

14193

14194

LOK SABHA

Saturday, 17th September, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(No Questions: Part I not published).

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION ✓

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

"That the present international situation and policy of Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration." ✓

Nearly six months ago, I spoke in this House on foreign affairs. That was, I think, in connection with the Demands for Grants. At that time I drew attention to the state of international affairs and I pointed out that the prospect was a very gloomy one. The situation had hardened and there was danger of catastrophe of world war or something leading to it and a general pall of fear. The guns were all loaded and fingers were on the triggers. I am happy to say that the situation now has improved greatly during these six months. The guns are still loaded, but the fingers are not on the triggers. I do not wish to paint too rosy a picture of the world which is today, because there are numerous dark spots and danger zones. Nevertheless, I think it is correct to say that there has been an improvement in the atmosphere all

round; and for the first time people all over the world have a sense of relief, the sense that war is not inevitable or is not coming, in fact, that it can well be avoided. I think that the biggest thing that has gradually evolved in people's minds all over the world has been, if I may use the word, futility of war, that war does not—modern war at least does not—solve any major problem and that therefore all problems, however difficult and intricate they might be, should be approached peacefully and an attempt should be made to solve them by negotiated settlement. Now, that may seem a simple thing to say and yet I think it is of high significance that more and more people have thought and spoken in these terms. I am not referring to the people of India, because we have always said something like that; but countries, great and powerful countries, which have placed their reliance considerably on their military might, today speak in different terms. That I think is a fact of a very great importance, because it may well be that this heralds an entirely new approach all over the world. Again I repeat that I do not wish to appear to be too optimistic, because there are danger spots all over and there are still many people who believe, perhaps they have said so, in warlike methods to solve them. But, an evergrowing number of people in all countries look towards peaceful methods and have turned away from those people who think in terms of war.

Soon after I spoke last time in this House six months ago, there took place the Bandung Conference. That was, as everyone knows, a very significant event not only in the history of Asia, but in world affairs, and I think it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

led to many other developments. In the Bandung Conference the 30 nations assembled there produced a document signed and accepted by all of them in favour of peaceful methods, and of course, against colonialism and racialism. That was, I submit, a remarkable achievement, considering that the nations represented at the Bandung Conference differed in their outlooks greatly, in their policies greatly. Yet, they found a common ground in regard to these basic approaches. It was a significant example of people trying to find common ground. In spite of differences, of peaceful co-existence.

Thereafter, many things happened. I am not going to detail them. But, round about that time, before and after, there was the Austrian Peace Treaty which removed one troublesome question from the long list of problems which Europe normally nourishes. The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia ended a rather longstanding dispute. There was a new approach to disarmament. There was the invitation then, which has taken effect now, by the Soviet Union to Chancellor Adenauer, and a number of other factors. Above all, there was the Four Power Conference in Geneva: the four Great Powers. That Conference did not produce any blueprint, did not produce and resolutions, etc. Nevertheless, without doing anything definite, it made a tremendous difference to the whole aspect of things in the world. All the four eminent representatives there, no doubt deserve credit but I would like to mention more specially in this connection the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. The world looked with some surprise and great gratification at the melting away to some extent of the high walls and barriers that had existed between these countries.

Subsequently, quite recently, two or three events have taken place. One was the conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Geneva,

which turned the world's mind towards these peaceful uses, because, the average person has only thought of the atomic energy as something destructive and catastrophic. Now, it appears that it could be used for the advancement of humanity and the choice before the world thus became clearer still as to whether they are going the way of war and infinite destruction or the way of peace and almost, if not infinite, tremendous advancement of humanity.

Then, there has been the recent visit of Chancellor Adenauer to Moscow resulting in some kind of Agreement. The Agreement does not go far. We must not expect suddenly all problems to be resolved. The problem of Germany is very far from solution. I would not like to say when it would be solved satisfactorily to all parties.

But, the fact to remember is that that problem is removed from the arena of possible conflict to the conference table. That itself is a tremendous gain. Therefore, this agreement between the Soviet Union and Chancellor Adenauer, although it does not go far, is nevertheless a gain for the lessening of tension and for the peaceful solution of problems.

Again, for some weeks past in Geneva the Ambassadors of the United States of America and the People's Government of China have been meeting and discussing a relatively small matter, that is, the return of their civilians to their respective countries, and it was announced some time ago, a few days ago, that an agreement had been reached in regard to this matter. As I said, it does not go very far. The major questions affecting China and the United States remain. The whole far-eastern problem remains. The future of Korea is still among the undecided questions. Formosa or Taiwan, or even those little islands, Quemoy and Matsu, about which there has for long been a general concensus of opi-

nion that they should, whatever other matters might be decided, go to the mainland—even that problem remains. And yet the House should remember that there has been some kind of a sea change over it all. We have not heard for a long time now of a major conflict in the China seas. Whether there has been any official agreement or not—and there has been none—the fact is that people move away from this idea of settling things by military measures, and have greater hopes of a peaceful settlement.

Now, all these changes have taken place which point to this one direction—the growth in people's minds of an aversion to war, or, if you like the fear of war, and a desire to settle problems peacefully. Now, it is true, I suppose, that this change in people's mind is partly at least due to the fact that they realise the tremendous potentialities for destruction of the new nuclear weapons, the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb and all its progeny. That is a major fact. And yet, I think, it is not that fact alone, but rather, well, if I may say so with all respect, a return to wisdom and goodwill, a reaction from these long years of war and cold war and the people getting tired of them because they led nowhere at all they realised,—it has solved no problem, it only kept them at a high pitch of effort, excitement, anger and hatred—a turning away from that in the direction of "Well, let us try to settle these problems in some other way, even though they might take some time".

Where does India come into this picture? It would be an exaggeration to say that India has made a major difference to world policy. We must not exaggerate our role, but it is a fact that India has on significant occasions made a difference and that difference has led to certain consequences.

During the last several years India has been called upon to undertake international duties in Korea, in Indo-China and elsewhere. And now, as the House knows, there is a proposal that India should undertake some

responsibilities in regard to the Chinese civilians or nationals in the United States of America. India has, I think it may be said without undue exaggeration, played a significant role in times of difficulty. It was not often enough a public role—and we did not, and we do not, desire to publicise it—but a gentle role of friendly approach to the parties concerned, which has sometimes helped in bringing the others nearer to one another. We have never sought to be, and we have never acted as, mediators. Let us be quite clear about it. And we have no desire to act as such. The word 'mediator' is often branded about. Therefore, I wish to make it perfectly clear. There is no question of mediation between great countries. All we have suggested and sought to bring about is that those countries should face each other, talk to each other and decide their problems themselves. It is not for us or for others to come in and advise them what to do. But we can sometimes remove obstacles which have arisen during the last few years.

Now, India's contribution to this new situation may perhaps be put in one word or two, *Panch Shila*, or rather the ideas underlying it. And the House will notice that ever since these ideas of peaceful co-existence—there is nothing new about those ideas, but nevertheless it was a new application of an old idea, an application to a particular context—were initially mentioned and promulgated, they have not only spread in the world and influenced more and more countries, but they have acquired progressively a greater depth, and a greater meaning too. That is, from being perhaps a word used rather loosely, it has begun to acquire a specific meaning and significance in world affairs.

I think we may take some credit for helping this process of spreading this conception of a peaceful settlement, and above all, of non-interference, of the recognition of each country to carve out its own destiny with-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

out interfering with others. That is an important conception. Again, there is nothing new about it. No great truths may be new, but the fact remains that that required emphasis, because there has been in the past a tendency for great countries to interfere with others, to bring pressure to bear upon them, to want them to line up with them; and I suppose, that is a natural result of bigness and smallness; and it has taken place not recently but throughout history.

Now, this stress being laid on non-interference of any kind—and it has been defined, the House will remember, as political, economic, ideological etc.—is an important factor in considering the situation today. The fact that it will not be wholly acted upon here and there is really of little relevance. You make a law, and it is no good people saying that somebody made us obey that law, and commit a crime. The law is the law which gradually influences the whole structure of living in that country, even though some people may not obey it.

I need not say that those who do not believe in it gradually come within its scope.

So that it is this basic conception which counts. And what does that conception mean, again? It means that there may be different ways of progress, possibly somewhat different outlooks on the objectives aimed at; but, broadly, they may be the same. If I may use another type of analogy, truth is not confined to one country or one people; it has far too many aspects for anyone to presume that he knows it all, and each country and each people, if they are true to themselves, have to find out their path themselves, through trial and error, through suffering and experience. Only then do they grow. If they merely copy others or attempt to copy, the result is likely to be that they do not grow, and even though the copy may be completely good, perfectly good, it is something imposed upon them or something undertaken by them without that normal

growth of the mind which really makes it an organic part of themselves.

We have had in the past thirty years or so the development of this country under a great leader, Mahatma Gandhi. Now, quite apart from what he did or did not do, it was an organic development of this country, something which fitted in with the spirit and thinking of India, and yet which was not isolated from the modern world, which fitted in or tried to fit in with the modern world too. No doubt, this process of adaptation will go on. But it is something which grows out of the mind and spirit of India, effected by learning many things from outside, as it must be; because, if we are isolated, as we were for hundreds of years, we fall back. If we are submerged by others, then we have no roots left. So that this idea of *Panch Shila*, apart from the various aspects of it, lays down this very important truth, that each people must ultimately fend for themselves. I am not thinking in terms of military fending, but in terms of striving intellectually, morally, spiritually, opening out all their windows to ideas from others, learning from the experience of others, but, nevertheless, doing it themselves; and those other countries should look upon this process of each other with sympathy and friendly understanding without any interference or imposition.

So India has played this some little role, and during these past few years the general policy laid down on behalf of India, and which we have sought to follow to the best of our ability, has been progressively recognised in other countries. It may not have been accepted by all, certainly not; some have disagreed with some parts of it or the whole even. But progressively, there has been a belief in the integrity of the policy of India, that is, it was a sincere policy based on a definite outlook and there was no ill-will in it for any other country. It was based essentially on goodwill and fellowship with other countries.

That, I think, has been progressively recognised.

The House knows that only a short while ago I undertook a somewhat extended tour of some countries, notably the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and also Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Rome, England and Egypt. Rather incidentally, on my way back, I even saw for a brief while a small corner of Western Germany, Dusseldorf. Wherever I went I had the most extraordinarily cordial welcome or welcomes which, naturally, moved me greatly. But I realised then, as no doubt the House realises, that that welcome had little personal significance; it was a demonstration of appreciation of India's basic policy and a demonstration in favour of peace. It is extraordinary how the people of every country that I visited were not only intellectually inclined towards this but emotionally inclined towards this idea of peace. And those countries, the House will remember, were not of one type. They were of various types and kinds and backgrounds. Nevertheless, this was a common factor. So I took that welcome to be a tribute paid to our country and the policy that we have pursued.

Soon we are going to have, in the course of these next few months, a number of eminent statesmen and leaders from other countries. Only the other day we had with us the Deputy Prime Minister of Egypt whom we welcomed cordially, because we have the most friendly relations with Egypt. In two or three days' time we are going to have the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Laos visiting Delhi. And in the course of the next few months we shall have the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union; and, I hope, accompanying him will be some of his chief colleagues also. Apart from that, among our distinguished guests during this winter season are going to be the Emperor of Ethiopia, the King of Saudi Arabia, the Shah of Iran, the Vice President of Indonesia, the Foreign Ministers of Canada, Italy and Australia and the Vice-

Chancellor of Germany. We shall welcome all these eminent dignitaries representing different view-points with equal warmth and show. I hope, that India has a large heart and a friendly approach for everyone.

Now, I just referred to a new responsibility which we are likely to undertake, that is in regard to the recent agreement arrived at in Geneva between the Ambassadors of the United States and the People's Republic of China. The matter has not been completely finalised yet but, I hope that in the course of a few days it would be finalised. In this matter, it was the Peoples' Government of China that proposed India's name to represent them or to undertake this duty on their behalf in the United States of America, just as the United States, I believe, suggested the name of the United Kingdom to undertake that responsibility for their nationals in China. The proposal of the Chinese Government naming India was accepted by the United States of America and thus we were approached to undertake this work by both parties. In the circumstances, we had to agree to this and we have expressed to the Peoples' Government of China and to the United States that if this responsibility has to be undertaken we shall endeavour to discharge it. We are not quite sure about the details of it yet as the matter, as I said, has not been finalised yet.

Now, I mentioned many cheering developments in the world situation. But, there continue to be many dark spots. In the North of Africa, Morocco and Algeria, recent developments, in some ways, have been terrible; and, I have no doubt that all who have heard of them in India have naturally been greatly moved by them. I do not wish to say much about that because efforts are being made to find some solution and I earnestly hope that those efforts will succeed. But, I will say this, that what is happening in these countries in North Africa has not only deeply moved people in the whole of Asia and Africa--and I

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

hope elsewhere too—because it is not merely a matter of some law and constitution but what happens to millions of human beings struggling for freedom. Well, what has happened, unfortunately of tragedy, has happened and all we can hope is that this is the end of this tragedy and that some way out to freedom for these countries will soon be found.

At the other end of the continent of Africa, there is the Union of South Africa which stands out today in the world as the unabashed champion of everything that I would submit not only the United Nations Charter but civilised humanity everywhere should abhor. They consider that they are the champions today—and there is no secrecy about it, no veil, no suttrefuge—of racialism and the master race, something which the Charter of the United Nations expressly forbids, something against which the last Great War was fought. But, here is this extraordinary instance of a Government continuing a policy which, I believe, every thinking and every civilised person in the world must deplore.

In the heart of Africa there is much trouble, much movement, much ferment because one of the outstanding features of the modern age is this awakening of Africa. With that, all of us in this country have the deepest sympathy. Africa has had a history of greater tragedy and suffering than any country or any continent, not today, I mean, but for hundreds of years ever since the slave trade had carried so many of them to the West. I earnestly hope that the peoples of Africa will find freedom.

✓ One of the bright spots in Africa is the Gold Coast and Nigeria and I hope that before very long we shall welcome these countries to full freedom.

✓ In Indo-China there have been the three International Commissions functioning and all three have Indians as Chairmen. We have been

✓ faced with problems from day to day—difficult problems—and we continue to be faced by them. But I must congratulate the Commissions and, more particularly, the Chairmen of these Commissions for the great tact and ability with which they have handled these problems.

