ाई की बातें करे। परन्तु हमारी सरकार को अपने हृदय से यह बात निकाल देनी चाहिए कि यह छोटा सा देश है उसके साथ शक्ति का प्रयोग नहीं करना चाहिए बल्कि बड़े देश के साथ करना चाहिए। वह महात्मा गांधी का कौनसा तत्वज्ञान है, मुझे मालूम नहीं है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अन्याय का प्रतिकार करना चाहिए। पब दलित लोगों को जिस प्रकार हाँ सके साम्राज्यवाद का प्रतिकार करना चाहिए। हम सब जानते हैं कि पुर्तगाल वालों को गाँवों से निकालने में और किसी दूसरे युद्ध में कितना अन्तर है। मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री से और सरकार से बड़ी नम्रतापूर्वक प्रार्थना चाहता हूँ कि उनको जो कुछ करना है उसको सरकारी स्तर पर करें।

मैं यह जानता हूँ कि पुर्तगाल एक छोटा सा देश है। हो सकता है कि हम इस प्रश्न को केवल सत्याग्रह से ही हल कर सकें। लेकिन अगर ऐसा हुआ तो इसमें जनता की तो जीत

होगी पर यह सरकार की शान के विरुद्ध होगा। कि हमारे यहां सार्वभौम सरकार हांते हुए भी इस आन्तरिक प्रश्न का जनता स्वयं हल करे। यदि ऐसा हुआ तो मैं तो यह समझूंगा कि यह उस स्त्री के काम के समान होगा जो कि अपने बच्चों की शिक्षा के लिए चक्की पीसने और बरतन मांजने और उसका पति मातदार हां। ऐसा करने में उस स्त्री की तां बहादुरी होगी पर वह बात उसके पति की शान के खिलाफ होगी। हम कहते हैं कि हम सत्याग्रह से इस सवाल को हल कर सकते हैं। यदि ऐसा हुआ तो सत्याग्रह करने वालों की तो इसमें बहादुरी होगी पर यह हमारी सार्वभौम सरकार की शान के खिलाफ होगा कि जनता सरकार की सहायता के बिना इस आन्तरिक प्रश्न को हल करे। इसलिए मंत्री इस देश की सरकार से प्रार्थना हैं कि वह इस बात की तरफ अवश्य ध्यान दे।

यहां पर नाना प्रकार के युक्तिवाद चल रहे हैं। कोई तत्वज्ञान की बात कहता है, कोई नीति की बात कहता है, कोई चालाकी की बात कहता है। इस प्रकार से अनेक प्रकार की सलाहें दी जा रही हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि इस विषय में हमारी सरकार की नीति बिल्कुल स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए। यह हमारा आन्तरिक प्रश्न है, और यदि मंत्री स्मरण शक्ति मुझे धोखा नहीं देती तो मंरा ख्याल है कि डॉ० सत्यद महमूद साहब ने कहा था कि हम गाँजा के प्रश्न का २० एन० आं० में नहीं ले जा सकते क्योंकि यह हमारा आन्तरिक प्रश्न है। हम तो अपने देश के अन्दर से पुर्तगाल वालों को इस तरह से निकाल सकते हैं जैसे कि हम चाँद और डाकूओं को निकालते हैं। यह तो एक प्रकार का डिफेंस है। इसके कोई एग्रेसन का उपाय नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की टैरीटरी पर पुर्तगाल ने हमला किया है और आज वे बन्दूकें लेकर आपको मारते हैं और आपके देश के एक भाग पर कब्जा जमायें बैठे हैं। उनको निकाल देना कोई युद्ध नहीं है। यह गाँजा की जनता के साथ युद्ध नहीं है परन्तु यह गाँजा पर अत्याचार करने वालों के विरुद्ध युद्ध है जो कि गाँजा पर कब्जा किये बैठे

हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस बात का ध्यान में रखे। मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): From the report of this debate on the Goa question as it will go out I hope it will be appreciated that among all the sections of this House there is little difference as to the methods or the objectives in this Goa question.

I shall here first refer to the grave warning which the Prime Minister uttered in the famous press conference that he gave on the 19th of July. This is what the Prime Minister in reply to a question said:

"We start on the presumption that the Portuguese authorities are indifferent not only to moral pressure but to facts."

And now here comes the warning:

"Nevertheless, we think that their regime in Goa will collapse and, if they are not careful, their regime in Portugal will collapse."

Now, this warning is intended for those in authority in Portugal at present. These are very serious words and I hope they will be heeded. Underlying this warning there is, of course, the pledge of this country that our position will be a position to seek peaceful settlement and welcome negotiations at all times. Such a warning was bound to bring forth a reply; and that reply has come in the form of a statement from the Presidency of the Council of Ministers—I suppose it means from Dr. Salazar. It has come to me with the compliments of the Portuguese Legation, and I believe it has been circulated to all Members of this House.

The relevant paragraph that deals with this warning of the Prime Minister is paragraph 3 on page 4. This paragraph contains two very interesting admissions. Admission

— [Shri V. B. Gandhi]

No. 1 is this. Dr. Salazar's statement says:

"Everybody in Portugal understands that the Portuguese State of India can be snatched by the overwhelming force of the Indian Union."

What it means in other words is that in the context of physical force, in the eventuality of violence and conflict, the Portuguese Government will be unable to defend the people of Goa. It is a very helpful admission, and an admission made in very clear language.

Another admission that the statement makes is as follows:

"Apart from a few people with ideas and interests subordinated to foreign lands, no one would forgive the Government for yielding to unjust pressure..."

Here is an admission that tells us that in Portugal of today there are people who differ and who disagree with the present regime in Portugal on this question of Goa. Proceeding further, the statement says:

"No one would forgive the Government for yielding and failing to defend our fellow-citizens from Goa..."

Now, what is this talk about defence? Who wants to be defended? The people of Goa are neither threatened nor attacked. They certainly have not asked the Portuguese for their protection. So far as we know, instead of asking for any protection from the Portuguese Government, the people of Goa since 1946, for almost ten years, have carried on a struggle to free themselves from the rule of Portugal. These brave people have suffered in all these ten years torments, physical and mental; and today we see that in one year—i.e. last year about 25,000 people were put in prison. And as we speak here today, according to our information, as many as 450 Goanese people, brave fighters in the cause of their own freedom, i.e. freedom from Portuguese rule are still in custody.

The statement talks also about fellow-citizens, when it refers to defending fellow-citizens. What do these unhappy people of Goa get from Portugal for their being allowed to be called fellow-citizens with the present regime in Portugal? Today they are denied the right of free expression. They cannot talk of independence even by word. They are denied every form of civil liberty; and every kind of constitutional agitation is forbidden and suppressed. Now, this is what they get for being treated as fellow-citizens of the present regime in Goa. Any evidence of independence on the part of citizens of Goa brings in its wake deportation, imprisonment, in fact imprisonment of an inhuman kind, for terms ranging from one year to 28 years as was said in the House yesterday by the Prime Minister. This is what they get for being treated as fellow-citizens. These facts are perhaps not known to the people of Portugal, and if they know them, they are perhaps not permitted to express their views on these facts. But it is not possible under modern conditions to keep a whole country insulated like that. These facts will some day be known to these people. The people of Portugal will know these facts and will take a decision. They will take a decision to release Goa, and then it will be for the present regime in Goa to make its choice. It will have either to do the bidding of the people or go out of office. That is what we understand by the warning that our Prime Minister has uttered.

These are the lessons of history. Such is the working of these forces of liberation. Our Prime Minister is one of the great democrats this world has, and his reading of the working of democracy, his reading of the way democracy works out its ends, is something on which half the world today is prepared to depend, and on which we are willing to depend. And some day the tide of popular opinion will overtake Salazar and his present regime in Portugal, and then Dr. Salazar will not succeed in withstanding this tide any more than King Canute did before him.

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** One question, Sir. May I know whether Members whose names are not included in the list before you can ever hope to catch your eye in this debate?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no list. Whenever Hon. Members get up, I note their names, and then to keep the balance in the debate, I call from this side and from that side alternately. Opportunities have been given, excepting to the Jan Sangh, to representatives of all parties in the Opposition. I do not know whether the hon. Member Shri Kamath represents any particular party, in which case I would have called him.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** He is a party by himself.

**Shri Kamath:** I was elected only very recently, just three months ago. You could not possibly forget that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I can never forget Shri Kamath.