- Now may I come nearer home to problems which perhaps occupy our minds more than these world problems? But it is right, I think, that even in regard to our internal problems, we should see them in proper perspective, I mean, in the larger picture of the world; otherwise, we shall see it out of perspective and not form a right judgment of them. Therefore, it is important that we should always keep this larger picture of world affairs before us. It is often said that external policy is a projection of internal policy, or sometimes to some extent external policy affects internal policy. They both affect each other. And the proper policy is one in which both are related and both help each other. In the same way, any policy that we pursue in the wide world has to fit in with our internal policy, broadly speaking. I do not mean to say that in every detail it has to fit in, but there are certain domains. But there must be the same broad mental approach; otherwise, both the policies fail. In the same way, any internal policy that we pursue must also be in keeping with these broad policies. But it is not so much a question of internal or external policy but the basic approach, basic, mental, intellectual moral approach to life and its problems, national or international.

✓ Among the problems which affect us especially in India at present are the Goa problem, Pakistan and Ceylon. I do not wish to say much about Pakistan except that, however difficult the problems may be, we have always sought in the past and we shall continue to seek in the future a peaceful solution of them. In regard to Ceylon I have stated in this House

that the situation there is not a happy one; indeed it is very unsatisfactory. But we still hope that we shall be able to find some way out which will be honourable to India, to Ceylon and most of all to the people concerned—the nine hundred thousand or so people of Indian descent.

Now I come to Goa. There is apparently a feeling, and even newspapers in India and abroad have given expression to it,—that there has been some marked or sudden change in our Government's policy in regard to Goa. Further, it has been thought by some people, more particularly I think by some foreign observers that we have made this change because of foreign opinion or foreign reactions. Now, naturally we follow and we are interested in foreign reactions not only about this matter but about every other matter. We want to be wide awake and know what the world is doing and what the world is thinking. We are not isolated. We do not wish to wall ourselves in.

But I should like to make it clear that whatever decisions we have arrived at have been completely internal decisions in our attempt to follow the policy which we consider right. Nothing that has happened or is being said in foreign countries has in the slightest affected or brought about the decisions we have made.

Secondly, I would venture to point out to this House that there has been no reversal of the policy and that we have consistently followed the same policy throughout and more especially in the course of the last little more than a year ever since certain developments took place. It is true that there has been sometimes a varying emphasis; it is true that at some periods there was a certain laxity in enforcing that policy.... (Laughter.) Laughter is pleasant to hear but when it has no meaning, I do not understand.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Just as this policy has no meaning.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not competent enough to bandy words

with Shri Kamath; nobody is competent enough for that.

What are the basic elements of our policy in regard to Goa? First, there must be peaceful methods—let us be clear about that. It obviously is essential unless we give up the whole roots of all our policies and our behaviour. Now, therefore, any person who thinks that the methods employed in regard to Goa must be other than peaceful—it is open to him to have that opinion but there is nothing that I can debate with him or argue with him because we rule out non-peaceful methods completely.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): What about Patna?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. lady Member opposite says: what about Patna? I entirely agree with her; I think peaceful methods were not adopted by a large number of people in Patna including the students, and including of course the police. I think it is about time that the people of this country and all parties decided that it is not desirable or in the interest of our country to indulge in non-peaceful and indisciplined methods of action.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What about the police?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the police is wrong, the police must be punished. Nobody defends the wrong actions of the police. There is no defence of the wrong action of the police or anybody or any official. But if I may say so—I was going to say so a little later—one of the elements in our thinking has been not only what happened in Goa but what happened subsequently in the city of Bombay and elsewhere; the indiscipline, the methods other than peaceful that come into evidence because—I am not blaming anybody—they exhibited a certain atmosphere in the country which was the very reverse and the opposite of the peaceful atmosphere which is so necessary for any peaceful movement of satyagraha etc. One cannot have it both ways. If one thinks that methods

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

like military methods, or police action as they are called—are necessary or desirable, well, one has them. If on the other hand one feels that peaceful methods are essential then one tries to have them. But to mix them up is to fall between two policies, two chairs, and to be nowhere.

There are, perhaps, some in this House—not too many, but certainly some—whose experience may go back during the last 35 years or so in India's history. When the national movement in India was pursuing, under a great leadership, peaceful methods, whenever we slipped—and we slipped sometimes—the movement was stopped utterly and absolutely, because it was felt by our leader that we must be true to our principle and to our policy and that nothing is going to be achieved by indiscipline and by people diverting themselves from that basic policy either through excitement or anger, or, even if you like, some justified resentment. Whatever it was, one cannot carry on a movement at any time, big or small, unless one is clear about one's policy and unless that policy is followed and some other policy is not included in that policy.

The word "satyagraha" has been used in this connection. I am not the originator of satyagraha nor do I presume to be an authorised commentator as to what it is. But, some of us at any rate have functioned at least for 35 years in a way and in a domain where satyagraha has been ever present. So, we have learnt through trial and error some experience about it. Anyhow, so far satyagraha is concerned it is no business of the Government. A government does not start satyagraha. The most that a government can do is not to come in the way of satyagraha, not to prohibit satyagraha because it is not against their law or their general policy. That is the most a government can do. It is for other people, people other than government to do it if it is not contrary to the law of the country or to the general policy

pursued. Therefore, as a government, of course, we do not discuss satyagraha. In some other capacity we might or some people might, consider it.

Now, I would like the House to remember what the basic policy was in the course of the last year and a quarter; that is to say, ever since satyagraha or some kind of satyagraha was talked about. Repeated emphasis was laid, of course, always on peaceful methods. Secondly, emphasis was laid that there should be no mass entry into Goa, or, no mass satyagraha in the form of mass entry. Thirdly, that it should be predominantly the business of Goans. It was about an year ago that was said, and repeatedly said. Later, gradually, what happened was that a number, to begin with relatively a small number, of Indians, non-Goan Indians, participated in the small groups that went in there. The groups were small and the Indians were relatively few. It is true we may be criticised for allowing this thing to continue. There was no vital principle involved. It may be asked "Why didn't you deny the right of Indians to do it"? It is not that I say that Indians have no right to do it. I am not for the moment talking about satyagraha—Indians have every right to work for the freedom of Goa or, for the matter of that, for the freedom of the North Pole if they want to. Why should I put a ban? But it can come in the way of my policy and therefore I can stop it, but mentally, I do not wish to deny the right, but if it comes in the way of policy or if it is likely to create consequences which are undesirable, then I come in the way or the Government comes in the way; because we thought that the participation of Indians in the so-called satyagraha in any large numbers would produce wrong results, we expressed an opinion against it. When one or two Indians go in, it is not a matter of great significance—it may be, of course—but it was doubtful and so we had to make that point perfectly clear later. Gradually, early in August, or earlier still—on the 18th July,—

the number of Indians increased somewhat. I want to be quite frank to this House that early in August, that is, let us say, a week before or a few days before the 15th August, we were in some doubt as to what, if any, action we should take, because we saw developments taking place which were not in keeping with the policy we had laid down. The policy throughout, even at the end of July, was that there should be no mass entry and predominance was on **Goans and not Indians**, though there was no strict, rigid barrier between individual Indians going there or not going there. We were much concerned about these developments. We know that large numbers of enthusiastic countrymen and countrywomen of ours were going there in a spirit of self-sacrifice and desiring to help in the freedom of Goa. Whatever our policy or their policy might be, even though their policies might differ, there was no question of our not appreciating the individual motives of those people who went there—or most of them—and that is why on the morning of the 15th August, when I was speaking from the ramparts of the Red Fort here, I said that my mind and heart were full of thoughts for those people on the Goa border. My mind was full of what happened and what might happen to our brave people doing an act, facing a danger. Whether I agree or disagree, my mind and heart will go out to brave men facing danger for a cause. But I was concerned about the consequences then, and we may perhaps be justifiably criticised that "Why do you allow matters to go thus far on the 15th August?" The criticism might be justifiable. I quite frankly say that my mind was not clear how, having gone that far, to suddenly ask those people who had collected or were collecting in larger numbers against our conscience in regard to the mass entry, etc., not to do so. So, what took place in Goa on August 15 happened. Later, all of us had to give a great deal of intense thought to this position, and as a result of that very careful and anxious consideration, we came to the conclu-

sion that we must lay stress on our basic policies in regard to Goa, again the old policy, but in addition, in the present context, certainly not to allow any doubt about that policy. As I said, it may be justifiably said against us that we were not quite clear, not about the basic policy but about certain developments, certain minor aspects of that policy and therefore, the people generally might have not been clear in their minds as to our policy. That charge might be brought against us perhaps and I think there will be some slight justification for it, though the basic policies have been completely clear for the last year and a quarter. Anyhow we felt that now it was not right or fair to the public or to ourselves or to anyone who was thinking in terms of going to Goa that we should leave the slightest doubt in our minds; and in the present context, we therefore came to the conclusion that no satyagraha, even individual satyagraha, should be permitted. As a matter of fact, it is obvious that—I am not speaking on grounds of principle but about the sheer practical aspect of it—after a big-scale effort was made on the 15th August, going back immediately to individual efforts, efforts of odd individuals, has no particular meaning. It is lost; the significance of it, moral or physical, is rather lost. Hon. Members may have read in the newspapers how the Portuguese have started describing some people as "violent satyagrahis". I do not know anything about them. I believe there are some small groups, or some small group in Goa itself, which have indulged in acts of sabotage like damaging a small bridge or something like that.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Is there any independent source to verify what the Portuguese said about the satyagrahis?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I just said that reports in the Press have appeared, and I have no doubt those particular reports are correct, that the Portuguese say that "violent satyagrahis have done this and that". What I was venturing to point out

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

was this. There are a number of people, not satyagrahis,—people who do not claim to be satyagrahis at any time,—belonging to some small or big group who have committed small acts of sabotage. These little attempts of odd individual satyagrahis, although completely different from that, tend to get mixed up with that other thing, or even if we cannot tell the Portuguese mix it up. I was just pointing out the practical aspects; but it is not this practical aspect that I am venturing today to lay stress in this House, but on the basic aspects of this problem. I am asked, "what is the alternative to this kind of satyagraha?" In answer to that, I can also ask my questioner, "what exactly you seek to achieve by the particular methods that you may suggest?" Obviously, problems of this kind do not yield themselves to some sudden and magic remedy. But, as the House knows, we have taken a large number of measures, economic, financial and other, which I have no doubt are effective to a considerable extent; and their effectiveness grows with other measures that we may take. These are the normal ways of approaching this problem. Remember that in our considering this, we are ruling out what is called military or police action. We have ruled it out. Then we are considering what other steps we should take. I have no doubt in my mind that the steps we take as well as the general development of the situation must necessarily and in the liberation of Goa from the Portuguese. I cannot fix a date. I do not think any person in this wide world can fix a date for the solution of any of the world's problems. Whether these problems are of Europe or of Germany or of other parts of Europe, of the Far East, of Indo-China or Africa or any other part, no date can be fixed. But, the main thing is that the policies pursued should be on right lines. I do believe that right conduct must necessarily lead to right results just as wrong conduct leads to evil results. I have no doubt in my mind about that. I do not think

that when we are acting in the international sphere, we can apply some other test.

12 Noon

In Goa, we have a remarkable picture of the 16th century facing the 20th century, of a decadent colonialism facing a resurgent Asia, of a free and independent India being affronted and insulted by the Portuguese authorities of in fact, Portugal functioning in a way which, apparently, to any thinking person, is so amazing in its incongruity in the modern world that one is a little taken aback. It is not the normal opposition of a normal argument or action.

We have watched, may be other Members may have watched,—with interest the reactions of foreign countries to what is happening in Goa. Goa is not only a symbol, small as it is; it was and it has become even more so a symbol of decadent colonialism trying to hold on. It is something more. It has become an acid test by which we can judge of the policies of other countries. Does any country actively support or encourage Portuguese intransigence in Goa? If so, we know, broadly speaking, where that country stands in world affairs. Or, are there any countries that, without positively and actively encouraging, passively support or acquiesce in this position? We know how those countries stand. Or, lastly do those other countries realise that Portuguese domination in Goa cannot and must not continue, not only for normal reasons and causes, but because it has become an affront to civilised humanity, more especially after the brutal behaviour, the brutal and uncivilised behaviour of the Portuguese authorities there. I submit, therefore, to this House that the policy Government have laid down in regard to Goa is not only a sound policy, but, if I say so, it is the only policy. Minor variations may take place from time to time, but the major roots of that policy must hold

good, unless we ought to uproot everything that we have done inside the country or outside and our national and international policies and seek some new path which we have no intention of doing. And I submit that this policy which fits in with this larger world policy as well as our national outlook is a policy which will yield results too. It is not merely an idealistic policy, but a practical policy. I trust, therefore, that any doubts about this matter would be removed from the minds of not only Members here but those outside and they will realise that we have consistently followed a policy through this last year. Certainly to some extent it now appears to me, we created some doubts and misunderstanding about it recently, and we allowed the situation to drift a little, and you may blame us for that, but the moment we saw what this was leading to, that it was taking us in a wrong direction, we had to pull ourselves up, and no Government which realised that could refrain, unless it lacked courage, from stopping this evil drift. I think we have shown—the country and the Government—courage in this matter to ourselves and to the world. That does not mean—and I should like this to be clearly understood by people outside India, here it is not necessary—the slightest slackening by our Government in regard to this question of Goa. All that has happened in recent months has made this question important. It may not be a terribly important question because it is inevitable—all the world knows and I am quite certain that people in Portugal know that it is quite inevitable—that Goa has to come to India, that they will have to leave India and that Goa then necessarily has to associate itself with the Indian Union. But the first thing is the liberation of Goa. If in the normal course this took a little time, it did not matter much. There are many problems which take time. As the House knows, there are bits of Portuguese dominated territory in China, in Indonesia, little bits—Macao, this and that, they continue to be as such. The

People's Government of China does not get terribly excited because Macao is Portuguese. Macao will go to them; there is no doubt about it; everybody knows. But they do not get excited. They are not weak in their military strength. It is a small matter for them if they choose to take it, but they do not choose to take it because of their larger policies. There is a bit of Portuguese territory elsewhere too. So, it would not matter normally if a matter takes a little more time or not, but the course of events has made Goa a more important and a more vital issue and to some extent over this issue the iron has entered our souls, the country, and therefore, one has to deal with this matter with all the wisdom and strength that we possess and not allow it to lapse, not allow it to become a static question, and I hope that people in other countries will realise that.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved: ✓

"That the present international situation and policy of Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration." ✓

Now, there are certain substitute ✓ motions. Hon. Members who wish to ✓ move them may do so.

Shri Raghuramajah (Tenali): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves the foreign policy pursued by the Government, which has led especially to the acceptance by many countries of the principles of Panch Shila and to the easing of the international tension, thus promoting the cause of world peace."

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

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the Government of India have not satisfactorily dealt with the Goa situation—

(a) by following an inconsistent policy towards the satyagraha movement in so far as it encouraged and indirectly supported the satyagraha, but after the resolution of the All India Congress Committee of the 4th September, 1955, put obstacles in the path of satyagrahis by virtually banning the satyagrahis' entry into Goa;

(b) by refusing to resort to the police action to liberate Portuguese enclaves in Indian territories; and

(c) by not carrying on an effective propaganda in foreign countries to explain India's stand on this issue."

↓ **Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly):** I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, while appreciating the efforts of the Prime Minister in the direction of liquidation of colonialism in Asia and Africa, disapproves of the policy of the Government with regard to Goa and Portuguese colonies in India.

Mr. Speaker: Amendments moved:

(1) That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

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

especially to the acceptance by many countries of the principles of *Panch Shila* and to the easing of the international tension, thus promoting the cause of world peace."

(2) That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the Government of India have not satisfactorily dealt with the Goa situation—

(a) by following an inconsistent policy towards the satyagraha movement in so far as it encouraged and indirectly supported the satyagraha, but after the resolution of the All India Congress Committee of the 4th September, 1955, put obstacles in the path of satyagrahis by virtually banning the satyagrahis' entry into Goa;

(b) by refusing to resort to the police action to liberate Portuguese enclaves in Indian territories; and

(c) by not carrying on an effective propaganda in foreign countries to explain India's stand on this issue."

(3) That for the original motion, the following be submitted:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, while appreciating the efforts of the Prime Minister in the direction of liquidation of colonialism in Asia and Africa, disapproves of the policy of the Government with regard to Goa and Portuguese colonies in India.

Shri Kamath: May I request the Prime Minister to tell us....

Mr. Speaker: First, let me finish what I have to say, and then the hon. Member may say what he wants.

These three substitute motions are now before the House, of course sub-

ject to the admissibility to some extent and the wording which will require some amendment, perhaps in some cases. That is the first point.

The second is the question of fixing time-limit for speeches. I think leaders of groups or parties may have half an hour each, and Members ordinarily fifteen minutes or less, but, not more.

Shri Kamath: Before we proceed to the debate, may I request the Prime Minister to tell the House a little more about the nature and the main features of the economic sanctions that have been imposed by Government against Goa, and the effect they have had?

Mr. Speaker: If the House is agreeable, I shall have no objection. But then I believe there will be a complaint that a lot of time out of the seven hours allotted has been taken by the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Kamath: We shall not complain.

Mr. Speaker: I would, for the present, proceed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Some of these measures are well-known, and others may not, perhaps, be well-known. I do not think it will be desirable, in any event, to give a list of steps we take; it is not, normally done.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): I was looking forward to this debate for a long time because I was anxious to have an opportunity to felicitate the Prime Minister for the work that he has done to relax international tension. But, unfortunately, recent developments in Goa make it difficult—make it impossible—to focus attention on the wider problems.

Recently, as it has been said, a third phase of India's foreign policy has opened, and we would have welcomed an opportunity to consider this fresh unfolding of our foreign policy in a calm and cool atmosphere. But the sudden shift in the Government's policy on Goa has pushed all other questions out of our mind and we are compelled—we are constrained—to

turn our attention almost wholly to the policy on Goa.

But before I offer my criticism of the Government's policy on Goa, I would like to point out what has been repeatedly pointed out by my leader—who is unavoidably absent today—that the foreign policy of a country should be a national policy and not the policy of a party. It has been our complaint for a long time that—as is the normal practice in all parliamentary democracies—the spokesmen of the Opposition parties are not taken into confidence. Major changes in foreign policies are brought without any kind of previous consultations with accredited spokesmen of the Opposition. It has been argued that there is a multiplicity of parties in this country and that makes it very difficult to pick and choose. May I, however, point out that the Election Commission has made it very clear that besides the ruling party, there are just three other national parties, and the three national parties are represented here by their accredited spokesmen, and I see no reason why the Prime Minister does not make an effort to consult the Opposition before major decisions on foreign policies are taken? Because we understand that vital decisions on foreign policy cannot be carried on always in the 'gold fish bowl'. The facts cannot always be placed before the whole world, but it should not be difficult to take a few people, a few Members of this House, into confidence.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair.]

As a matter of fact, it becomes very difficult for us to offer any kind of constructive criticism of the foreign policy because all we know is what we have gathered from newspapers or from publications that are available to any intelligent citizen in the country. As Members of Parliament, as representatives of various political opinions in the country who have mobilised behind them significant sections of public opinion, we are not given opportunities to know more, and thereby contribute more, to the

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

shaping of the foreign policy. It is not that there are no opportunities: my contention is that there is not the will. The Prime Minister likes to be a Robinson Crusoe. He only wants his man Friday on the island where he shapes his foreign policy. The rest of us have to remain away, admiring his handiwork; but we may not have any share either in suggesting alterations in the plan or in shaping the contours of the policy.

✓ In spite of the general indifference—if I may be permitted to say, the calculated indifference—of the Prime Minister towards the opposition, we have tried deliberately and consciously to be in line with the foreign policy of the Prime Minister. Often the Prime Minister has told us that the opposition tries to take partisan advantage out of difficulties in Kashmir or the complications in Goa or the complications with Pakistan. May I point out that it is the opposition that has usually tried to be in step with the Prime Minister's policy, and it is the Prime Minister and his party that have tried to take advantage of the foreign policy for greater glory of his party. After all, the achievements of India's foreign policy are not entirely due to the Congress Party ✓ alone. As the Prime Minister himself admitted just now, geographical and historical reasons are responsible for whatever we have achieved. There is no one here on this side who wants in any way to belittle the magnificent contribution that our Prime Minister has made; but let it be realised that he has been able to do this because behind him is a great country, behind him are the traditions of a mighty movement in which all of us had an opportunity to take part. And therefore in spite of the constant rebuffs that we have received we have tried, as I said, to keep in step with the Prime Minister.

✓ Take this policy on Goa. On 15th August 1954 a large number of satyagrahis mobilised near Goa, near Diu ✓ near Daman. Suddenly, without any kind of previous consultations—surely

we would not have been foolish enough to bring hundreds and thousands of men from different parts of the country for satyagraha if we had known that the policy of the Prime Minister was going to be to prevent from entering Portuguese territories—but last year suddenly on the morning of the 15th we learnt that they ✓ would not be permitted to enter. They were our own police who were there ✓ to prevent them from entering. Did we defy or challenge the Prime Minister? We fell in line with him. Quietly we asked those men to withdraw. And for one whole year our effort was to hammer a united front in the country, a national front in which every political party would be represented, a national front that would try to function in close co-operation and in co-ordination with the national policy of our Government.

But what do we find? That our constant desire to adjust ourselves has been understood as weakness; our patience and our goodwill have been misunderstood; we have been malign-ed. I have found that the Prime Minister has been going about denouncing the Communist Party and the Praja Socialist Party calling us reactionaries, saying that we have no roots. After all picturesque denunciations come easily to those who have had expensive education. My friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee is a standing example of that. Therefore, I am not in a position, and I have no desire on this solemn occasion, to exchange that kind of courtesies. But I would like to remind the Prime Minister: let not our patience, our goodwill, our loyalty to our nation be misunderstood; let them not be strained to a breaking point. Recently, the Congress Party decided, guided by the leadership of the Government to reorient, to completely change the policy that was being pursued. Of ✓ course, the Prime Minister has told us just now that there has been no change; there was a certain laxity only and that laxity has been removed. ✓ May I point out that till the 28th

of August, prominent Congress Members, Members of this House whom we all respect, were prepared to offer satyagraha; arrangements were being made for their going to Goa to offer satyagraha. And, on the 2nd of September, our policy was reversed. Is it merely that laxity was removed or was there a basic change? If there was a basic change, what were the reasons that brought about that change? Surely, between the 28th August and the 2nd of September, the Prime Minister had ample opportunities to call us, to meet us, to discuss with us and to convince us; and, even after the 2nd of September, except for the speeches that he has made in the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha, he has never tried to take us into confidence and tell us what his plans and policies are. (Interruption).

In the Congress Party, thanks to the charismatic leadership of the Prime Minister, able, very fine and very eminent persons who constitute the Congress Party here, have got into the habit of adjusting themselves to every shift in policy as the iron filings adjust themselves to the magnet. But the Prime Minister cannot except us, who are sitting on this side of the House, to adjust themselves as iron filings. We believe that in parliamentary democracy, through discussion, through persuasion, through reasoning and through arguments we should be convinced. Where was reasoning, where were the arguments, when suddenly the policy was changed or, as is said, the laxity was removed? It may be that, as the Prime Minister has said, laxity was removed in view of what happened on the 15th August. May I point out to the Prime Minister—I know that he knows it very well; he knows it better than myself—but may I point out what were the facts on the 15th August. 2538 satyagrahis participated in the satyagraha at Goa. This satyagraha was organised in two days, on the 15th August and the 19th August. These satyagrahis entered from 11 different points and at 7 of these points, the number of satyagrahis was hundred or less than a

hundred. It was only at four points that the number was large, Castle Rock, Arunda, Kankombi and Banda. The figures varied from 240 to 596 and it is at these places that 14 out of the 17 deaths took place. How was it that at 4 places only there was such a large mobilisation? Responsibility lies, to a considerable extent, upon the Chief Minister of the State of Bombay. Suddenly, without any kind of consultation, he brought about a dislocation of the transport. People who were to be taken to distant places were told overnight that they were not permitted to go. What was the result? The people rushed and crowded in those places where there was originally going to be a certain planned employment of volunteers. The plan was completely thrown out of gear because of the dislocation of the transport that was brought about by the intervention of the Chief Minister. As was usual, without any kind of previous consultation.

The Prime Minister has referred to the happenings in Bombay. As a citizen of Bombay, I regret what happened in the city. I was in that city on the night of the 15th and also on the 16th and I have enquiries to find out as to what happened. It was the wooden attitude, the characteristic wooden attitude of the Chief Minister of Bombay, that provoked the people into many of the actions they did. The Chief Minister of Bombay has been consistently opposed to what the Prime Minister has called the laxity. He was most anxious that the laxity should be removed; he was most anxious that the policy about Goa should not be what the Prime Minister was trying to develop from Delhi but what the Chief Minister wanted to develop from Bombay and he deliberately behaved in a manner which provoked the people. I am not saying that he wanted the people to get provoked, but by his attitude, inflexible attitude, a wooden attitude, an irresponsible attitude the people were provoked. As the Prime Minister himself said, men had been killed; we had witnessed the supreme demonstrations of brave sons and daughters

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

of India laying down their lives smilingly for the freedom of our country. And in this great movement in history, when there is a pause everywhere, one expected that there would be a pause as far as the Chief Minister was also concerned. No, Sir; he was not prepared to budge an inch from the position that he had taken up all these days. He was most anxious that the policy of the Prime Minister should be revised in the light of the opinion of the Chief Minister, and the resolution of 2nd October is a triumph of the Chief Minister of Bombay over the Prime Minister of India. For that let us not blame the people of Bombay alone. What happened in the rest of India? And over the country people were moved; there were large-scale demonstrations. Were they not peaceful? In Delhi, in Calcutta, in place after place, in the smallest villages—I was motoring from Poona to Bombay—I know that in every village on the way shops were closed, people were in the streets and everybody was in mourning.

Let it not be said, "what happened in Bombay?" but we should see everything in proper perspective. The Prime Minister has told us to learn and to remember that everything has to be viewed in a certain perspective. Let it not be said that when internal affairs are concerned, the perspective can be ignored. We are told that the policy has been that Goans are primarily responsible for their own liberation. May I point out that more than 3,000 Goans have already been arrested and on 15th August 1955, ninety Goans participated with the satyagrahis who went from India and 120 Goans were arrested inside Goa? At two there were firings and a large number of Christians girls were also arrested and imprisoned. It is very easy to invite people and exhort them to organise resistance. But we all know that in Goa today there are 12,000 troops—10,000 Portuguese troops and 2,000 policemen armed with sten guns. The Prime Minister said that it is the 16th century that is confronting the

20th century. As far as the weapons are concerned, it is perhaps the 20th century that is confronting the late 19th century. 12,000 troops are placed where there are only 600,000 people—one soldier for every fifty persons in Goa. You were a good fighter; everyone in this House was a good fighter. I would ask Tandonji this: would it have been possible for the Prime Minister and Tandonji to organise satyagraha if there were foreign troops in the proportion in which they exist in Goa? It is all very well to say "exhort the people to organise satyagraha", but with heavy odds they have to do it. 12,000 troops are there armed to the teeth and a fascist regime behind it. Against a fascist regime they have been fighting. No one in the world would have been able to put up such a kind of resistance as the Goans have done and still we throw the entire responsibility on them. Why did we all jointly agree that Indians will have to participate? Because we knew that Goans are completely outmatched, that the Portuguese mobilisation against the Goa people was disproportionately large, that unless the Goans were supported by Indians in the non-violent struggle that we wanted to wage, they would not be able to meet the Portuguese offensive. That was the whole controversy in 1954-55 and we thought that by the 15th August, 1955 we had convinced the Prime Minister that Goans will form the spearhead, but the spear has to be supplied by Indians. But suddenly on the 2nd September, the spear has been knocked away. I do not know what the little spearhead can do. There are hundreds of prisoners, political prisoners today in Goa and elsewhere under Portuguese detention. Some of them are on the jaws of death; some of them are hovering on the brink of lifelong misery. I have been connected with the Goa national movement for the last nine years and I know so many of my friends from Goa who have been banished have not come back. Many more are likely to be arrested. What will happen to them?

In Goa today people are de-spirited; they have been isolated. The great might of the Indian people had been removed from them, the warm embrace of the Indian people has been taken away from them. I would like to know from the Prime Minister categorically as to what he is going to do to see that the Goans who are today in Portuguese prisons are not maltreated and driven to their death, or driven to exile or exiled death. What kind of security can we offer to them? After all, if we invite Goans to organise satyagraha and then fail to stand by them how long will they be able to carry on in this isolation.