**Shri Raghuramalah (Tenali):** It has been most gratifying to see the unanimity of opinion expressed by the Members of the various sections of the House not only on the necessity for early liberation of Goa but also, broadly speaking, on the policy pursued by the Government of India so far. That Goa should be liberated and integrated as part and parcel of India needs no reiteration. It is not only the birthright of every Goan and of every Indian to strive for it; there are a thousand other reasons why Goa cannot tolerate its present position. Dr. Salazar is reported to have said once that if the Portuguese have to leave the Indian Settlement of Goa, nothing would remain there but a ravaged, uncharacteristic land, and not any bit of any nation. I am sure intelligent people all the world over would laugh at such a preposterous statement. That there has been practically no life worth living for any

self-respecting person in Goa is well-known. Politically they have no rights. I am told, nominally they have a Governor-General's Council, the majority of whom are nominated and the rest supposed to be elected by a very few voters who belong to the richest classes. I am told further that no resolution can be moved even there without the prior sanction of the Governor-General. Let alone the Government; even in ordinary civil life, civil liberty is an expression which, I am told, is unheard of in Goa. Fancy that even for a marriage party or for a calendar or for anything of what we consider as very inoffensive, prior sanction of the governmental authorities is necessary. Economic life is stifled to an unimaginable extent. Let alone the fact that nothing has been done to exploit the resources of the country for the good of the country, even ordinary banking facilities are not allowed. I am told there is only one bank, the *Banco Nacional*, which only receives deposits without interest, hardly lends money, and when it does, does at a prohibitive rate of interest; Customs duties are manipulated to suit the convenience of the Home Government; the whole of the benefit and advantage goes to Portugal.

These are very grave reasons why Goa should be liberated, but I think the greatest of all is India can no longer tolerate foreign rule in any portion of it. It is preposterous for any foreign nation to imagine that it can hold any bit of this country. It is surprising how of all people the Portuguese fail to see what is written so clearly on the wall. Any child who reads the history of the world can realise that the Portuguese cannot hold it any longer. The French have realised it. Earlier, the British realised it; the mightiest Empire has been liberated. The French have followed suit. It is curious how in these circumstances Portugal fails to see the obvious. All we can hope is that very soon light will dawn even on Portugal. Some of their statements recently made are amazing. But rightly out

[Shri Raghuramlah]

Government have withstood all the provocative speeches and provocative actions of the Portuguese Government. That the policy pursued by the Government has the approval of the entire House is obvious. I was only thinking of a little statement gravely made by Acharya Kripalani—his reference to 'limited war'. I do not know whether it is possible, after the dawning of the atomic age, for any nation to limit war. Whether it was possible within recent years is a doubtful point, but after the dawn of the atomic age and the invention of the hydrogen and other bombs, it is increasingly being realised that a spark of war anywhere is most likely to spread throughout the globe. It is this realisation that has been at the background of the minds of the Statesmen who met at Geneva recently, at the so-called Summit Conference. If they have agreed to agree on many points on which they have always so far disagreed—and probably in their heart of hearts they still disagree—it is the consciousness that war cannot be limited to a section of the people or to a part of the globe. Therefore, there is no meaning hereafter in referring to war as being a limited war. Acharyaji has also said that war has solved problems. That may be so, but war has also set more problems to be solved than it has solved. That is why the statesmen of the world who have recently met were in a hurry to agree among themselves, even on questions on which they have so far greatly disagreed. Apart from that, we should not forget, whatever be the provocation this country receives, that we are no longer a small, tiny little nation in some corner of the world whose actions will go unnoticed. We are in our own way one of the powerful nations of the world. Whatever we say—thanks to the policy pursued by our Prime Minister and this country—whatever we say, whatever we do is being watched—daily watched—all over the world, and we cannot afford to undo of the great work which we have done for the peace not only around us,

not only in Asia, but in the whole world, for the sake of a hurried solution of a tiny problem. The present situation undoubtedly hurts our sentiments, but the policy we pursue should also be consistent with the national policy we have been pursuing for greater objectives, which have been the hope of the world. I, therefore, support the various sentiments expressed in this House and add my own voice that while we cannot tolerate any longer this foreign possession in India, and every step should be taken by the Government to ensure the early liquidation of this foreign rule. We should also, at the same time appreciate the difficulties the Government are facing and give the Government every support, in their present policy, so that there may be an early achievement of the freedom of this part of India, as in French India which has recently been liberated.

स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ (गुलबर्गा) : अब तक इस सदन में जो चर्चा हुई है उस से यह बात जाहिर होती है कि गाँवा के मसल के बारे में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता और हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट, जो पार्लिसी इकमत आज अमल में ला रही हैं, उस के साथ हैं। इस चर्चा के बाद दुनियाँ के किसी देश को या किसी इकमत को यह कहने के लिये कोई अवकाश नहीं रहता है कि जो पार्लिसी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार गाँवा के मसल के बारे में अल्पमत कर रही है उस के साथ हिन्दुस्तान की जनता नहीं हैं। लेकिन आज देश के सामने जो सवाल खड़ा हुआ है वह यह नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता इस मामल में इकमत के साथ हैं या नहीं, सवाल यह है कि यह मसला किब तरह से हल होगा,

और जब हम गोआ के मामले के बारे में कुछ कहते हैं तो हमें सांघना हांगा कि गोआ का मसला किस तरह से हल किया जा सकता है। और इसी तर्ज में दो एक छोटे छोटे विचार इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

सुझाई की बात है कि अलग अलग पक्षों के प्रतिनिधियों ने और नेताओं ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो पालिसी हिन्दुस्तान में चल रही हैं उस का समर्थन किया। हो सकता है कि चन्द बायों के बारे में, कुछ तफसीलात के बारे में उन का मतभेद हो। मंत्री भी चन्द दिशाओं के बारे में भांडा बहुत मतभेद हो सकता है। लेकिन हमें एक बात, जो मूलभूत बात है, उस को समझना जरूरी है। जब हम पुलिस एक्शन की बात करते हैं तो आखिर उस के पीछे क्या बहानियत है, क्या विचार है। जैसा कि अभी मंत्री एक दोस्त ने बताया, गोआ का मसला हमारे एक मेम्बर फ्री लान्सर कहते हैं। डा० लंका सुन्दरम् ने यह भी बात कही कि अगर सत्याग्रही गोआ में जाते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का यह फर्ज होना चाहिये कि वह यह देखें कि उन के साथ उसी तरह से सलूक किया जाये जैसा कि प्रिन्डनर आफ वार के साथ किया जाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह एक फंडामेंटली रांग प्रॉपोजीशन है। सत्याग्रही कभी प्रिन्डनर आफ वार नहीं होते हैं। सत्याग्रही अपने उसूल के लिये, एक सिद्धान्त के लिए कदम उठाते हैं। उन का इस बात से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार क्या करती है, क्या नहीं करती है, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता क्या करने वाली है, क्या नहीं करने वाली है, वर्ड पॉपुलर ऑपिनिशन हमारे साथ है या नहीं है। फिर भी क्योंकि वह न्याय की बात है, ब्रिस्टम की बात है, अच्छी बात है, फॉर वन है। इस लिये सत्याग्रह किया जाता है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जो भी सत्याग्रह करने का कदम उठाये, उन को यह नहीं सांघना है कि उन के गिरफ्तार हो जाने के बाद गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया गोआ पर वह दबाव डाले कि उन के साथ प्रिन्डनर आफ वार का सा सलूक किया जाए। यह एक फंडामेंटल चीज है जो मैंने कही। मगर जिस बात की तरफ मैं इशारा कर रहा था

वह जो यह मांग की जाती है कि पुलिस एक्शन किया जाये, वह उस के बारे में भी। हमें स्पष्ट शब्दों में यह समझ लेना चाहिये कि पुलिस एक्शन के माने क्या हैं। हैदराबाद में पुलिस एक्शन हुआ और वह सर्वसफल भी हुआ। लेकिन हैदराबाद का मसला और गोआ का मसला एक नहीं है, यह दो भिन्न मसले हैं। वह तो लिमिटेड वार का था और वह अनलिमिटेड वार का है। आप गोआ के बारे में पुलिस एक्शन करने के लिये क्यों कहते हैं, इस को मिलिटरी एक्शन कहिये। अगर हिन्दुस्तान की फौज गोआ में दाखिल होती है तो वह एक वार की नयेत हासिल कर लेगा। अगर हम गोआ के मसले को हल करने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की फौज को भेजना ही जरूरी समझते हैं तो वह हमारे सांघने की बात नहीं है, उस पर तो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को ही गौर करना है। हमारा फर्ज इतना ही है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के नाते, गोआ का भारत का एक अभिन्न अंग होने के नाते, गोआ की जनता और भारत की जनता के एक होने के नाते, गोजन फ्रीडम कोई अलग चीज नहीं है। गोआ के लोगों की स्वतन्त्रता हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों की स्वतन्त्रता के साथ जुड़ी हुई है। यह एक स्वतन्त्रता है। गोआ में आज जो स्वतन्त्रता के लिये संग्राम किया जा रहा

है It is the last war of Indian Independence जब यह बात है तो फिर हमारा यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि हम उसका साथ दें, जहां तक कि हम दे सकते हैं उस हद तक दें और एंसी सूत्र में ब्रिटन भी शान्तिमय सत्याग्रह के उसूल हैं उन को हमें मानना पड़ेगा। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि सत्याग्रह का जो फल निकलता है वह तो निकलता ही रहेगा लेकिन सत्याग्रह का सिलसिला कब तक चलेगा इस के बारे में कुछ मर्यादा होती है क्योंकि सत्याग्रह की जो शक्ति होती है वह कभी न कभी मर्यादित होती है, और वह खत्म हो जाती है। जहां तक हमारा तजुर्बा है, एक फौजस्ट रंजीम के तहत जब जनता स्वतन्त्रता के लिये आन्दोलन करती है तो फौजस्ट रंजीम के साथ बायोलेस भी होती है और जनता बहुत पीड़ित हो जाती है। हैदराबाद में

[स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ]

सत्याग्रह हुआ। २९,००० सत्याग्रहियों के जेल में जान के बावजूद भी अत्याचार का सिलसिला जारी रहा। ऐसी हालत में जनता इस बात के लिये मजबूर हो जाती है कि आत्म-रक्षा के लिये, सैल्फ डिफेंस के लिये वह अपनी तरफ से कुछ कदम उठाये। मगर इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि अगर गाँजा की जनता को आज की हालत में छोड़ दिया जाता है तो आत्म-रक्षा के लिये, अपनी आबरू और अपनी बुजबट बचाने के लिये वह जिस तरह से ठीक समझेंगी वैसे कदम उठावेंगी और जिस मार्ग पर चलना चाहेगी चलेंगी। जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम यह समझें कि जो भी आन्दोलन आज चल रहा है और जो आगे चलना है उस को गाँजा की जनता ने ही चलाया है। इस सत्याग्रह में २,००० से ज्यादा गाँजानी शामिल हुए हैं और अब कोई दुनिया का अक्सलमन्द आदमी यह नहीं कह सकता कि यह गाँजानियों का सत्याग्रह नहीं है या इन्स्टीगैटेड सत्याग्रह है या इन्स्पयर्ड स्ट्रगल है। ऐसी तो कोई बात अब नहीं कही जा सकती है। लेकिन हमारी जिम्मेदारी यह हो जाती है कि हम इस हालत को सम्हाल लेने की कोई पालिसी अविचार न करें। मरे कहने का मतलब यह है अगर गाँजानियों का जो सत्याग्रह है, वह इंस्पैरेशन में चला जाता है, वह अगर कुछ प्रमोशन में चला जाता है तो उस के लिये कुछ और सहाय्य कुछ इन्फेंस करेगा। हमारा फर्ज यह हो जाता है कि हम उन के लिये जितनी ताकत पहुँचा सकते हैं उतनी ताकत पहुँचायें। मैं समझता हूँ और काफी गौर के बाद मैं इस मतीबे पर पहुँचा हूँ कि गाँजा का मसला आखिर दो गवर्नमेंट्स के बीच का मसला है। इस लिये हमें कोई ऐसी बात नहीं करनी चाँहिये जिस से कि हिन्दुस्तान की गाँजा के बार् में जो पालिसी है उसको धोखा भी भक्का पहुँचे। अगर हम ने कोई ऐसा काम किया तो हम गाँजा की जनता की स्वतन्त्रता के प्रति एक अन्याय करेंगे। मरे कहने का इतना ही आशय है कि अगर मिलिटरी एक्शन का ही सवाल है तो वह सर्वमैट का काम है और जब वह मुत्ताब्ब

समझेंगी मिलिटरी एक्शन भी करेगी। इस के बार् में हमें फिज करने की जरूरत नहीं है। हमें तो इतना ही समझ लेना है कि गाँजा की जनता का जो स्वतन्त्रता के लिये संग्राम चल रहा है, एक जनता होने के नाते वह हमारा ही संग्राम है और वह लड़ाई हमारी स्वतन्त्रता की ही लड़ाई है। इस लिये हमें जो कुछ भी करना है हम करेंगे। साथ ही साथ हमें इकम्त को यह बताना है कि जो भी सैक्शंस वह गाँजा के मामले में एपलाइ करना चाहे करे और इस मामले में हमारी सपोर्ट उन के साथ हाँगी। यह केवल मिलिटरी सैक्शंस ही हो सकती है ऐसा मंस विचार नहीं है। अभी तक और भी बहुत से सैक्शंस एपलाइ करने को बाकी पड़े हुए हैं और वह उन को एपलाइ कर सकती हैं। पीरफुल मैच एडाप्ट कर सकते हैं।

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं इस सदन को और गाँजा में जो सत्याग्रह चल रहा है और जो उसको चला रहे हैं उनको एक बात बताना चाहता हूँ जो कि हो सकता है कि उस में एक काशन में उन को जे जब स्वतंत्रता का संग्राम चलता है, सत्याग्रह चलता है, तो कभी कोई ऐसी स्टैंड आती है कि नैगोशियेशन का सिलसिला शुरू होता है और जब नैगोशियेशन का सिलसिला शुरू होता है तो जो इन्ट्र होतें हैं वह कुछ धुंधले से हो जाते हैं। आज गाँजा के लोगों के सामने इन्ट्र क्या है? वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ सम्मिलित होने का है, एक होने का है। जो रिकार्ड आज गाँजानी लोगों के सामने रखी रही है मैं ने उन के बार् में कुछ पढ़ा है और कुछ रिलायबल सोर्स से सुना भी है। ऐसा कहा गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ आप का क्या सम्बन्ध होना चाँहिये वह तो देखा जावेगा लेकिन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जो व्यवस्था है उस के बार् में सोधेंगे।

मुझे याद है कि जब हम हिन्दुस्तान के साथ इंटरवाय के इन्टेंशन के सिलसिले में कुछ कदम उठा रहे थे—संग्राम चला रहे थे, ताँ हकूमत और मरे दरमियान नैगोशियेशन के अन्त मरे सामने यह सवाल रखा गया कि

हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हैंदराबाद के एक्सचेंज का जो मसला है, उसका हिन्दुस्तान की जो हकूमत हांगी, वह दल लेंगी, लेकिन रंस्यांसीबल गवर्नमेंट के बार में हम और आप चर्चा करेंगे। हम ने उस वक्त अपना दिमाग साबित रखा और मैं ने जवाब दिया कि पहले एक्सचेंज का सवाल साल्व हांगा और बाद में हम रंस्यांसीबल गवर्नमेंट को दलेंगे, क्योंकि आज हमारा सामने सवाल हिन्दुस्तान के साथ एकता का है। इस लिये वहां सत्याग्रह करने वाले और फ्रीडम फाइटर्स से मेरी नमू प्रार्थना है—वाहे बं लांग गांआ के हाँ या इंडियन—कि आज हिन्दुस्तान वह नहीं दल रहा है कि वहां क्या रिफार्मज होगी, वहां रंस्यांसीबल गवर्नमेंट है या नहीं, बल्कि उरुकी नजर इस तरफ है कि गांआ की जनता हिन्दुस्तान के साथ कब आने वाली है। इस बात को ये न भूलें। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जो भी सत्याग्रह का कदम उठाया गया है, वह ठीक है, मुनासिब है और जरूरी है और उसका जारी रखना चाहिये और जिन लोगों को इसमें हिस्सा लेने का अवसर प्राप्त हो, उन्हें लेना चाहिये। मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि अगर हम अपना काम करें ताँ हकूमत हिन्दू को कोई एडवाइस करने की जरूरत नहीं है। आज तक जो कदम उठाया गया है, वह कदम ठीक है, वह कदम मजबूत है और आगे भी उसी मजबूती के साथ कदम उठाये जाते रहेंगे। मैं एक सूप के लिये भी—एक लम्हे के लिये भी—यह मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि कल हमारा प्रधान मंत्री ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया, उसमें कोई कमजोरी थी या कोई लिमिटेशन थी। मैं ने उसमें आत्म-विश्वास और कुञ्जत पाई। जब कुञ्जत के साथ हकूमत अपना कदम उठा रही है, ताँ हमें हाँई शक रहने की कोई बात नहीं है। वायलेंस और नान-वायलेंस के बार में मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। पीसफुल मॅथड्स पर हमें चलना है। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार आज अपनी वैद्वीशक नीति के दायरे में अगर पीसफुल मॅथड्स अविलयार कर रही है, ताँ हमें उसका मान कर चलना चाहिये और उसी दायरे में रह कर जो कुछ हम कर सकते हैं, वह हम करेंगे।

मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज इस हाउस में जो भी चर्चा हुई है, उसका लिहाज साताजार करेंगे या नहीं, यह तो भगवान जानें, लेकिन जो सिविलाइज्ड वर्ल्ड ओपीनियन है, वह इसका लिहाज करेगी और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका काफी असर होगा।

شوی ایم - ایچ - وحسن (فطع)

سواد آباد—مدھئے)؛ قیسی امینگر  
صاحب - کل پرائم منسٹر صاحب  
نے جو بیان گوا کے متعلق دیا ہے -  
وہ بہت تفصیلات رکھتا ہے - گوا کی  
آزادی کے سلسلے میں جو کوشش  
گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا نے کی ہے - اس  
کی بھی اس میں چرچا ہے اور میں  
سمجھتا ہوں کہ جو جو قدم اس سلسلے  
میں حکومت نے اٹھائے ہیں - وہ  
ہندوستان کی شان کے بہت  
مقام میں اور بہتر ہیں - یہ  
بھی خوشی کی بات ہے کہ اس  
مسئلہ میں - یہی جماعتوں نے  
پارلیامنٹ میں بھی اور باہر بھی -  
حکومت کو بدھائی دی ہے - مبارکباد  
دیکھ کی ہے اور اس کے اوپر اپنا  
پورا پورا بھروسہ اور وشواس ظاہر کیا  
ہے - آخر میں جو قدم اٹھانے کا اعلان  
کیا گیا ہے وہ ساریتخانے یعنی  
لیگیشن کو بدل کرنے اور تعلقات  
مقطع کرنے کے متعلق ہے - وہ قدم  
بھی کئی سیریس اور اہم ہے - میں  
ایک نتیجہ کی حیثیت سے ہی  
اس مسئلہ کو بھی دیکھتا ہوں -  
ہندوستان کی پرانی آزادی کی تاریخ

[شری ایم - ایچ - رحمن]

بھی ہمارے سامنے ہے - جس میں ہم نے دنیا کے سامنے ایک بیٹھاپہر مثال پیش کی ہے - ہمارے سب سے بڑے نیتا مہاتما گاندھی نے جس طرح ستیہکرا کو چلایا اور ہندوستان کی آزادی حاصل کر کے ایک ریکارڈ دنیا کے سامنے پیش کیا - وہ بھی اس بات کو ظاہر کرتا ہے کہ شانتی کے ساتھ پیسٹلی - اطمینان اور امن کے ساتھ صلح اور آشتی کی سہرت میں کسی معاملے کو حل کرنا آج کی دنیا میں لڑائی کے مقابلے میں بہت زیادہ مناسب - بہتر اور کامیاب راستہ ہے - اس لئے جو قدم بھی اس سلسلے میں ہماری حکومت نے اٹھایا ہے پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے جو کچھ بھی اس معاملے میں کہا ہے وہ بالکل مناسب اور قابل تعریف ہے - پہلے سالزار کی حکومت کہتی تھی کہ گوا پر ہمارا قبضہ ایک دھارمک حیثیت اور اہمیت رکھتا ہے - پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے اٹلی میں جانا اور پوپ سے مل کر اس بات کا مکمل اور تھوس جواب دیا ہے اور پرتگال کے اس پریویڈنٹ کو ختم کر دیا ہے - جیسا کہ اخباروں میں بھی آچکا ہے - انہوں نے پوپ صاحب سے بات چیت کی اور پوپ نے اعلان کیا کہ گوا کا سوال کو دھارمک سوال نہیں ہے - بلکہ وہ ایک پولیٹیکل مسئلہ ہے - اس طرح پرتگال کا وہ قبضہ بھی جیسی کا

نہیں دے سکا - فرانس نے عقلمندی دکھائی - اس نے سمجھ لیا کہ جب انکا بڑا ہندوستان آزاد ہو سکتا ہے تو یہ چھوٹا سا علاقہ بھی اس کے ہاتھ میں نہیں رہ سکتا ہے - اس نے ہندوستان کے ساتھ سمجھوتہ کر کے اپنی عقلمندی کا ثبوت دیا - لیکن سالزار کی فاسٹ حکومت وہ سمجھ بھی اپنے پاس نہیں رکھتی ہے - گوا کے جو لیڈر شری گائونڈے اور علوارس صاحب یہاں آئے ہیں - ان سے جو بات چیت ہوئی ہے - اس سے اندازہ ہوتا ہے کہ وہاں کے عوام نے اپنی بساط سے زیادہ ہمت دکھائی ہے اور اس آزادی کی اسٹریگل میں اپنی جان کی بازی لگائی ہوئی ہے - جب ہم بار بار یہ کہتے ہیں کہ گوا ہندوستان کا ایک آگ ہے - اور بلشہ وہ ہندوستان کا ایک حصہ ہے - ایک پارت ہے - تو پھر میں یہ نہیں سمجھتا کہ اگر وہاں کے رہنے والے لوگ گوا کے اندر آزادی کی جدوجہد کو جاری رکھیں اور ہمارے لوگ - بھارت ورش کے لوگ - ہمارے سے وہاں جا کر ایک زبردست ماس - تھیکر کے طور پر اس جدوجہد میں مدد دیں - تو اس میں کیا فرق پڑتا ہے - ہندوستان ایک بڑا ملک ہے اور گوا اس کا ایک حصہ ہے - اگر کوئی اس حصہ پر زیادتی کرتا ہے تو وہ زیادتی صرف اس حصہ پر نہیں ہے بلکہ پورے

ہندوستان پر ہے۔ اگر آج نوآبادیاتی اصول کی بنا پر گوا کو زبردستی اپنی مٹھی میں رکھ کر اس کی توہین کی جاتی ہے تو وہ محض گوا اور اس کے شہریوں کی ہی توہین نہیں ہے۔ بلکہ وہ ہندوستان اور اس کے رہنے والوں کی بھی توہین ہے۔ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے جس اسپرٹ میں اپنا بیان دیا ہے اس اسپرٹ کو مد نظر رکھتے ہوئے ہی ہم کو یہ بات کہنے کی اجازت اور گنجائش ہے۔

آخر پارلیامینٹ کے ممبران پر بھی جذبات کی ہی ذمہ داری ہے۔ وہ جلتا کے ہر نمائندے میں اور جلتا کی آواز بن کر ہی یہاں ہمتی ہوئے ہیں اور وہ آواز ان باتوں کی طرف ہماری توجہ دلاتی ہے۔ جیسا کہ ابھی سوامی جی نے فرمایا ہے ایک طرف ہماری اپنی ذمہ داری ہے اور ایک طرف حکومت کی ہے۔ دونوں ذمہ داریاں ایک ہی ہیں۔ جلتا کی ذمہ داری حکومت کے ساتھ وابستہ ہے۔ جدا نہیں ہے اور حکومت کی ذمہ داری کے ساتھ جلتا وابستہ ہے۔ اس سے جدا نہیں ہے۔ اگر ہم اس سٹیٹوٹری کا طریقہ اختیار کرتے ہیں تو حکومت اس بات کو محسوس کرے کہ وہ ایک صحیح طریقہ فعل ہے۔ اس لئے کہ گوا کے رہنے والے چاہ کتنے ہی فدائی بن کر کام کر رہے ہوں۔ مقررہ کی حکومت ایسی نظر نہیں