The Prime Minister tells us that he has imposed economic sanctions. If last year, on the 15th of August 1954, the Prime Minister had permitted the satyagrahis to enter Goa, if he had permitted at that time the crisis to develop and if the economic sanctions had been then imposed. I am sure the Portuguese Government would have been brought to its knees. But in the last one year when we have been generally indifferent to the Goan question, the Portuguese Government had been very active. Air-links and sea communications have been established with Karachi and with Colombo and with Aden. We read in the newspapers that all kinds of assistance are flowing in. The economic sanctions are not going to cripple completely the Portuguese Government. If our economic sanctions fail to bring it to its knees it needs to be remembered that the fractured part of Goa might achieve an independent position for itself and it will be almost impossible later on to solve this problem of Goa. I cannot say whether what the Government has done about Goa had been too little or not but nobody can gain-say the fact that as far as the policy of the Government is concerned, it has always been too late, particularly so far as the economic sanctions are concerned.

The Prime Minister in the last few days has also brought about another shift from integrating Goa with the

rest of India. We are now talking of self-determination of the Goans. I have never been able to understand this question of self-determination of Goans because they join the Goan freedom movement and feel like fighting only when they know that they are to be a part and parcel of the larger India. After all it is not always possible for people to get worked up in order to have freedom in a little area which they inhabit. It is only when they know that they would be part of a great experiment that they would have opportunities of participating in a great adventure that the response from the people is forthcoming.

Some months back, when our President addressed the Parliament, he made a categorical declaration that Formosa belongs to China. There was no question of self-determination by the people of Formosa. But when the question of Goa comes, the question of self-determination is brought up. What is sauce for the Chinese goose is not sauce for the Indian gander. I am unable to understand: if Formosa belongs to China and if we have to make this declaration from the house-tops, why in the case of Goa, do we say that in Goa the question of self-determination comes in. The Prime Minister, Sir, has been emphasising over and over again in the past few months that there are three parties to the struggle: the Goan people, the Government of India, and the people of India, and he has said that the Indian people have a responsibility. Are we to surrender our responsibility? May I, through you, Sir, ask the Prime Minister, in what way we are to fulfil our responsibility to the Goan people? The Prime Minister himself, 25 years back, asked us to take a pledge with him, the pledge to liberate every inch of India. At that time it had not been said that in respect of those pockets that are not liberated, the liberation will be the responsibility of the Government of India. At that time we took a pledge that no Indian will rest until the whole of India is

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

free. What are we to do? In what way are we to be permitted to participate in this great liberation movement? Is it to be isolated to the Goans? Is the whole responsibility to be put on them? I can understand, at long last the Prime Minister coming forward and saying: "I shall carry the burden on my shoulders". We admire his willingness to do it. But, as far as the national liberation movement is concerned, even we used to tell Gandhiji: "We will not allow you to carry the entire burden yourself. It is our privilege to carry the burden and nobody has a right to deprive us of that privilege."

✓ Nobody quarrels with the Prime Minister when he says that we have got to pursue peaceful methods. There is no suggestion of any kind of military action being taken. But, after all, can such a policy be unilaterally enunciated? What about Portugal? Is Portugal interested in peaceful methods? Portugal has converted its possessions in India into armed camps. Those areas are armed to the teeth. If we in India had troops on the same basis on which there are Portuguese troops in Goa our Defence Minister would have to increase his army to 7.2 million persons. An army of 7.2 million persons would be needed in India today if we were to build up our strength on the basis on which the Portuguese have built up their armed might in the Portuguese possessions.

Formosa is 100 miles away from China. There are other islands which are a thousand miles or a few thousand miles from England and from America but they are considered to be important for security reasons. The security of nations is threatened even by islands occupied by hostile powers a hundred or a thousand miles away. Here is a part of our own country. A part of our own country is being occupied by a hostile power converting it into a powerful military base. Their whole regime is built up of fascist terror. Is it not a threat to our security? Is the peace policy to be pursued even when a dagger is pointed at our chest? If that

is to be the peace policy, I welcome it. Let us meet that dagger with our open chests. Let us be prepared to fight the violence of the aggressor with the non-violence of our people. But, even that the Prime Minister will not permit us to do. He says: "How can it be done?" Has not the Master over and over advised the Abyssinians to fight the Italian aggression with non-violence? Over and over again his advice was that the people should be prepared to bare their bodies and face bullets. The Government may not be willing to do that. But, our young men and women are prepared to do that. In movements of liberation large number of people die. In Morocco, in Algeria men have died in hundreds but at no time was the conscience of the world stirred as by the carnage in Goa. Why was it? Because, there the people laid down their lives smilingly and peacefully. A unique technique was being worked out and I have not the least doubt in my mind that if the Prime Minister had only permitted the laxity to continue for a few more days or a few more weeks he would have seen that non-violence is as potent in international affairs as it has been in internal affairs. But, no. The Prime Minister will not permit us to do it. The Prime Minister believes that he will be able to solve the problem by diplomatic pressure, diplomatic pressure against the dictator, diplomatic pressure to bring a dictator round to his sense. May I remind the Prime Minister that there was another Prime Minister 16 years back who suffered from a similar delusion? His name has been forgotten. From the limbo of the past, only by a great effort, one has to remember him from the scrap-heap of history and one has to pick him up from there. That man was Neville Chamberlin. He tried, and believed, that out of nettle danger, we have plucked flower safety. Does the Prime Minister here propose to do so? He hopes to persuade Salazar. He gave us a long list of great dignitaries who are coming to India. We welcome them. We join our Prime Minister in welcoming them. I was hoping that one name would be there—

the Prime Minister of Portugal. The Prime Minister of India, with all his strength, with all his courtesy, with all his goodwill, with all the charms that he possesses, cannot persuade the Prime Minister of Portugal to visit India and to negotiate with him. What is the meaning of diplomatic pressure? Perhaps the Prime Minister believes that the United Kingdom and the United States of America will be able to do something for us, but he has never told us. He has said that our policy is clear. I was listening to him very carefully to find out as to what this clear policy is, but the more I listened to him the more confused I became.

Sir, what is this policy? Does he expect the United Kingdom to bring some mild pressure on Portugal—the United Kingdom with vulnerable Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus? The whole world is ringed round the British possessions. Do you expect the British to put pressure on Portugal? Do you expect the chief of the robbers to bring about some kind of change of heart in a small robber himself? The United States of America, the great United States of America, is trying to woo the Franco regime and is trying to bolster up affairs by building up a bulwark of democracy in western Europe. Do you expect the United States of America that has been trying persistently, and against the conscience of the civilised world to woo Franco, to alienate Salazar? After all, the Prime Minister knows the international affairs much better than I do. He understands the complexities of this problem much better than I do. I would like to know from him whether Sir Anthony Eden or President Eisenhower will ever be able to put any kind of pressure on Salazar.

Then, there is His Holiness the Pope. The Prime Minister went and saw His Holiness the Pope. It is always good for our Prime Minister to visit any holy man, but, Portugal is a Catholic State. It is not an ordinary State; it is a Catholic State. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether even His Holiness the Pope will be able to put pressure upon the Catholic State to

behave? After all, it is an open book, and we know what has happened. Many changes are taking place. According to my congress friends, our Prime Minister is a miracle worker. I know he can work many miracles, but all past history tells us that to bring about a change in Salazar's mind through diplomatic pressure is not possible through that miracle. He has got many things in his bag but this particular rabbit is not inside it. Therefore, I say, and we are not suggesting that you should take military action. But diplomatic action is powerless. Your economic sanctions will not take you very far, because you have taken them too late. Already, the necessary readjustments have been brought about. The only thing remaining is the pressure of the people and the willingness of Indians to die for our country, for the liberation of our country. We shall not permit a hostile power to build up an arsenal of strength on our own territory. If the Prime Minister wants to pursue a policy of peace, we give all strength to his elbow, but the only way in which we can give strength to his elbow is that we should be permitted to lay down our lives. We should be permitted to lay down our lives so that this problem may not remain a continuous sore.

I have only one more point to make, and that is, after the enunciation of the new policy, the satyagrahis have been treated in a very humiliating fashion. They have been insulted. I am sorry to say, I am ashamed to say, that some of the satyagrahis who tried to enter Goa have been kicked by our own policemen. May I appeal to the Prime Minister not to treat the freedom-fighters in this fashion and not to permit political policies to come in the way of even elementary appreciation of people's emotions?

Lastly, I have one appeal to make to the Prime Minister. It is not too late: call the accredited spokesmen of various political opinions in this House; sit with us; try and hammer out a common policy. Place your cards on the table inside your own room; let us pool together all the information that we have. Let us try and evolve a truly

[Shri Asoka Mehta]
national policy. Do not expect that the policy you hammer out inside the A.I.C.C. will receive endorsement from this section of the House.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I am not going to touch all aspects of the international situation. I wish to concentrate on the problem of Goa, because it is the main concern of the people of our country today. Especially after hearing the Prime Minister's speech which has surprised many of us, wherever we have found contradiction, it is necessary to point out certain facts. I want to say that the Prime Minister's attitude towards the problem of Goa was entirely different from what he has spoken today.

✓ The citing of *Panch Shila*, the Geneva Conference and the other developments that have taken place have made a big contribution to the lessening of the international tension. Our country too has played an important part in this change of the world situation and all of us are proud of the prestige and appreciation that India has gained on account of the part that she has played and also in support of the popular forces struggling against colonial rulers. It is also true that it is the force of the people in this country and also all over the world that has brought these changes. If anybody says that it is only due to the manoeuvres of the skill and intelligence of certain individuals, then certainly one would not agree with him. It is the desire of the people all over the world for peace and also their determination to struggle for peace that have brought about these changes.

I have to point out that there are certain things happening here in this country that go against the cause of peace. I am referring to the passage of war equipments and materials from this country to help British to fight against the Malayan people.

Not only for the Malayan campaign, but we also understand that war supplies to build the SEADO base in Singapore are also being sent from this country through our ports. Not a month passes without some equipment

being sent out from these ports; not a month passes without certain planes touching our country which are directly of the military type or which carry soldiers and equipment to Malaya and Singapore, the headquarters of SEADO. Why does not the Government ban such activities, if they are happening? As in Malaya, the Britishers are continuing their murder in Kenya. We hope that the Indian delegation to the U.N.O. will certainly take up the question of Kenya in the next U.N. Assembly.

German militarisation and the question of their revival under the Paris Agreement are matters of very great importance. Certainly it will attract the attention of the people of the whole world. After the Bandung Conference, the conditions are favourable for working together with the Chinese people for what is called a collective peace for Asia and the Pacific region. Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of China, has in July and August spoken about these things. I do not know why our Prime Minister does not take the initiative in these things to strengthen the peace efforts.

Now, I come to the question of Goa. The plan of the A.I.C.C., the decision of the Government to ban all forms of satyagraha is not only a betrayal of the struggle of the Indian people, but it is a stab on the back of the Goanese people themselves. The trust of the nation has once again been betrayed by the ruling party.

I have heard the Prime Minister speak today. Though he has often repeated that it is against our basic policy, as my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta has said, nobody has understood what the basic policy of the Government of India today is. To sum up, ✓ the basic policy of the Government is, no police action, no mass action, no individual action, everything goes out ✓ of action. That is the policy of the Government of India. Goa borders are sealed; nobody can enter Goa. If anybody approaches the border, he will be arrested by the Indian police. ✓ India Government is policing the Portuguese colony.

How to liberate Goa? As far as the liberation movement is concerned, the Prime Minister has brought in Pancha Shila, he has brought in peace; he has said that there is a larger interest and that any action taken against Goa in liberating Goa is against the larger interest. There are only two ways of liberating any country. The liberation struggle is fought by the people. We have the example of the liberation struggle in our own country. The liberation struggle is carried on by the people where the people are oppressed, where there is an oppressor and the oppressed. Where there are some pockets which are even today under colonial rule, it is the duty of the Government to support the people, and the people and the Government fight for the liberation of these colonies. People's action has been banned. The ban of the people's action to liberate Goa certainly means banning the right of the people to support the liberation of Goa.

The Prime Minister has today said that their policy was the same. If I have understood what he has said, it is true that the desire of the Government themselves and the ruling party was that there should be no mass action in the country. As far as the Congress President was concerned, as far as the Prime Minister was concerned and many other were concerned, they had given moral support to the liberation of Goa. Before the 15th of August, the Congress and the Government morally supported the struggle. The Congress President in a speech said:

"We are pledged to the liberation of every inch of Indian soil and shall not rest until we have fulfilled that pledge."

In another speech in the Madhya Pradesh he said that it was a call not only to the Congress, but to the nation as a whole and the struggle must be intensified on the basis of non-violence. He has also said that Goa is a national issue. Now, to say that

there has been no change in the policy is not correct. Satyagrahis are stopped: anybody who wants even to enter Goa and join the struggle in a non-violent manner is stopped; even individual satyagrahis are stopped. So, to say today that there is absolutely no change is something which nobody can understand. The Prime Minister himself praised the satyagrahis on August 15th. He had said that at no time there will be police action. But, at the same time, he praised the heroism of the satyagrahis. There was this moral support. The Goa Vomochan Samithi, the leading organisation in the liberation movement consisted of members of the Congress party. There was a struggle for the liberation of Goa. It may be an individual struggle; but a struggle was there. After the 15th of August, that struggle was stopped. Take the history of our country. We have got our traditions. Not only have we fought against the British and the French. Even when we were not free, we were helping all countries in whatever way it was possible, and supporting their liberation struggle. Today, a position has come when you are not able to support the liberation struggle in your own soil. Goa is in the Indian soil, though the Prime Minister has tried to make a shift and say in his speech in the Rajya Sabha that Goa is part of India, but it is not in the Indian Union. It is not in the Indian Union: everybody understands that. If it is in the Indian Union, there will be no struggle. As shown, by Shri Asoka Mehta the differentiation between Goa being in the Indian soil and not in the Indian Union and the people of India remaining separate and the argument that we are supporting only the struggle in Goa is not correct. I shall deal with that afterwards. What I want to say is, the tradition of our country has been, we had been supporting the liberation struggle in other parts of the world. Even today, if we are supporting the peace policy, it does not mean that we are opposed to struggle against colonialism in this country. Peace policy and anti-colonial struggle cannot be opposed to each other. When we have the tradition of supporting the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

liberation movement in this country, we have supported others, today we have come to the position that not only we do not allow the people in whatever form they like to enter or to fight against the foreign Government, but also, according to today's papers, the satyagrahis were kicked by the Indian police. So, what a change has come in this country. If the news is correct that the satyagrahis were kicked, as reported in the papers, certainly things are taking a very bad turn. Before the 15th August it had been said by the Congress President and others that the satyagraha struggle would be intensified. I do not know what changes have come after the 15th August.

1 P.M.

The Prime Minister said that the basic policy is peace and non-violence. Has anything happened in this country on the 15th or 16th August against this basic peace policy. We had satyagrahas even before, but I say that in the annals of our history this is the first time that it has been conducted by all parties and groups in this country. The satyagraha which was conducted in Banda and Castlerock on the 15th August was peaceful. Let the Prime Minister point out any instance where it was not peaceful, or where the satyagrahis were violent. He has pointed out that some thing has happened in Bombay after the event. After the shooting of the satyagrahis in Goa, the people in their emotion joined together to register their protest against the actions of the Portuguese and to show that they wanted to liberate Goa. If something happened when thousands of people had gathered together, that does not mean that the satyagraha must be stopped.

I do not want to go into details as to what happened in Bombay, but if the people had requested the Government that the national flag, for the sake of which people had died in Goa, must be flown at half mast for some time, it was the duty to do so if they

had the wisdom to understand the psychology of the people. Instead of doing that what the Government has done is something which, according to the Prime Minister, I can say is against the policy that they are following as far as international affairs and Goa is concerned.

That was the only incident. There was absolutely nothing else. The Goa Vimochan Samiti were very careful to see that the mass satyagraha did not create any violence, and that it was peaceful. Nothing has been said by the Prime Minister to the effect that the satyagraha conducted was peaceful, or that it was violent. There was only an incident which happened in Bombay, because of which no responsible Government can say that there should be no liberation movement. The Congress first was not in favour of satyagraha because there was a fear that the movement might not be peaceful, but after the 15th August it was clear that the movement was peaceful and there was no violence. If that is so, then what is it that has been responsible for the change in policy? As Shri Asoka Mehta has said, we are not able to understand, and the people are not able to understand, what has been responsible for this change.

As the Congress President himself has said, the problem of the liberation of Goa has been a national issue. It has been an issue on which all parties and all those who were not in any party have joined together. It has been an issue on which the Indians as a whole—and not merely persons belonging to any one party—have joined together. The Goa Vimochan Samiti consisted of representatives of all parties. If even in spite of all this, there is this change, the people are not able to understand it.

In this connection, I would like to point out what the people themselves feel on this matter. It will be recalled

that lakhs and lakhs of people had gathered at Ramlila grounds to greet the Prime Minister soon after his visit to the Soviet Union. But just a few days after that, those very people had gathered at the same place to protest against the action of Government. How has this sudden change come about? The people had greeted and hailed the Prime Minister earlier for the policy that he has been following, the policy of fighting against the oppressor, and fighting for the freedom of the people. But after August 16th, those very people came out and said, there is no use of satyagraha against the fascist butcher, we have been conducting satyagraha for the last eight years, but there has been no result; and so, the people mobilised themselves and said, now there must be police action, peaceful police action, for that alone will solve the problem of Goa, Government must do something in this regard, for as far as Portugal is concerned, peaceful methods are of no avail. That was how the people felt over this matter.

That was amply demonstrated on August 16th and 17th all over India, including every nook and corner of India. Even in villages where there was no political activity before, all the people came out together and demonstrated that the problem of the liberation of Goa was dearer to their hearts than anything else, and that they were ready to sacrifice their lives for this cause. And they all wanted that Government must do something to help them.

But what do we find now? We are told that big international changes have happened. What are those big international changes? We are told, there is Panch Shila. But Panch Shila was there even before. So then, what are the changes in the international situation that have occurred between September 1st and 3rd, and that have made our Government say that there should be no more satyagraha, not even individual satyagraha, and that they would not allow it? Nobody knows even now what is the reason

for the change in the policy of Government now. Certainly, there have not been any big changes in the international situation within the last one month.

In the course of his speech today, the Prime Minister has referred to the reactions in other countries. Yes, we know what the reaction is. The Prime Minister has denied it, and he has said, there was no imperialist pressure, and it was not as a retreat to the imperialist pressure that the satyagraha was stopped. But there are reasons to believe, as has already been pointed out, that there was imperialist pressure. The imperialist press had been writing in such a way as to exert pressure. I wanted to quote from the writings in the British and American presses, to show how they have been not only not supporting, but on the other hand slandering the satyagraha struggle in this country. But I do not want to take up the time of the House. As against this, all the Asian countries and all the other countries in the world have supported the Goa liberation struggle. There have been meetings, and there have been big demonstrations also in other countries, as for instance, in China. It was not only the Governments of those countries, but even the people there, who said that Goa belongs to India, and that the action of the Portuguese Government has not been correct.

So, we know what the reaction has been. If within this one month there has been any change, it has been this, namely that the imperialists, especially the British, did not like that. That is what has been responsible for this new development.

Another reason was the fear of the power of the democratic forces at home. On August 16th and 17th, Government must have certainly seen the unity of the people, and the united upsurge of the people, and they must have understood the power of the people. They must have seen the unity

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

of all sections of the people for a national cause, and that unity becoming stronger and stronger, with the people getting ready to sacrifice their lives for the national cause. Our Government were afraid of the power of the people, and therefore they did not like it. That is why they stopped mass movements even as national movements, where the masses were united were stopped earlier.

The Prime Minister has said that there is a larger interest to be kept in view, namely the interest of peace. And he has said, that Panch Shila is there. But what is Panch Shila? It is a vulgarisation of the noble principles of Panch Shila and a repudiation of the Bandung declaration to say that the Government of India if they wipe out an aggressive imperialist base in our country will jeopardise the world peace and will also hinder the efforts for peace. I want to point out that Panch Shila does not mean this. It is said, Panch Shila means co-existence. That is correct. But there can be no co-existence anywhere in this world between an oppressor on the one side, and the oppressed on the other. The basis of co-existence is freedom. There may be one system of government in one country, and another system of government in another country. Whatever the system of government, co-existence can be between only free peoples; whatever the form of government, there can be no existence between an oppressor and the oppressed. That is what is called co-existence. Panch Shila means negotiations and peaceful settlement of problems between government. Yes, negotiation and peaceful settlement of problems. But here on the one side, there is the oppressor; on the other, there are the Indian people and the Goan people together. As my friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, has said, I want to show that there is no question of separation. We are one; historically, geographically and culturally, the people of Goa and the people of India are one. But we are separated. It is not our fault that

we are separated. We had been separated because we had not been able to defend ourselves. Even when Vasco de Gama came—I was reading the history of Portuguese rule in India—to Calicut, he was driven away by Marikar. Then he again came to Goa. So the Portuguese came to conquer India; we were not able to defend ourselves. So it is a continuation of the occupation of our territory by a foreign power that we see in Goa. We sent them away from here but after that, the struggle is continuing from Goa.

So Panch Shila means negotiations between two Governments. But, I submit there can be no negotiations between the oppressor and the oppressed. The basis of Panch Shila, the basis of co-existence, is freedom. The countries that are free today may have different systems of government, whether it be the capitalist system or the other system. Whatever their system of government if two countries are free, there is co-existence and there must be co-existence. That is the principle of co-existence—and not co-existence between Salazar and the people who are oppressed.

We cannot compare peace and anti-colonial struggle. The Bandung Conference declaration was a declaration against colonialism. That declaration was an affirmation that the subjection of the people to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of the fundamental human rights and is contrary to the charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the policy of world peace and co-operation. So if you want to continue the policy of peace and co-operation, you have to find what is the impediment. The impediment to peace and co-operation between nations is subjugation, domination and exploitation by a foreign power. So it is in the interests of world peace and co-operation that we want that colonialism must end, and the Bandung

declaration definitely says that there is something that is standing in the way—subjugation, domination and exploitation by a foreign power. It is a denial of the fundamental rights of man and is contrary to the charter of the United Nations; it is also an impediment to the policy of world peace and co-operation. So as far as the Bandung declaration is concerned, the Government of India should today take action. Because here is a colony, an imperialist base. As long as it remains, it is an impediment to world peace and co-operation; it shows the subjugation, exploitation and domination by a foreign power.

The Prime Minister, when he spoke last time in this House, said that even the existence of Portuguese rule in Goa is an interference in the political system of India. I do not know whether the Prime Minister has forgotten that. You say that here the existence of Portuguese rule in a part of India is an interference in the political system of India. Panch Shila means that one country should not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. So far as the Prime Minister's declaration is concerned, the very existence of Portuguese rule in Goa is against Panch Shila. Therefore, as far as that declaration is concerned, whatever action we take today in this regard is fighting against the colonial system, and that action is quite correct. It does not go against Panch Shila, against the principles of the Bandung declaration and against the wider policy of peace in this world. In regard to any action taken by a government I want only to point out this. I do not say that peaceful negotiation should not be there. It must be there. All of us are for peaceful negotiation. But I do not want to deal with it because my friend Shri Asoka Mehta has shown when and how and with whom peaceful negotiations can be conducted. For the last eight years we have been doing it. As I said, I have no time to deal with it just now. But here are the actions of the Government since the beginning of the

year. I have got them here from date to date. What are those actions? The Prime Minister himself the other day, when speaking in the Rajya Sabha, said: no, not for the sovereignty of Goa. As far as the sovereignty of Goa was concerned he requested the Portuguese Government to sit down and talk things, to understand their feeling. Even for that the Portuguese Government is not willing. Not only that. They have declared—I do not want to quote—but Salazar has said: if it is about Goa, there is no question of negotiation.

Peaceful negotiation means that the other party must also be prepared. Otherwise it is just like a man who said. "I have fixed up my marriage, it will take place tomorrow". When asked, "But where is the girl?", he said "the girl is not willing, but I have fixed up my marriage and it will take place tomorrow". Where is the peaceful negotiation here when the other party is not ready to do so? It is just like settling one's marriage where the other party has not given any permission at all.

We are sorry. We are not only not against the Government; we will support the Government. As Comrade Asoka Mehta has said, let the Government come out and say: you wait for some time; we are negotiating; Salazar has changed his heart; not only has he changed his heart but also his head; so the head and heart of Salazar have changed; here are the other countries coming in support of us; so you wait for such and such time. Then we can understand that negotiations will be conducted and a settlement will be there. The people in this country who have made so much sacrifice are ready to wait for some more time. When they have waited for eight months the people will be ready to wait for a few months more.

The policy of the Government of India today is: no action by the people; no individual action; we will liberate our country. But that is against the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

fundamental principle of liberation. It is only with the help of the people that liberation can take place. We fought against the Britishers. Something happened when we started the struggle, but it was a continuous struggle against the British and the French. As far as the French are concerned my friend has already spoken about that. I only want to say this. The French would not have left the country had it not been for the struggle of the people in Pondicherry, Karaikal and Mahe. In fact, not only the action of the people in our country but the action of the people in Viet Nam, where there was a fight against the French imperialism and imperialism was finding it difficult, that made the French leave India. So the most important thing as far as liberation is concerned is the action of the people. So the people must act. And as far as the French were concerned that was the lesson we learnt.

Here is an instance where the people are convinced today—if not the Prime Minister—that as far as things that have happened till today are concerned; here is a government that will not negotiate, that is not ready for negotiation. And we are not finding out any other powers that are prepared to come out and negotiate for them. They are not only coming out for negotiation, they give support to Portuguese imperialism.

I have no time. I want only to touch some of the points that have been raised by the Prime Minister last. The Prime Minister said that we want to follow peaceful methods and non-violent methods, that is the policy of the Government. That is very good. I want to ask the Prime Minister: is the policy of following peaceful and non-violent methods confined as far as the foreign governments are concerned, as far as the imperialists are concerned and is it a policy of violence as far as the people are concerned?

The Prime Minister himself has said that there should be some co-ordina-

tion between the foreign policy and internal policy. Certainly. But, is there any co-ordination between the foreign policy and the internal policy here? I say, certainly not. Was there any peaceful negotiation in Darjeeling where lakhs and lakhs of workers were exploited by the foreign capitalists of the country? When they sent in their petitions to Government, when they approached the Government and said that they wanted two annas more, why was there no negotiation? Why did not the Government interfere? On the other hand, when they came outside, Government ordered to shoot them. In the name of law and order so many persons are killed in this country. I want to know how many firings there have been in this country after 1947. It is said that the Government is not non-violent and that Government cannot be non-violent. Government has always been resorting to violence even for small reasons. I do not want to enter into it in detail. What has happened in Patna and other places? If the Government's basic policy was negotiation, if the Government's policy was to talk over things and to see some way out, there will not be so much firing and killing. Here it is not like that.

Goa is our country; it is our soil. Unfortunately, there had been some power there for the last so many years. In spite of our trying for these 8 years, in spite of our request to them, in spite of saying that we do not want a *de-jure* transfer now and that we will be satisfied with a *de facto* transfer, the Portuguese Government is not ready for negotiations. Against such a Government, today, our Government, the Government of India say that our basic policy is a policy of peace and a policy of non-violence. I am surprised when you say that no individual shall offer satyagraha. What will become of individual satyagraha? It means no satyagraha. No struggle in any form whatsoever against foreign domination. That is the policy of the Government of India today.

I will only take two minutes more. Our request is, remove the ban on satyagraha. If people want satyagraha, let them have it, because a ban on satyagraha is a bolt on the history of our country. We have always been struggling and we have always been in support of such a struggle not only in our own country but even wherever people have fought for their freedom. Why not our Government call meeting of the Prime Ministers of the Bandung Conference countries, not only of Africa and Asia but others and ask them whether they will support us or not? It is time that we understand who are our friends and who are not. Why not call a meeting of the Asian countries and put this question and let them say what answer they have got? If time is necessary, give the Portuguese Government an ultimatum and also all the nations of the world. After that, what we say is, any action, including police action should be taken. Police action should be taken even if it is against the Government's policy.....I have already shown that it is not against the Panch Shila. Let us take such action, in case there is no settlement, with the support of all the nations of the world—except one or two who might even go outside—for the liberation of Goa.