آتی کہ وہ اس امتیاز کو۔ اس ظلم کو بند کر دے اور اس طریقہ سے گوا کی آزادی اس کے ہاتھوں سے آسانی سے حاصل ہو جائے۔ اس لئے اگر ہم زیادہ سے زیادہ تعداد میں وہاں جا کر سٹیٹوٹری میں حصہ لیں تو صحیح یقین ہے کہ اس کا پورا اثر وہاں کی حکومت پر ہوگا۔ دنیا میں جو بات پہلے ناممکن نظر آتی تھی۔ یعلیٰ سٹیٹوٹری کر کے کسی ملک کی آزادی حاصل کرنا۔ وہ ہم نے کر کے دکھا دیا اور دنیا کے سامنے ایک نئی تاریخ پیش کر دی۔ ایک نئی مثال قائم کر دی۔ دوسری طرف حکومت کی اپنی ذمہ داری ہے۔ سٹیٹوٹری ہونے کی حیثیت سے۔ نان وائلنس کے اصول کو ماننے والا ہونے کی حیثیت سے اور پینچ شیل کے پانچ اصول اور آدرش سامنے رکھتے ہوئے۔ جو ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے ہندوستان، کا میسیڈجو ہو کر دنیا کے سامنے پیش کئے ہیں۔ ہمارے سامنے دو طریقے ہیں۔ وہ دو طریقے ہیں اقتصادی ہائیکٹ اور پولیٹیکل پریشر۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اگر ان طریقوں کو اختیار کیا جائے اور اس قسم کی کوئی کارروائی کی جائے تو یہ ہمارے سٹیٹوٹری ہونے یا امن اور شانتی کا پیغمبر ہونے کے خلاف نہیں جانا ہے۔

ہانڈنگ کانڈرٹس میں جلتی بھی سطلتوں جمع ہوئی تھیں انہوں نے

[شری ایم اے ایچ اے رحمن]

نوابادیاک کے طریقے کو کلفیم کیا تھا -  
 آج ہم کو سلوں اور پاکستان سے  
 کہنا چاہئے کہ سالزار کی حکومت  
 کو سٹیڈیگریوں کے خلاف ان کی مدن  
 نہ ملے - حکومت کے لئے ہمارا یہ  
 مشورہ کوئی ایسا مشورہ نہیں ہے کہ  
 ہم اس سے جدا ہو کر کوئی بات سوچ  
 رہے ہوں - ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب  
 نے ایک مضبوط پالیسی اختیار کی  
 ہے - ہم بھی اس کا ایک جز ہو کر -  
 ہم بھی ہندوستان کے ایک بازو بن کر  
 ان کو یہ مشورہ دینے کا حقیقی  
 دکھتے ہیں کہ ایک طرف حکومت  
 ایسے قدم اٹھائے جس سے تیزی کے  
 ساتھ وہ چھوڑ حاصل ہو سکے جسے  
 ہم حاصل کرنا چاہتے ہیں - اور ایک  
 طرف ہم سٹیڈیگری کی جدوجہد کے  
 ذریعہ لامہابی حاصل کریں تاکہ  
 سالزار کی حکومت یہ متصووس کرے  
 کہ آج کی دنیا میں یہ ممکن نہیں  
 ہے کہ وہ آزاد ہندوستان کے ایک  
 حصے کو دہائے رہے - یہ چوڑا ناقابل  
 برداشت ہے - اس معاملے میں  
 حکومت کی بھی یہ ذمہ داریاں ہیں  
 کہ وہ اندامک باتھکات کرے اور پولیٹیکل  
 پریشر ڈالے - اور دوسری طرف ماس  
 سٹیڈیگری کیا جائے - اگر ہم ایسا قدم  
 اٹھائیں تو ہم اپنی حکومت کو بھی  
 مضبوط بنائیں گے - لہذا ہم اپنی  
 حکومت میں پورا اعتماد رکھتے ہوئے  
 اور اس کے ساتھ ساتھ اپنی ذمہ داری

کو متصووس کرتے ہوئے یہ مشورہ  
 دینا چاہتے ہیں -

(English translation of the above  
 speech)

Shri M. H. Rahman (Moradabad  
 Dist.—Central): Sir, the statement  
 made yesterday by the Prime Minister  
 on Goa was a very detailed one. It  
 also mentioned the steps taken by the  
 Government of India in connection  
 with the liberation of Goa. I am of  
 opinion that the steps taken by  
 Government in this connection are  
 commensurate with her position. It  
 is a matter of gratification that all the  
 parties in the House as well as out-  
 side have congratulated the Govern-  
 ment on having taken those steps;  
 they have also expressed their confi-  
 dence in the Government. The last  
 step contemplated, namely, the closing  
 down of the Legations and breaking  
 of diplomatic relations is serious and  
 important. I look at this problem from  
 the point of view of a *satyagrahi*. As  
 the old history of this country's strug-  
 gle for independence shows, we have  
 set a singular example in this matter  
 before the world. The way our  
 greatest leader, Mahatma Gandhi, con-  
 ducted the *satyagrahas* and attained  
 independence for the country is a new  
 record in the world and it shows that  
 in these times to settle a problem  
 pacifically and in a spirit of compro-  
 mise is a much more successful and  
 better method than war. The steps  
 taken by our Government in this con-  
 nection and the statement of the  
 Prime Minister are very commendable  
 and proper. The Salazar Government  
 used to say that their occupation of  
 Goa involved a matter of religious  
 significance and was important from  
 that point of view. But the visit of  
 the Prime Minister to Italy and his  
 meeting with the Pope has furnished  
 a proper answer to this statement and  
 has put an end to that kind of pro-  
 paganda by the Portuguese. The Prime  
 Minister, as reported in the Press also,  
 had talks with the Pope who declared  
 that the question of Goa was not a

religious question; on the other hand it was purely a political problem. This has rendered futile the argument put forward by the Portuguese. The French Government have given proof of their political foresight in withdrawing voluntarily from their possessions in India as they realized that when so large a country as India could become free, her possessions therein, which formed a small part of it, could not remain under her domination. So they came to terms with India. But Salazar's fascist regime lacks even that much good sense. I have talked to the Goan leaders, Shri Galtonde and Alvares, who are here and I have gathered that the people of Goa have shown more courage than was expected from them and have staked their all on this struggle for independence. We have reiterated many times that Goa is a part of India—undoubtedly it is an integral part of our country—and it is but natural that people from India should enter Goa and support the local people in keeping the mass *satyagraha* going. India is a big country and Goa is a part of it; if any excesses are committed in any part of India it is not that part alone which suffers; these excesses are committed on India as whole. If the Portuguese persist in retaining their stranglehold on Goa as their colony and thereby insult her it is not an insult offered to Goa or her citizens alone but to the whole of India and her people. I hope we can also say this in view of the spirit in which the Prime Minister has made his statement.

After all, we, as Members of Parliament, are responsible to the people, whom we represent. We are the voice of the people and have, therefore, to attend to these problems. As Swamiji has just remarked, the responsibility, on the one hand, is ours and on the other, it is that of Government. But it is all one and the same thing; the responsibility of the Government is closely connected with the responsibility of the people in this matter. If we adopt the method of mass *satyagraha* the Government must feel that

this is the right method; because with whatever perseverance the people of Goa might be working for the liberation of their land, the Salazar Government is not the one to relent. It will not stop the atrocities that it is committing on the people of Goa and it is not probable that they will get their independence easily. In view of this if we go to Goa in large numbers and participate in the *satyagraha* there, I hope it will have its effect on the Government there. We have set a new precedent before the world by achieving the impossible i.e. liberating our country by *satyagraha*. On the other hand, there is also the responsibility of the Government. As a *satyagrahi* a believer in non-violence and the principles of *Panch Sheela* as expounded to the world by our Prime Minister as the apostle of Peace, I think that there are two ways open to us, namely economic boycott and political pressure. I think that the adoption of these methods does not violate our principles of *satyagraha* and our belief in a peaceful approach to such problems.

All the Powers represented at the Bandung Conference had condemned colonialism. We should ask Ceylon and Pakistan not to help the Salazar Government in its action against the *satyagrahis*. This advice is not something which we are offering as people detached from the Government. Our Prime Minister has adopted a strong policy. Being Indians and being believers in that policy we have a right to suggest that the Government should take such steps as might help in the quick solution of this problem. On the one hand we should carry on mass *satyagraha* to its successful conclusion so that the Salazar Government should feel that it is not possible today to keep a part of free India in subjugation. This is intolerable. On the other hand, the Government also has its responsibility in the matter. They should apply economic sanctions and bring political pressure to bear on the Portuguese Government.