There is a difference between invasion and liberation. There is a difference between a war of invasion and, a war of liberation. Invasion means entering another's territory,—territory which is not ours,—and capturing that country for subjugation and domination. But liberation means something else. The country had been ours. It is our own soil; the people had been subjugated years ago and could not come out of it. We go there and we join them in the war of liberation. It does not mean that there should be no negotiation. If with the support of the nations negotiations fail, it is the duty of the Government to see that even police action must be taken. But, today what I have to say is, 'remove the ban'. The people of India will march forward for the liberation of

Goa in spite of the bullets of the Portuguese and the ban of the Government of India, if the ban is not removed.

Shri Raghuramaiah: Both Shri Asoka Mehta and the leader of the Communist Party have reminded me of an old *guru* who used to tell his students that the best way to succeed in life is not to let one hand know what the other hand is doing. The leader of the Communist Party, Shri Gopalan, has made a distinction between a war of liberation and other wars, and has suggested also police action. I remember the days when he and many of his followers were holding big peace conferences, parading all over the country, telling people that there should be no war and sending down doves of peace. I do not know what has happened to my friend, but all I can say is that he is trying to follow that *guru* who said that the right hand should not know what the left hand does. You talk one thing for international consumption. You talk quite another thing or do quite another thing for internal propaganda. We do not believe in that kind of thing or policy. We have got to follow a consistent policy and the real test of greatness is not in mere talking but the real test comes when you ought to show it in action. The whole world is watching us and there is no doubt we have been taking a good deal of interest in the solution of some of the problems of the world. Everybody knows that after the last war, nothing was settled, the main problems remained as they were and there was everywhere hatred, suspicion, intolerance—a hot war on one side, that is in Korea and Indo-China, and a cold war throughout the capitals of the world. I am proud to say that the party to which I have the honour to belong has taken a great initiative in starting a movement, which is now spreading more and more throughout the globe, that nothing can be solved by war, that everything must be solved by peaceful methods. The leader of the Communist Party has stressed on co-existence. Co-existence is only one of the pivots

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

on which we are moving. There is another equally important thing to which millions of people look to for the solution of their problems—that is the peaceful solution of problems. Co-existence does not mean that the oppressed and the oppressor should live always in that manner so that the oppressed becomes still more oppressed and the oppressor goes on oppressing more and more. The question must be solved. There must be liberation for all the oppressed people throughout the world. How to achieve it is the point.

What is happening within recent months or years has shown us very clearly that what we have been preaching is being appreciated throughout the world, even the Summit Conference, the Geneva Conference, and the recent agreement between China and America on whatever minor issue it may be, have shown this. It is not as if they could not go to war, it is not as if they had no armaments, but it is that they have realised the futility of war. I ask you to examine one thing. Has the great war removed the fear of Germany from the Russian mind? Even today, one of the things worrying the Russians is their fear of a re-armed Germany. What has the war done? Therefore, a climate of peace is being slowly worked up—and constantly. My friends will of course say "Yes, we appreciate the bold policy of the Government, we appreciate the peaceful approach to problems, but in the case of Goa, let us relax it a bit. It will be a small war, it will be a liberation war, it will be a small police action." I do not know whether they really mean it? No. Shri Asoka Mehta was using very nice epithets, similes—I do not want to imitate him—and he said one thing, namely, that he heard the Prime Minister and got confused. I am sorry for Shri Asoka Mehta, because I had a better estimate of him: that the lucid and clear exposition of our foreign policy should have confused him, is a thing one should marvel at. What I would say further is this. I had another disappointment. I

always thought that Shri Asoka Mehta was a clear thinker, but I must say that by the time I finished hearing him my confusion is worse confounded and I do not know where I am. What is it that he wanted? He wanted mass satyagraha. Where is it going to lead to? He said something which is not correct regarding our attitude before the 15th August towards mass satyagraha, Congress Party had always been making it clear that we were not in favour of mass satyagraha, whatever may be the case with individual satyagraha. Therefore, there should be no doubt in anybody's mind, mass satyagraha was not encouraged by the Government of India, so far as I am aware. You talk of mass satyagraha; you talk of peaceful satyagraha. Thousands of people, martyrs, get shot there. You come back and hold meetings and say that innocent people are being shot and ask us to go on and march. You say that this will only be a small war. You cannot talk with two voices international affairs. We are a mature nation. Like an adult, a nation has to build its reputation, and there are no two opinions about Goa. Probably Shri Asoka Mehta or the Leader of the Communist Party want to announce to the world that it is only they who are the champions of the cause. The feeling is universal throughout the country. This country will not tolerate Goa or any bit of this country being under foreign domination. There is no distinction between an Indian and Goan. Goa is part of this country, culturally, geographically and the change is bound to come; it will come.

But the point is: what is the method? What should be our approach? Should we jeopardise the entire foreign policy of this country which we have been sedulously building up for so many years? Should we do that just when it comes to test? We have been counselling and lecturing to this country and that country. We should show in actual practice how the principles of Panch Shila, the princi-

ples of peaceful solution of problems are going to solve the problems. Is this the time to put in a finger and say: 'No, no. When it comes to our own cases, let us make an exception; let us not follow the rule, let us have a small war.' I am sorry that they say that when the prestige of this country is going up and up.

I am glad to bring to your notice what the American Ambassador has said recently. Many of you might have read in the papers this statement recently. I quote here specially the American ambassador's view because some time back there has been some criticism of India's foreign policy in America and it is significant that he has spoken in such clear terms about our role. He says:

"In a brief reference to India's peace role, Mr. Cooper said, peace is a world-wide concern. India though young in independence, has been willing to assume responsibility and has played a constructive and influential role in the settlement of world tension. The Bandung Conference, in which India played a leading part was an example of nations finding areas of agreement, in spite of different political systems and disagreement on some fundamental issues. It is to the credit of Bandung, and I am sure due in part to the large viewpoint of Prime Minister Nehru, that though it represented largely the Asian and African world and spoke for its aspirations, it did not proclaim any exclusiveness....."

I read this only to show that even in such external circles, there is a growing appreciation of the foreign policy of India. As a matter of fact those of us who are students of foreign affairs would have noticed that even the summit conference originated in a suggestion made by our delegation to the U.N. General Assembly in 1953. The whole peaceful approach to problems has been initiated by us.

Should we jeopardise it? What else will it lead to if mass satyagraha is to continue? Should we allow thousands and thousands of our patriotic and innocent people to be shot at by the Portuguese or what is the alternative? Therefore, we have to take stock. We are responsible persons. The martyrs are our own kith and kin. We should not allow Satyagrahis to be slaughtered mercilessly in the brutal way in which the Portuguese did. We have got to be responsible and take stock of the situation. That is all, I submit, that the Government have done. They have seen the developments from the beginning when mass satyagraha was advocated and when they have found that it will ultimately lead to certain logical consequences and violence, Government thought it fit to stop them. Whatever my friends on the other side may say, it is all that has happened and they say certain things for obvious reasons and want it to appear that they alone want the liberation of Goa.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): We went and begged Jawaharlalji to allow Congress people to join our Committee; we wanted them to participate in the movement.

Shri Raghuramalah: Shri Asoka Mehta has told us that the Congress people here simply followed the Prime Minister. Of course it is very good and we are proud of it.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: We wanted your support. You came halfway with us and then ran away; that is all.

Shri Raghuramalah: We do not run away. We offer you to come to us. Shri Asoka Mehta, who is the exponent of your Party's foreign policy, I take it, was telling us: 'Why not this Government allow us to take part in the formulation of the foreign policy?' and so on. It is open to him and nothing prevents him from taking share in the broad approach. The prestige which our party has built up, which our leader has built up is open

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

to you all. We are allowing you to share in our heritage, in our tradition and in our glory. We are not stopping you from doing so. But, the point is that you want us to follow you and you do not want to follow us. You want us to follow you when it is against our principles. May God help us, that is all I can say about it. (*Interruption*).

I was very glad in one way when Shri Asoka Mehta in his opening remarks, at any rate, let the cat out of the bag. He said: "Oh: this party is exploiting the foreign policy." Who asked you not to exploit it? Who asked you not to go to public meetings and say, this is our national policy? Who prevented you from exploiting the foreign policy. Who asked you not to say: "This is our national policy, we are proud of it"? So, when it suits you it is your national policy. So long as there was satyagraha it was national policy. The moment there was stoppage of satyagraha, it is not national policy but only a Congress policy. If you want to share with us the glory of our foreign policy you have got to go through it the whole hog. You cannot go through it half way when it suits you and leave it when it does not suit you. We have clear-cut programmes before us. Our foreign policy is now, I am proud to say, influencing the course of world events. We are proud of it.

I am one of those who sincerely believe that the policy which we are now pursuing in respect of Goa is the only logical approach to the problem. I would like my hon. friends on the other side to tell me, what will be the logical consequence of a continued mass satyagraha? Will they stop saying tomorrow: "Well, people are being shot. Go and march on to that country?" Have they not held public meetings on the 15th and 16th of September here in Delhi and asked the Government to take police action? We do not want to be driven to that condition either consciously or unconsciously. I would, therefore, strongly

support the policy pursued by the Government and in this connection once again invite Shri Asoka Mehta and members of the Praja Socialist Party who are anxious to partake in the glory of this policy:

Shri Kamath: No, no. God forbid. Keep all glory to yourself.

✓ **Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** I have moved a substitute motion which reads thus:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, while appreciating the efforts of the Prime Minister in the direction of liquidation of colonialism in Asia and Africa, disapproves of the policy of the Government with regard to Goa and other Portuguese colonies in India."

The hon. Members of this House will notice that I have signed it along with the representatives of the other parties of the Opposition in this Parliament. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy, Shri Kamath and Shri Raghavachari who are members of Praja Socialist Party have signed. Shri V. G. Deshpande who belongs to my party and Shri A. K. Gopalan, leader of the Communist Party have also signed it. One Congress Member was asking me: "How have you joined the comrades?" I pointed out to him that the comrades have joined me because this is the only sensible thing which any self-respecting Parliament can pass today, if it has an iota of self-respect.

Three months back I was addressing a press conference in London, in the India House, on this Goan issue: thanks to the courtesy of the High Commissioner of India Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit. She was kind enough to invite the British Press to an afternoon party in the India House where I had to talk on some of the burning problems of India. I was cross-examined by the Tory Press, by

the British Press on the Goan issue. Honestly I thought that we were pursuing a national policy. Therefore, I said that all parties and groups both inside and outside the Parliament of India supported the Indian Prime Minister's stand, that Goa is an integral part of India and must come to her. The freedom of the Indian people cannot be complete unless and until all foreign pockets are liberated and merged in the Indian Union. I honestly thought when it was so stated by the Prime Minister that there was no difference, no cleavage, no breach between the Government and the people, between the Treasury Bench and the Opposition parties.

I am sorry to say that the last speaker, Shri Raghuramaiah, was badly briefed and that he had a poor case to defend.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakapatnam): He was not briefed at all.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: He was casting aspersions here and there. I am today, after three months, compelled to move this motion showing our disapprobation of the Government's policy. It gives me no joy; it gives me great sorrow and great regret. Shame and sorrow overwhelmed the country when the ruling party and the Government of this country wantonly torpedoed the united front which had been built on the Goan issue. We approached the Prime Minister, in the month of May. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani led the deputation consisting of myself, Shri H. N. Mukerjee and members of the Opposition parties. We told the Prime Minister, "Mr. Prime Minister, on this Goan issue, there should be no difference between the Government and us. Shri Asoka Mehta has been good enough to impress upon us the desirability to forming an all-party committee and therefore we have formed a committee. But we do not want to function unless and until the Congress people join. We have approached the Congress Members of this Parliament. They are willing; they are ready; they are

anxious to mobilise public opinion and also to do their best to strengthen the hands of the Government in fighting this barbarous, Fascist, Portuguese people". We wanted to hold three conventions but we did not appoint the third convener and kept one to be reserved to the Congress Party. We went to the Prime Minister in the month of May. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani is here in this House and she will agree with me when I say so. After a very frank talk—I shall not disclose all that had happened during the discussion—the Prime Minister said: "Give me two days' time". He said he would ask the Bombay Government. We knew that, Shri Morarji Desai, having regard to his antecedents, might create trouble for us. After two days, the Prime Minister gave permission to the Congressmen to join the all-party Parliamentary committee which was formed and which was to function unitedly. I want to assure the Members of Parliament and I want to assure the Prime Minister that there was no question of any party prestige in this matter. The committee agreed that they will not carry anything by majority, and that they will only go by the consensus of opinion. We decided that four conventions should be held in order to mobilise public opinion. The first convention was held in Bombay and the Prime Minister was very nappy to know that a Christian Member of this Parliament, Shri Frank Anthony, presided over that convention. That was a great success. Dr. Lanka Sundaram was there. I could not go but other people were there. Then came the great Calcutta convention. That was also a great success and Swami Ramananda Tirtha, President of the Hyderabad Congress, came over to Calcutta. It was my privilege to have him as my guest for some hours on that day and he presided over that conference. He made a very strong speech and it was unanimously adopted that satyagraha should be resorted to and that was the only way in the circumstances. The Prime Minister says: peaceful action; there shall be no police action;

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

there shall be no military action. Then, what? Let the Prime Minister tell me. Then only satyagraha or negotiation remains. But Salazar would not talk to you. Salazar would not even respond to the demands of the Prime Minister for an open conference. I sent him a telegram just before I left London. I was very much distressed when the first brave Member of Parliament, Shri V. G. Deshpande, braved the barbarities of the Portuguese barbarians and was taken to the Portuguese jails. I was sick then; I was in the sick-bed at a Zurich hospital. I was very much perturbed. I thought of an interview with Salazar, when I was told that Shri Deshpande was being brutally treated and was being badly mauled by a half-naked Portuguese fellow in the prison. I was deeply perturbed and I wrote to the Prime Minister. I discussed the matter with some friends in Europe at a meeting. They said: "Look at this—what the Portuguese have said. They say that we are not going to discuss with Shri Jawaharlal Nehru or any representative of the Nehru Government, the question of abdication of Portuguese sovereignty". They shut the door against Shri Nehru, who is an apostle of peace and non-violence. Very well. Salazar shuts the door on negotiation, on arbitration, on conferences, without compunction. I sent him a telegram saying "why don't you accept, as Prime Minister of Portugal, this very reasonable demand of our Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, for a conference between your lieutenants and Pandit Nehru's lieutenants without prejudice, even without accepting any demand?" But he would not accept that. Then what? The only honourable thing to do was for our people, for our men and women, to undergo suffering and sacrifice for the liberation of Goa, which is nothing but the continuation of the liberation and freedom movement of India. I do agree with Shri Jawaharlal Nehru—every man and woman should agree with him—that the continuance of Portuguese domination is not only an

anachronism, but an affront to Mother India, an affront to our self-respect. The British Empire had vanished; the French Empire has been liquidated in India. I had the privilege of talking to some Members of the House of Commons sitting in the House of Commons itself; I had the privilege to discuss with them the Goan issue on two occasions. I was simply amazed to know the amount of ignorance which prevailed there. They were honestly under the impression that it was predominantly a Catholic country. I told them, "what nonsense are you talking? 64 per cent are non-Christians, are Hindus." They did not know it; they thought that it was predominantly a Catholic country and so they wanted continuance of Portuguese domination.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Did they not own Goa at one time?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: As a matter of fact, they were completely ignorant of basic facts and when I pointed out what kind of Christianity they had, they were talking of the great contribution of Portugal and the good things that they had done. I read Sardar Panikkar's speech both to the Press Conference and also to the Members of the British House of Commons. In his latest book, *A Survey of Indian History*, Sardar Panikkar says:

"There is very little to recommend the Portuguese from any point of view. Devoid of scruples or sense of honour, overweening in their pride, indolent and with no sense of morality, they produced no statesman or administrator of outstanding ability except Albuquerque during the period of hundred and fifty years when they held the mastery of the Indian seas."