I offer this advice with full confidence in our Government and also

[Shri M. H. Rahman.]

with the fullest realisation of my responsibilities.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Cairtor): Sir, today's debate on this issue of Goa has been a very subdued one. With the exception of Acharya Kripalani a proper approach to this problem has not been submitted by anyone. It is an irony of fate that we are talking in terms of Goa and Goans. We have to just look at the map of India to see whether we can put the name of Goa and Goans in our vocabulary or have only to think in terms of certain Portuguese possessions in our country. We have to see that Goa is there. We have to see that Daman is there and we have also to see that Diu is there. Now, we cannot take Goa as a separate unit but we have to consider Goa in relation to the Portuguese possessions which includes Goa, Panjim, Daman and Diu. Taking these into the picture we will find that Goa is not a country. It is just a small possession of the Portuguese and if it is merely a small possession which is possessed by the Portuguese then there is no reason for us to suggest that the struggle must be from inside and that the Goans must struggle for getting their independence.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I very humbly submit, and the House will agree with me, that it is the struggle of the Indian nation to throw away the last vestige of the foreign yoke that exists in our country. It was in the year 1739, when Salsette and Baasein were still in the possession of the Portuguese, just after a struggle of one month the Peshwas drove away the Portuguese from there. If the British had not stepped in, probably, by this time there would not have been any existence of any Portuguese possessions in India. We cannot but accept this position that there is absolutely no difference between Hyderabad as such in the year 1947 and the Portuguese possessions that do exist today. The struggle for liberating Hyderabad was as much an Indian struggle as the struggle for liberating Goa. We cannot call upon

our countrymen to go and offer satyagraha before people who are not civilised, but on the contrary who are acting as barbarians; who are inflicting punishment of barbarous type and even meting out corporal punishments to those satyagrahis who go there unarmed. They beat them with a desire either to kill them or with a desire to kill their spirits. It is with such people that we are trying to offer satyagraha.

And, why offer satyagraha today? Are we very weak? We have got a saying:

अशक्तिमान् भवेत् साधुः ।

That is not the position. We are not 'अशक्तिमान्' (powerless) today. We are powerful today and mere show of power would be enough to drive out the Portuguese from where they are. They, a small nation, hardly even as big as the older, smaller States of Mewar and Jodhpur in Rajasthan, sitting at a distance of 5,000 miles from us are trying to thwart us in our desire to free our countrymen from the yoke under which they are suffering.

Sir, it is not that I do not approve of the action which is being taken by the Government. But, then, we should at some stage say: "Thus far and no further". My hon. friend Shri Gadgil when he was speaking said that we should wait, we should develop world opinion, we should suffer and then, only if we find that they do not come round to our views, we should take some action. I say, we cannot go on waiting till eternity. And, certainly not when we have got the power to do a particular thing. When we have got the power to wrest the particular possessions which still remain in the hands of the Portuguese, there is no reason why we should not exercise that power. Therefore, Kripalaniji when he was saying that he distinguished between war and war, I said: "No use. Even we do not want to make use of the word 'war'". The late Vallabhbhai Patel coined a very

nice word when Hyderabad was taken. He said it was 'police action'. Here we have to drive out people from our own territory; people who are living just near us; people who have usurped a part of our own territory and they go on saying to many things. Dr. Salazar has said very recently—I do not know how far that utterance is correct, but that is what we have read in the papers—that: "talk of anything about Goa, but not of yielding its sovereignty". Who is he to say that it is a question of sovereignty for him? The sovereignty over Goa is—the undisputed sovereignty of Goa—is that of the Indian nation and it is this that has to be established.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** I have hardly spoken for four minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no time left. The hon. Prime Minister has to start at five o'clock.

**An Hon. Member:** It is a question of police action.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** Then I would request the Prime Minister to give me four or five minutes more to speak.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not in the hands of the Prime Minister to give the Hon. Member more time. It is a matter for the Chair to decide.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** We have been able to liberate a portion of Goa and it was that Nagar Haveli which we had liberated last year. Nagar Haveli is in our possession—thanks to the Azad Gomantak Dal that we were able to liberate that particular area and that is still with us. But, unfortunately, even there we are afraid that lest the Portuguese might be annoyed with us we have not yet been able to march over that territory which is ours. The days are gone when we have to depend upon the good certificates from the people of Portugal in our own territory. As we treat this merely as our domestic affair it behoves us that we should not ask for certificates from

the International Court or from people outside our country. We have to decide the fate of our own country. Here we are enjoying liberty. We are all Indians here in this whole country. We are enjoying liberty. We are enjoying peace and we see with our own eyes that our own people in the Portuguese possessions are being made to suffer and made to suffer heavily. Are we going to tolerate this state of affairs? I, therefore, say that as far as the Government has gone, it may be good; but the Government should go still further and think in terms of wresting the property which belongs to us and which is being usurped by those who have no right to live there. They must be driven out at the earliest opportunity that we can.

5 P.M.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Yesterday I made a statement before the House outlining the policy that Government was pursuing in regard to Goa. I must express my deep gratitude to Members who have spoken in this House today for their broad appreciation of this subject and their general acceptance of the policy of Government. There have been some criticisms, but, on the whole, the area of agreement is very large and the area of disagreement limited and narrow.

Now, there is no one in this House who requires any argument about the justification of India's claim to Goa. That is obvious. There is hardly any question that has come before this House which has had such unanimous approval or agreement. The only questions that have arisen are as to the steps that might be taken to give effect to India's claim. Even there—I will not say that all the Members of the House—so far as I can understand, it is by and large the opinion of this House that the methods should be peaceful. So we limit our approach to this problem considerably.

Now, although it does not require that anything should be said in justification of our claim to Goa, nevertheless, I shall venture to mention a few facts, perhaps more, if I may say so.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

for consumption by others who are not so wise as Members of this House are. There is, of course, the geographical argument. Now, the Portuguese Government claims that Goa is a part of Portugal. Sometimes that remark is made which is so illogical and absurd that it is rather difficult to deal with it. You are suddenly transported into a land where logic does not prevail. To say that Goa is a part of Portugal is something in the nature of a nursery tale or nursery rhyme about the cat jumping over the moon. It has no relation to facts and any kind of will, decree or law passed in Portugal is not going to make Goa a part of Portugal.

Then, a reference is made to a number of treaties,—treaties more especially with the British Government,—between the United Kingdom or England as it was then, and Portugal; and there is the NATO alliance. I think it has been made fairly clear by responsible people that the NATO alliance—whether we approve of it or disapprove of it is another matter—has little relevance to this question. It has been stated that under that alliance, a subject like Goa or indeed any other subject can be brought up for discussion, but that alliance is not by any means compelled to deal with such problems or go beyond its narrower periphery of action. We may, therefore, set aside the NATO alliance.

Then there are these treaties with the various British Governments. I think the first one is dated 1374. It is fairly a long time ago. These treaties began, as far as I can remember, with an attempt by the then King of Portugal to protect themselves against the then King of Castille, that is, Spain. This was soon after the Arabs or the Moors as they were called, were driven out of the Iberian Peninsula; and Portugal was rather afraid of Castille which was growing in strength. These treaties were also aimed against the Hollanders as they were called or the Dutch, who were spreading out. In

the course of these treaties all kinds of provisions were made about the right of Portugal to go and raise armies directly in England. This later treaty of 1660 might interest the House:

"That His Majesty of Portugal, or any one whom he may depute, shall be permitted to raise and procure in this Commonwealth,"

that is, England,

"soldiers and horses, to defend and secure himself against the King of Castille".

"And that the Military Force, which he shall be at liberty to levy do not amount to more than 12,000, namely, 4,000 out of each of the three Nations of England, Scotland and Ireland respectively".

Sitting here, I was—most naturally—following carefully all that was said, but sometimes, I picked up a volume of these ancient treaties to look through them to know what after all and where these treaties were. I am afraid this volume is as old as the treaty. It has gone to pieces. It was rather interesting reading—the archaic language of five or six hundred years ago.

Then we come to that famous treaty in which the port town or what is called the town and port of Bomaïne was handed over at the time when King Charles II of England married the Portuguese princess. There are all kinds of references to the port of Bombaine and Colombo, and that is the whole background.

I am mentioning these rather irrelevant facts to indicate how that complete picture of the world ceased to exist many hundreds of years ago. After that, there were ancient treaties which were several times confirmed by subsequent treaties or something else was added to them, and there was a confirmation clause. In the treaty of 1661, when the town and port of Bomaïne was handed over, there was a

secret clause. It is that secret clause to which reference is often made as it was under that secret clause that England promised to help and protect Portugal and her colonies in 1661. It might interest the House to know that in spite of these various treaties - I am not going into many other historical incidents - later in this country, I think in 1912, a little before the first world war, there were actually negotiations between England and Germany for a partition of the Portuguese Empire. The negotiations led to other events including a big war. But I merely mention this to indicate what value is attached to many of these ancient treaties. Of course, every constitutional lawyer and historian knows that any treaty or any agreement has to be interpreted in terms of the existing circumstances. If Portugal, for instance, today in terms of that treaty claims the right to raise an army directly in England, Scotland or Ireland. I have little doubt that the United Kingdom would refuse to acknowledge that fact, although there it is. So, it is rather absurd to talk about these ancient treaties in these terms. A treaty has to be seen in terms of the historical developments that have taken place since then. Apart from the historical changes that have taken place in the last four or five hundred years, - and they have been tremendous, - particular changes that have taken place recently, - relatively recently, - are quite enough for us, that is to say, historical developments which have taken place in India resulting in the independence of India. Of course, so far as independent India is concerned, it is in no way bound by any old or modern treaty between other countries to which we have not subscribed, so that in no event are we concerned with the treaty between Portugal, England and other countries. But quite apart from the fact that we are not bound, I am trying to indicate that nobody else is bound by them, because they have only to be construed in the light of other developments. These developments have been startling, developments resulting in independence of India. The Independence

of India was never conceived as the independence of a part of India, as the independence of India excluding certain areas which may be controlled by some other authority and certainly by some authority outside India. It is inconceivable that you can conceive of the independence of India big parts of India being held by an outside authority. The House will remember that long ago, over one forty or more years ago, sometime after the United States had established themselves as a strong nation, even then there was the fear of interference by European powers in the American continents and this led to the famous declaration by President Monroe of the United States. This was in 1823:

"The United States would regain as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to itself the effort of any European power to interfere with the political system of the American continents." That is to say any interference by any European country would be an interference with the American political system. I submit that in the existing conditions - I place my case quite clearly - that the Portuguese retention of India is a continuing interference with the political system established in India today. That need not be called a particular doctrine; it is just a recognition of the present fact. It may be that we are weak and we cannot prevent that interference. That is a sign of weakness, but that does not matter. The fact is that any foreign power trying to interfere in any way with India is a thing which India cannot tolerate and subject to her strength, it will be opposed. That is the broad doctrine I lay down. That applies in the existing conditions to the Portuguese retention of Goa and therefore, for a variety of reasons into which I need not go, - reasons if you like of national unity, national security and all that, - we cannot possibly accept such interference or such foothold, however small it may be. The

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Size has nothing to do with it, because if it is a foothold it is a foothold and it is an interference and a possible danger in the future, more so for a country which itself is tied up with all kinds of alliances. When it has that foothold, it means that is a foothold not of that country, but a group of countries with a large number of alliances, and therefore, all kinds of possible dangers and entanglements might arise.

I do submit that the case of India is regarded to Goa is as clear as any case that I can think of and it should not require really any tremendous arrangements to justify it. But various types of arguments are raised by the Portuguese Government and they are strange. Therefore I thought I could venture to repeat what I have said. Now again, I am not going into the old history of the Portuguese possession of Goa; but I think many Members will remember that this history is a very dark period of India's history. I am talking about a fact of a considerably early period. We have had dark periods in various parts of the country; I do not lay stress on it. But I mention it because Goa is repeatedly referred to as a shining light of European culture. Well, what European culture is, opinions may differ. I do not give my opinion; it may or may not be accepted. But I should like to put it to Europe itself and to the countries of Europe if they think that the culture represented Goa today, or even if I may with respect say by Portugal, represents the European culture at its highest and brightest in any field - political, social, economic or cultural.

Then there is this religious argument. Hon. Members belonging to the Roman Catholic church have spoken today in this House as they have spoken elsewhere. I do not think anything that will happen in Goa is going to affect our broad policy in regard to religious freedom; but the attitude that the Portuguese Government takes is just the attitude which is to make some people view this question from

a narrower point of view than we like then to, that is, the very thing it accuses us of trying to do, it does but I do not think that will affect us. That is another matter. Hon. Members know how many Catholics have taken part in this struggle for freedom in Goa and how many from outside Goa. Therefore, let us be clear. From every point of view this question of Goa has to be decided and there can be only one decision and that is, its merger with the Indian Union.

One hon. Member, may be Dr. Lanka Sundaram or perhaps Acharya Kripalani, said that the fact of Goa joining the Indian Union is not an arguable point. We do not go and discuss with the Portuguese Government as to whether Goa is to be part of the Indian Union or not. The only thing that we can discuss with them, - I have no doubt the time will come and it will be discussed - is the manner of doing it, the legal or other steps that have to be taken. That is why our approach has been throughout, both in the case of the French possessions and the Portuguese possessions in India, that the other party should recognise this basic fact, and also give us *de facto* possession of those areas and then the legal steps can follow at leisure. That is what exactly has happened in regard to the French settlements. Even now, strictly the legal and constitutional position is rather doubtful. But, *de facto* they are part of India. I have no doubt, - it may take 1 or 2 or 3 months - this House as well as the French Parliament will have to legalise this. *De facto* possession becomes *de jure* and they become formally and juristically part of India. We do not mind if there is some delay. We are prepared to accommodate the other Government concerned in these matters. But, where the basic right is denied, there is no question of argument. Any argument, any negotiation with Portugal denying that right is not possible.

There is another point that I wish to make clear. When we say that this is a matter of special concern to the

Goans, it does not mean that the matter is of lesser concern to Indians. What was said was in connection with certain types of movements and agitation that were going on. The future of Goa, that is, the union of Goa with India is a matter of special, intense, equal concern to every Indian as to every Goan. There is no difference in that matter.

We now turn to the question of what are the methods to be employed. Acharya Kripalani put a straight question as to whether our Government was pledged to non-violence. The answer to that is 'No, the Government is not.' As far as I can conceive, under the existing circumstances, no Government can be pledged to non-violence. If we were pledged to non-violence, surely we would not keep any Army, Navy or Air Force and possibly not even a police force: I do not know. One may have an ideal. One may adhere to a policy leading to a certain direction and yet, because of existing circumstances one cannot give effect to that ideal. We have to wait for it for some time. Acharya Kripalani reminded us of Mahatma Gandhi saying that the Polish defence against the German armies might also be called *satyagraha*. Also Gandhiji defended, in fact not only defended, but encouraged the Indian Army to go to Kashmir, to defend Kashmir against the raiders. It is surprising that a man like Gandhiji, who was absolutely committed to non-violence, should do that kind of thing. So that, even he, in certain circumstances, admitted the right of the State, as it is constituted, to commit violence in defence. It is true. Obviously, the Government of India cannot give up that right in the existing circumstances. Nevertheless, we have made it perfectly clear and we have based our policy on this that we shall use force only in defence, that we shall not provoke a war or start a war or adopt any aggressive tactics in regard to a war. It may be that sometimes it is very difficult to draw a line and be clear as to what is happening. Broadly speaking, this is our policy.

From that policy many things flow. Our armaments, our Army, Navy and the Air Force are strictly meant for defence purposes. That is to say, we arm our Army, Navy and the Air Force with a view to defence. There used to be an Expeditionary Force in the British times. We have none. We are not going to send any force anywhere else. There are weapons of war to strike at a long distance. We keep none of these. We have no intention of striking at a long distance. Our own conception in keeping the Army, Navy and the Air Force is defence, effective defence, strong defence, but defence. May be that defence may overstep somewhat in a conflict. That is a different matter. At any time we have to apply that approach to this question, to any of our activities wherever they may be, whether that activity is taking us away from that or in the right direction. At any time, I said. Much more so today, when, fortunately for us and for the world, there has been a rather remarkable turn for the better. One cannot say definitely what that turn is. One cannot precisely measure it. But, I think all of us will agree that there has been a great improvement in the general atmosphere of the world. Cold war, conflicts, hatred, etc.—they will not vanish away quickly. All these things are still there. Nevertheless, it does appear—I do not think this is wishful thinking—that humanity has taken a turn in the right direction. In that, many factors have worked. It would be completely wrong for anyone to say that this country or that country has brought it about. It is really because of the efforts of many countries and to a very small extent our effort also that all this thing is happening. In circumstances like these, more especially, we have to view every step that we take, even a small local step, in this larger context. I would have said, even without this larger context, following the general policy that we do, we should have considered this question of Goa and come to the conclusion that only peaceful methods should be employed. But, in this larger con-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

text, that becomes even more important.