That, Sir, is the position. We approached them; Shri Ramananada Tirtha presided over that conference. I think that Shri Hafizur Rahman, another Congressman, presided over the Delhi convention. I was in England talking to the Members of the

House of Commons. Really there was no cleavage. I was simply amazed to find that the President of the Indian National Congress, after the Resolution was passed, emphasised that we should remember that Goa was a national issue. This is a wanton piece of advice and admonition to us that it is a national issue. If there was in India any movement which could be really called an all-Party movement, it was the Goa liberation movement. As a matter of fact, the protagonists of all-Party unity had not the decency, had not the courtesy, to consult any other Party. I am not now thinking of Party position or Party prestige. When Shri Deshpande went to Goa on the 18th June, he had not the Hindu Mahasabha flag in his hand. He had the National Flag in his hand. He had the Indian Union Flag in his hand. Everyone fought on that basis. When he went there, there were not merely members of my party. There were other groups led by an eminent Praja Socialist leader. Some of my communist friends were there. It was an all-party move. We all marched together, with no party flag, with no party slogans, with no party cry. The only cry was the cry of India, Bharat Matha, with the Indian Flag in their hands. Today, we ought to remember, we ought not to forget that there is one other Member of this Parliament. Shri Tridib Chaudhuri who is rotting in the Goa jail. He belongs to the Revolutionary Socialist Party. He comes from the district of Murshidabad and he represents that great district in this House. He never fought in the name of his party. He went with a large batch of volunteers and faced Portuguese bullets, Portuguese lathi charge and Portuguese barbarities.

What is the position today? Why this unilateral action of yours? I am not thinking merely of consultation for the sake of consultation. The Prime Minister knows the address of Acharya Kripalani; he knows my address; he knew the addresses of all the people who are members of the All Parties Parliamentary Goan Committee. Should he not even ask us, discuss the

matter, that is give us facts to justify his volte face, to justify his somersault? Why this reversal? I am amazed that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, a man of his position, a man of his integrity, should talk this in Parliament, that there is no reversal of policy. Look at the facts. On the 15th August, 1954, the Goa Vimochan Samithi had decided that the struggle should be carried on inside Goa. The Goan National Congress under Mr. Peter Alvares wanted to offer satyagraha. The first attack, the first affront, the first betrayal came from Shri Morarji Desai. He arrested about 100 volunteers who were following Shri Iswarlal Desai. Shri Desai is now rotting in the Goa jail. They were forcibly prevented from entering Goa. Have not non-Goans any right to participate in this struggle?

In April 1955, Shrimati Sudha Joshi, wife of Shri Mahadev Shastri Joshi, who is a member of the Goa Vimochan Samithi and a representative of the Goan National Congress, presided at Mapuca inside Goa, over the Congress session. She was arrested. Then the movement began to catch fire. On 18th May, 1955, the Congress decided to send the first batch of Indian satyagrahis in Goa under Senapati Bapat and Shri N. S. Goray. They marched into Goa. Why did you allow them to march? Was not that an indication of policy? By that time, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and Members of the Opposition had gone to the Prime Minister. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had lifted the ban and had allowed all of us to function on one Committee. As a result of that decision, we had accepted certain things. We are acting in a united manner. Therefore, on the 18th of May, the Government of his country had decided that satyagraha should be allowed inside Goa and that it should be conducted by Indians. From the 18th May, it went on.

You know that on the 15th June, Shri V. G. Deshpande left Poona. As he entered, you know what happened. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru came back in the middle of July. After he came

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

back, I read sitting in England that he held a Press Conference. He knew perfectly well that arrangements were being made for the continuance of the satyagraha movement. He knew what the Goa Committee was going to do: not in defiance of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's wishes, but in consultation with the high-ups in the Government of this country. On the 19th of July, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru declared as the Prime Minister of India, let the Atlantic powers take notice that India is a great country, India is a powerful country, it will stand no nonsense and continued Portuguese occupation of Goa is scandalous beyond measure. He also declared that he will see that the citadel collapses. Was not that an encouragement, a direct abetment of satyagraha? Was not that putting the seal of approval on what the Goa Committee was doing? By the 19th July, when the Prime Minister declared that he would stand no nonsense, he gave his blessings. Nine batches including Shri V. G. Deshpande's batch and Shri T. K. Chaudhuri's batch had already entered Goa. The Goa Vimochan Samithi did not take any improper action. I assure the House, all this loose talk of Shri Raghuramalaiah that these people wanted to indulge in mass satyagraha against the wishes of the Prime Minister in a reckless manner, is without foundation. It is a wicked slander. They deserve much better of this Parliament. Who is Jayant Tilak? Tilak is the grandson of the great Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak. I saw the Prime Minister on my return from England and I told the Prime Minister: "If there is any misgiving, send for Tilak. He is a young man. But he is a sensible man. Shri Jedhe, Chairman of the Goa Congress Committee is a Congressman. He will never go against your wishes." On the 21st July, Tilak, Secretary of the Goa Vimochan Committee, came to Delhi. He saw Pandit Pant on the evening of the 21st and thereafter certain railway facilities were given, were arranged for the satyagrahis. We were obliged to Pandit Pant and the Government for giving all that.

What I am saying is nothing was done by the Goa Vimochan Samitti against the wishes of the Government, against the wishes of the Congress. They did their very best to fall in line with what the Prime Minister or the Home Minister or the high-ups in the Government wanted to do. As a matter of fact, I have got here.....

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Dist.—West cum Rae Bareli Dist.—East): When an important Member of the House is speaking, the Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs is not present. The Deputy Minister is also not present and the load has been thrown on our poor friend, Shri Sadath Ali Khan. I would suggest that when an important Member is speaking, somebody responsible should be present, at least the Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs,—the Prime Minister we can understand—unless they can prove that they are busy in the Council of States which has got a lunch interval just now.

Mr. Chairman: Every day in the House a complaint like this is made and the Chair is unable to compel the presence of any Minister here. It has been said so many times and therefore it is for the Ministers to see that the wishes of the House are complied with.

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): I would like to point out one thing, that it is of course not for want of any desire to attach importance to the discussion of this subject, but this is rather lunch time and the hon. the Prime Minister left. I am sitting here watching the proceedings. Whatever is said will be duly conveyed to him.

Mr. Chairman: The difficulty is this. It is most probable that the hon. the Prime Minister may be busy with more important work also, apart from its being lunch time. At the same time, the Members of the House do not know what other Ministers are officiating for him and taking notes.

Shri Pataskar: I am sitting here and watching the proceedings and the Parliamentary Secretary is taking notes.

Sardar A. S. Sagal (Bilaspur): He can give his legal opinion on that.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Dist.—East cum Ballia Dist.—West): There is collective responsibility and the Minister is sitting here.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): I may assure the Members here that I have been taking down copious notes and all these notes will be presented to the Prime Minister when he comes here.

Shri Joachim Alva: May I also point out something very, very important? When the External Affairs Ministry's estimates were debated in this House on the last occasion there was not even a Chowkidar present in the Official Gallery, and when the Defence Ministry's affairs are discussed, all the Secretaries are present throughout the debate. This is the scant attention which the External Affairs Ministry pays to this House.

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: The officers of the Ministry have other things to do.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary has just told us that he is present. We are very grateful for his presence because otherwise we do not know what we would have done, but if even now you can send word to the Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs or the Deputy Minister to be present, we shall be very much obliged.

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: The Deputy-Minister will be here in a few minutes.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Such a situation has arisen several times, to no effect. Let Shri Chatterjee continue.

2 P.M.

Mr. Chairman: I hope the hon. Member will continue. But the desire of the House must be conveyed to the Prime Minister and the other Ministers. It is quite true that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs is taking down notes. But at the same time, without in any manner not appreciating his taking notes, it is quite another thing for any of the Ministers to be present here and his take notes. We do not know what the notes are. We want that when a matter like this is being discussed, some of the Ministers should be in the House to get impressed with what is being said here.

Shri Pataskar: I would like to draw your attention to one fact, which I think hon. Members have not probably taken note of, and that is that I am here. As I said in the beginning, the Parliamentary Secretary is also taking down notes. In this case, probably if the Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs were present, it would be a different matter. Of course, I quite understand that there should be some responsible Minister present here to convey whatever discussion takes place. But I do not know why only a particular Minister should be present here. Whatever notes are taken down will be conveyed to the Minister concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Ordinarily, it is quite right, that one of the Cabinet Ministers should be here.

Shri Pataskar: But in this case, there is one such Minister here.

Mr. Chairman: When a Minister is here, there can be no objection, for other Ministers may have other work to attend to, for other work also has to be attended to. So, it is enough if one of the Ministers is here. But the House does not know whether the Minister of Legal Affairs is officiating for any of the Ministers in charge. That is a point which must be made clear. If a Minister in charge is not able to be present, then he must at least inform the House that such and

[Mr. Chairman]

such Minister has been asked to officiate for him.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: The Minister of Legal Affairs has not been taking any notes. I have been watching him all along.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri Pataskar: I am afraid the matter is being treated rather lightly. So far as the present arrangements are concerned, there is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs sitting here—at least there was one before, but there are two now—and taking down notes consistently; he has taken notes even when the Prime Minister was here. That is why I thought I need not unnecessary take notes twice.

Mr. Chairman: At the same time, the hon. Minister might be taking down mental notes. Who can say that he is not taking down mental notes?

Shri Pataskar: Evidently I am here, and I shall convey whatever points are raised.

Mr. Chairman: The presence of the hon. Minister is evident. There is no doubt that the hon. Minister represents the Cabinet here. So, there cannot be any legal objection that no Minister is present. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary is also here and taking down notes. So, there can be no objection on that score also. But at the same time, it is quite desirable that when a discussion like this takes place, some of the Ministers responsible for External Affairs should be here. It is but fair that they should be here.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I am afraid these interruptions are being made in order to interrupt the speech of the hon. Member Shri N. C. Chatterjee. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let us proceed with the debate now.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am obliged to my hon. friend Shri Feroze Gandhi

for emphasising the desirability that some responsible Minister should be here. But I hope the hon. Minister of Legal Affairs will not merely take mental notes, but would kindly take some physical notes also. The first physical note that I want the hon. Minister to take is this. On the 21st of June—kindly put it down.....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Is this a class room?

Shri Pataskar: This is going on in a very light way. I do not appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman: This is not fair. The use of such language in the light manner is not right.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I stand corrected.

Mr. Chairman: This is the Parliament of India, and we must keep dignity in the House.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I shall proceed with great dignity.

Shri Pataskar: I think the Chair should look to the dignity of the Government as well. An hon. Member should not dictate and say, take down notes.

✓ **Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** On the 21st of June 1955, Shriman Narayan—no longer Agarwal—Congress General Secretary, issued a public statement calling upon Congressmen to take ✓ active interest in the Goan movement.

Therein, he said: "I am asking you to remember two speeches, one by Pandit Nehru which he delivered on the 4th June..." I am quoting that ✓ portion of the circular:

✓ "Pandit Nehru spoke on the 4th June as follows:

I concede the right of Indians to go to Goa as satyagrahis, because it is an undisputed fact that ✓ Goa is part of India'."

Therefore, Pandit Nehru knew exactly in Poona what the Goa Vimochan Samiti was doing and what was

going to happen, on what scale it was being done. And there he said that it is the right—it cannot be to go to Goa by Portugal or anybody else in the world—that Goa is a part of India. What has happened since the 4th of June till today? What happened on the 3rd September when you declared that Indians have forfeited the right to go to Goa as satyagrahis? What has happened? This is not the right given by Pandit Nehru. This is not the right given by the Parliament of India. This is not the right given by any Government or Treasury Benches. This is the God-given, inalienable right which Mahatma Gandhi, whose name you take everyday, had declared to be the right of every man and woman, to fight against injustice, inequity, oppression; it is an inalienable and God-given right. What right has the All India Congress Committee, or for that matter, this Government of India, to deprive any Indian of this God-given, inalienable right?

Then Shri Shriman Narayan added:

"The Congress President, Mr. Dhebar, has also declared in a recent statement that the Indian National Congress cannot accept the right of the Portuguese Government to deal with Indians as aggressors....."

Because they were not aggressors; they were defenders. Shri Dhebar was right. On the 4th of June, Shri Shriman Narayan, Congress General Secretary, made this appeal to Congressmen. Appeal for what? Appeal to come forward and join the satyagraha. Appeal to come forward and intensify the momentum of this movement. And, therefore, all parties were united. On the 15th of August, the great, historic Red Fort speech—from the ramparts of Lal Kila—of the Prime Minister was delivered. He gave his *mubarak*; he gave his good wishes.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: The Deputy Minister has come.

He said they are suffering without expecting any armed aid. He paid his tribute to them on the 16th August—when I was not here. Parliament paid a great tribute. The Prime Minister made a great speech paying homage to those who had laid down their lives, who had sacrificed their lives for India's honour and for emancipation of Goa. He said that the Portuguese Government's action was brutal and uncivilised.