Some hon. Members opposite talked about a limited war, Goa being small and India being big. That, I think, ignores the fact that the world is much more a unit today, far more for peace, than it ever was before. I do not say that it is impossible for some country or for India to have a limited war: may be conceivably possible. It may yield results too. May I here say something about Acharya Kripalani's quoting me as having said that war has never brought any results. I do not think I have ever said that. What I have said is that whatever war may have done in the long past, it cannot bring results now. I have gone further and said that the last two great wars have certainly brought many results; not the results sought for, but something entirely different from what the people wanted. Victory is not a result. Victory is only a way to achieve a result. They brought victory to a certain set of powers, but also greater problems to the world. However, that is a different proposition. Whatever war may have done in the past, in the present state of affairs in the world I think it is right that any major war cannot bring the results aimed at. What it will bring no man knows today. And if you rule out a major war, as I think the world should, then you have to apply the same argument to a small war not because a small war is qualitatively the same thing—it is not—but, nevertheless, a small war helps also to keep up the atmosphere which creates a big war. It is a step in the wrong direction. Here we are fighting against these vague ghosts and phantoms which create cold war—sometimes real fears, sometimes unreal fears—on a certain level, on a certain political level, on a certain psychological level, moral level and all that. If we ourselves move away from that level and base ourselves on some kind of what somebody calls a police action or a limited war, then we are injuring all the larger causes that we stand for,

and possibly getting ourselves entangled into great difficulties. It seems to me it would be exceedingly unwise to take a step which not only is opposed to the basic policies that we have been pursuing but which may for reasons entirely practical and reasons of our national interest may create difficulties for us. When it is as certain as almost anything can be that in the course of time—I do not mean in the long course of time—it is quite inevitable that Goa becomes an integral part of India, are we to lose all the possible major benefits of pursuing a right policy by taking this risk, by doing something wrong according to that policy and at the same time taking a risk which might endanger us to some extent? Because, you cannot isolate these things. You have to see the full picture of the consequences of an action. If we have to consider what we have to do in Goa—or, be it in any other part of the world—we have not only to consider the step we have to take, but the successive steps we may have to take; the second, third, fourth, fifth, right up to the tenth and twentieth. No Government or no responsible person can take a step without thinking of the consequences or just leaving others to face the consequences. There are no others. The people of India are concerned. We have to face the consequences.

Now, then, it being admitted and settled that the policy we should pursue is a peaceful policy, it is open to us in the terms of that peaceful policy to do much. I need not go into details. Some Members referred to economic blockade and this and that. Obviously, it is open to us to pursue those policies, and many others.

Reference has been made to *satyagraha*, mass *satyagraha*, individual *satyagraha* and the like. To begin with, the Government of India or any government, does not talk or deal with *satyagraha* in that way. An Hon. Member suggested that the Government of India should lead the *satyagraha* movement into Goa. That, if I may say so with all respect, mixes up

the functions of the Government, as if the Government was an agitational body agitating for somebody against somebody else. No Government will perform *satyagraha*, can perform *satyagraha*. I do not know; I have made the statement. When I make that statement naturally I am thinking of *satyagraha* in the normal terms it has been performed. There may be some possible extensions of that move which are beyond my mind at the present moment. But, *satyagraha* as we know it has been performed within our country against a governmental apparatus. It may be performed against another governmental apparatus. But one government performing it against another government is, for the moment, not clear to me—how that is done.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): It is non-violent war.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Dist.—Central): It is Ram Rajya war.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Therefore, let us not get mixed up. Many hon. Members who have had the privilege of being initiated into the *satyagraha* movement during this Goan campaign probably have had no previous experience of this, nor have they understood either the technique or the theory of it, always excluding of course some hon. Members opposite who have that knowledge. *Satyagraha*—I will not go into that matter, but it is an interesting subject which I should like to discuss on some other occasion here or elsewhere.

Another Hon. Member suggested that we should call upon the Portuguese Government to treat them as prisoners of war. It will not be correct that, while we or anybody can claim what I would call civilised treatment for anybody, and more so for peaceful people, peaceful *satyagrahis*, we should call upon them to treat it as a war. Who is at war with them—the Government of India or some local organisation has declared war against Portugal? You get hopelessly entangled in matters of this kind.

So far as our Government is concerned, we have nothing to do with *satyagraha*. If something wrong is done in our territory, we stop it. If no wrong is done well, we permit it to the extent that no wrong is done. That is the governmental viewpoint. You may view it, of course, from the public viewpoint apart from governmental. A party can view it; the Congress organisation may view it too as to what, under the circumstances, to do. It has a perfect right to do as other parties and organisations have a right. They may view it, but the Government cannot think, conceive of the question in terms of its patronising *satyagraha*. The most it can do is to, well, not interfere, provided it is within certain limits, provided it is non-violent and so on and so forth; provided also that it does not lead to a situation of violence on a big scale. That has also to be considered. Therefore, when one talks about mass *satyagraha*, it is not because mass *satyagraha* itself is wrong, but because the manner of doing it is likely to lead or may lead to unknown results and rather large-scale violence. It may cease to be *satyagraha*, or it may be compelled to turn in some other direction. If there were, I suppose, an adequate number of trained *satyagrahis* well, they might even indulge in mass *satyagraha* in a properly disciplined way. The House would remember that the arch-oldest of *satyagraha* Mahatmajis—suddenly put a full stop to the whole movement and said "Only one man will go now". We are novices. We do not pretend to understand all these important points. But, one thing is clear—that, if we want a settlement of this question by peaceful methods, we should not do anything or we should try to avoid doing things which, though peaceful in themselves, lead to violent methods. Because then you have to be prepared for that violence and you have to be prepared for the second and third step of violence. Whatever we do we must do with our eyes open and not in a confused way, doing something in a rather excited way and then hoping that something will come out of it.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

something good will come out of it. That, surely, is not a proper way for a Government to function or indeed for any organisation to function. Therefore, I submit that while Government will no doubt act on the policy enunciated—and in that enunciation of policy there are large areas of possible development—it should not be thought that whatever can be done has been done by Government. There are possibilities of much more to be done in a proper way; it takes a little time sometimes. And I think what Government has done or is likely to do can by no means be considered ineffective. It is effective, and it may be progressively more effective. That is the Government side of it. So far as the other side is concerned, Government cannot lay down anything except a negative side, because the public organisations have to consider that—whatever that may be; may be, my own organisation may consider it, and other people's also, but Government cannot; Government will only consider that that organisation functions within the limits that have been indicated.

One thing I should like to mention. There has been a so-called constitutional statute introduced or sought to be introduced by the Portuguese Government in Goa, Daman and Diu, evidently trying to create some impression on the people there. This constitutional statute is a very very feeble attempt at local reform, giving absolutely no authority or power. Briefly speaking, the position even after this will be that out of 23 seats in a new council which is elected under a very limited franchise, 11 will be elected, i.e. less than half; and the whole thing is very restrictive. And even this council does not get much power. In fact, all power remains in the hands of a handful of officials. Oddly enough, the position in Goa not only today but even after this constitutional statute will be that they will have less free-

dom,—if I may use the word in a limited sense—than Goa had under the monarchy in Portugal. It is extraordinary. They go on backwards there. Instead of there being some advance in local reforms, they have actually become more and more restricted.

I would again say that in considering these matters now—these or other matters—we cannot consider them from a purely narrow, local or even national point of view. Whether we will it or not, we have become parts of an international community which is spread out all over the world. If we remember that, and if we remember that every action of ours has reactions elsewhere just as other actions have reactions here, then perhaps we shall be able to judge these matters in the proper perspective.

**Shri Kamath:** On a point of clarification. May I ask whether Government are at least prepared to give medical, legal and transport facilities to individual and mass satyagrahis on the border? Government can do that.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Perhaps I may give a parallel, but I would not give the parallel now. So far as this is concerned, it is the ordinary function of various authorities to give medical aid where necessary.

**Shri Kamath:** They are not giving it now.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Medical aid or sometimes even legal aid. That is not the function of Government as such. Even local bodies there presumably give it. It is the function of any representative of Government who happens to be there to give medical aid or other aid; that is obvious. But when he talks about transport aid, it is rather extraordinary.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now stand adjourned and meet again at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 27th July 1955.