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

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: A portion of my time has been taken up by interruptions. You will kindly allow me that time.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Let him have more time.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: On the 21st August, the Sitapur speech of Pandit Nehru was delivered. In that speech, he declared that it is not merely the right of every Indian, but it is the duty of every Indian—I am reading that speech—

"It is the right of an individual and or groups to perform satyagraha."

What I am pointing out is this. On the 21st of August, after the satyagraha had been committed—call it group-scale or whatever scale you like—knowing full well what has been done, the Prime Minister gave his blessings, paid his tribute, Parliament paid its tribute. But what had happened after that? On the 23rd August, two days after the Prime Minister's speech—I have got the letter in my hand—some Members of Parliament communicated to the Goa Vimochan Samiti their desire to offer satyagraha, after the Prime Minister's speech from the Red Fort ramparts, after the Prime Minister's speech in Parliament of India, after the Prime Minister's Sitapur speech, they thought it was their duty, in response to the demand the Congress Secretary made in the circular, to come forward, and Shri Nijalingappa, who joined

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

our committee as convener, and Swami Ramananda Tirtha, were given permission to offer satyagraha in Goa. That fact was communicated to the Goa Vimochan Samiti. What had happened after that date that you changed your policy? Is it not a reversal of policy? You say on the 4th June that it is the right of every Indian, you say on the 21st August that it is the duty of every Indian to offer Satyagraha, you repeatedly declared that nobody can dispute this fact. Your Congress President says that it is not only the undisputed right, but the Congress will never accept the right of the Portuguese Government to deal with Indian citizens as aggressors. After that you declare that you shall not allow any satyagraha, individual or group. Is that not a reversal of your policy?

What are you afraid of? It is this. I am very sorry to make this allegation. But there is a feeling in the country that possibly the Congress Secretary's circular did not have the adequate response which was expected of Congressmen; therefore as the Congressmen thought that the initiative was going into the hands of the opposition parties, they did not like this. Naturally, nobody would like to lay down his life and suffer immolation at the hands of the Portuguese barbarians.

But what is this brake? If you put this brake when the car has gained momentum, when it is running at sixty miles speed and when the whole country is behind the movement, what happens? You will not merely damage the car but also throw the driver out of the car; you imperil his life. What has happened today is that you have not merely killed the Indian movement. By this unilateral action which you have taken without consultation and without taking anybody into confidence, without sending for the Goa All Parties Committee, without even asking Jhede and Tilak of the Goa Vimochan Samiti who have done so much for this liberation

movement, you have put this brake. What is the effect of that? By putting this brake on you have completely finished the Goan movement not merely in India. By doing this you have demoralised the unfortunate people inside Goa. They feel that they have been completely let down, that they have been sacrificed by the Indian people and the Indian Government.

The Prime Minister is not here, but I hope the hon. the Deputy Minister will take note of it. Here is a very interesting article by Dr. Krishnalal Shridharani which was published in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of the 12th September 1955. He is not a Hindu Mahasabha man, not a socialist, not a communist. He has made a spirited appeal to Pandit Nehru. He has pointed out that the Nehru regime came to power through the prowess of satyagraha, and therefore for him to say today that satyagraha is not all right or that satyagraha should not be allowed is something antagonistic to the basic stand of his life and the achievements of Mahatma Gandhi. He says:

"For the Prime Minister to say that we have had no experience of international satyagraha, and then to ban its first use in connection with Goa, is like begging the question. You cannot have an experience unless an experiment is allowed. India has special obligation not only to allow such an experiment but to encourage it."

Then he says:

"The Government of India is not just any other Government when it comes to satyagraha. It is a Government made possible by satyagraha. To brush aside the question of international satyagraha as academic is something like denouncing an obligation."

If I remember aright—the hon. Minister will correct me if I am wrong—did not Gandhiji say that Poland's resistance to Hitler's aggression was

nothing but satyagraha? Did he not support the Government of Pandit Nehru when the Indian Army marched into Kashmir in order to throw out the Pakistani aggressors? Was that not just and proper? Did he not give his blessings to Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose when he went to see him in the year 1940 at Wardha and unfolded his plan of direct, violent, armed action against the British Imperialists from outside India? Did not Mahatma Gandhi say, "Subhas, that is not my way, but if you succeed, I will be the first man to welcome you when you come back"? Did he not say that? Is not that the same kind of moral stand which he took and which he applied? Is that the stand which Pandit Nehru is taking today? What right has the Government or the Congress Committee to deprive the people of their God-given, inalienable birth-right to offer satyagraha?

The Goan National Congress have been doing their best to fall in line. Nobody wants to sacrifice his life for the fun of it. They realise that as things stand, the Government of India cannot take police action or military action and that Salazar's obduracy, stupidity and arrogance would make negotiation impossible. Therefore they offer satyagraha. Is it fair, is it just to take away that weapon?

If Sardar Patel had been alive things would have been different. Hyderabad's arrogance and villainy were completely liquidated because the Iron Man of India was here. Pandit Nehru is to-day surrounded by men who have developed cold feet, who have not the guts, who have not got the courage of Sardar Patel. If he had been alive things would have been different. He would have liquidated this and laughed at Portugal and the 'civilised world'. Wherever I went, France or Germany or England or other places, they asked, "You cannot deal with Portugal? After all, they know how to run away from the battlefield. Are you really seriously contemplating all this action? Do you think there will be a third World

War if the Indian Army marched into Goa? Neither Mr. Eisenhower nor Mr. Eden would be such a mad person as to order the American Army or the British Army into action." I do not think that they would take any military action for a seventh rate or decadent power and would do anything like that. I think that what we are saying is quite correct but, in any event, it would not be fair to ban individual satyagraha and deprive Indians of that right which Pandit Nehru had recognised, Shri Dhebar had recognised, which the Congress had recognised and which the Secretary wanted to be implemented by congressmen. It is something which has not only been a reversal of policy but something derogatory of India's honour, India's respect and India's prestige.

Shri Gadgil: I have been greatly impressed by the earnestness of my friend Shri Asoka Mehta, although his eloquence has not carried me away. I have equally a great admiration for the way in which the Communist leader presented his point of view. So far as the forensic skill of Shri Chatterjee is concerned, all I say is that his foresightedness should be equal to his forensic skill.

This is a question on which there is some agreement and some difference. What I would like to say is, to borrow the phraseology of my friend Shri Asoka Mehta, extend the area of agreement and reduce the area of disagreement as much as possible. The agreement is on the point that this is a national question and it should be handled as such. With this in view, I would appeal to the Members not only of the Congress Party but also of other parties that in arriving at any particular line of action or a way out of the present situation, no party should allow considerations of prestige, so to say, to outweigh considerations of national interests. I do not want to say much about what Shri Chatterjee has quoted *datewise* about the announcement made by the Congress Secretary or the substance

[Shri Gadgil]

of speeches made by the Prime Minister. Evidently, he has said that it is the right of an Indian citizen to march into Goa because Goa is India, historically, culturally and ethnologically. Not only that; but, he has said that existence of Portuguese rule in Goa is an interference with our own independence. In other words, it is a continuing wrong. Every day there is a fresh cause of action and the sooner the whole thing is liquidated the better. What I feel is that these matters must be considered very dispassionately and we must not be swayed by what has happened immediately after the 15th August or preceding that. Let us not be carried away by what the police officers at Belgaum may have done a day or two before. It is a matter for regret if it is a fact.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Why do you not get them punished?

Shri Gadgil: I am sure that due notice will be taken of the same.

Similarly, we must not be carried away, when we assess the situation as it develops, and when we consider what will be our future line of policy, by what happened in Bombay, whether it was due to over-enthusiasm on the part of the crowd or due to tactless handling by certain authorities. These are considerations which should not weigh with us when we have to decide our future policy in the highest interest of the country.

I would go a step further. Logic is a process and not a product, and, therefore, the test of the decision is not whether it is logical or it is rigidly consistent or whether it has doctrinaire correctness. My only test is whether the decision taken is in the highest interest of the country and whether the decision is consistent by and large with the national ideals which we have preached so long and have attempted to practise, and whether the decision is consistent with our approach to the solution of national problems. These are the broad tests by which we must consider any

particular decision. There is a grievance, I could see from all the speeches delivered from this side of the House, (pointing to the opposition) that they have not been consulted. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will answer it, but I put it in a very humble way. Assume that the decision was taken without any reference to leaders of other parties. Will they put their particular sense of self-importance, very legitimate self-importance, over the consideration of national interests?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: May I correct his impression? It is not at all a question of self-importance. We wanted data; we wanted facts; we wanted cogent reasons; we wanted to have a discussion round the table so as to understand the difficulties in the way of Government.

Shri Gadgil: I have thoroughly appreciated it and I pose the question exactly in that context. It is not for me to say what I have been doing in this connection. What I am saying now is not for the first time; I have made that appeal in the informal meeting of the A.I.C.C. and I am glad to inform this hon. House that my suggestion was by and large accepted by the mover of the resolution, Dr. B. C. Roy, a friend of Shri Chatterjee, and was also generally accepted by the hon. Prime Minister himself. But the fact remains that the decision has been taken and we have to face a certain situation. When satyagraha started in 1954, it was started not on the basis of All party affair. Gradually, the Government's attitude became clearer and more sympathetic, and in April or May of this year, the All Goa Vimochan Samiti came into existence, where the decision in the initial stages was a decision of some party and not of all the parties. But later on it became a decision of all the parties. May I, on the analogy of the same, request my hon. friends here that this decision may be the decision of the Congress Party in the initial stage? We request you to consider whether in the highest interest of our country

we should not exhaust every possible means of coming together and reducing our misunderstandings to a minimum, if not further.

My humble view is that it is true that the Government's attitude was sympathetic. That only shows that Government is fully responsive to what is happening in the public mind. If this is the background, if this is what the Government has done so far, why is it that you are immediately concluding that because the Government has taken a particular decision, it is completely against popular interests. All I humbly suggest is this: you must not view this in that way. If you so like, doubt the wisdom of this particular decision but do not doubt the sincerity of those who have taken this decision just as I do not doubt the sincerity and earnestness with which you have put your points of view today. I am sure that it will go to clear the air considerably.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: But I doubt the wisdom.

Shri Gadgil: One of my friends here has said something about the character of satyagraha. I am sorry that he does not know what has happened on the 15th of August. Before the 15th of August, from the month of April upto that date, nearly 1100 satyagrahis offered satyagraha and about 97 were Congressmen. There was no complaint of any violence or anything done which would have brought discredit to the principle of non-violent satyagraha. What happened on the 15th of August is equally a matter of pride for me and should be a matter of pride for every Indian who has faith in satyagraha. The organisation put up, the methods followed, the disbursement of the satyagrahis and the way in which they behaved in the most provoking circumstances are a tribute to the fact that they have fairly imbibed the spirit of satyagraha. If anybody says that what these 3120 people did on the 15th of August was responsible for what has happened on the 16th of August somewhere else, I should say in all humility that you are belit-

ting the sacrifices that they have made. Therefore, I say that this is a question which we must consider in a dispassionate manner. If our Prime Minister has contributed so much to the solution of many an international problem and when we are all proud of it, why can we not imagine for a minute that he will certainly have the capacity and the opportunity to solve this problem of Goa similarly. The policy of peaceful approach which has been laid down for years had given us some good dividends in the matter of French possessions in India. Why should we say that because it has not given us immediate results so far as Portugal is concerned, we should discard it. No. As you say Government was sympathetic. The Prime Minister also agreed that it was a matter of right for every Indian or group of Indians to go there. If he has taken a decision which is different from the normal trend which developed from May to August, you must credit him that he must have very very strong reasons to do so.

An Hon. Member: What are they?

Shri Gadgil: It is possible that those reasons are of a character that any public expression of the same may not be in the best interests of the country. There are occasions when certain vagueness is in the highest interest of final clarity. There are occasions when in order to understand better, one need not express in words. There are occasions when something, if left unstated, becomes more lucid.

Now, somebody asked: what are the items of economic sanctions, this, that and the other? All I can say is that it will be poor strategy for any Government to say that they are going to march their armies this way and that way and give a perfect blue-print for the benefit of their enemies. That is not a right policy. I most respectfully again suggest this. Just as the initiative was taken by other parties in starting satyagraha and the Congress came later on and it became an all-party affair, I again suggest that

[Shri Gadgil]

the initiative of this particular decision is taken by the Congress and all of you might join and make it a national decision.

Now, I fully realise the point of security raised by Shri Asoka Mehta. We have by closing the frontier, with all its implications, put Portugal out of, so to say, the ring of our friendship. Now we can just imagine what it means to us in any critical position—God may not bring that moment—but if some such situation arises, Goa will be necessary for us from the point of view of security.

Some days ago Dr. Salazar made a speech and he analysed in his own way and said: it is not necessary for economic benefit of India, not necessary for the security of India, this that and the other. Now, in view of what has happened and in view of certain other powers taking suspicious interest in Portuguese Goa I think—I am sure the Government of India must be quite alive to that—the Goa problem cannot be delayed beyond a certain point of time, because it has now a significance, from the view-point of security of this country. I am therefore requesting the members of the Opposition parties: do not feel let down, or do not feel aggrieved that you have not been consulted before the decision was taken by the Government of India, but do join, and let the whole world know that so far as the Goa question is concerned, not only in the matter of ultimate objective, but even in the matter of method, the entire country is behind the Government, behind the Prime Minister

Now, imagine what will happen if the Goa Vimochan Samiti and friends of that committee take a decision to continue the satyagraha. Something will go wrong; Government will certainly act in a manner which it feels absolutely necessary, but the attention of the Government will be diverted and definitely in so far as the world is concerned, those who

are already there to take advantage of any rift that is possible on the question of Goa will certainly make capital of it.

Now consider which situation is better. Even assuming this decision is not to your liking, in the interest of the country you accept it, although it is not to your liking, and you give a chance to the Government to deal with the problem till such time when you can honestly say that this policy of the Government has failed, failed completely. But till then you owe it to yourself, you owe it to the country, you owe it to the martyrs who have laid down their lives, that sufficient time must be given to the Government. It will not be letting down those who have gone ahead, those who are rotting in the prisons, or who are dead and gone. Just as when Gandhiji was asked what he would do while settling affairs with the British Government he said that before he finally decided, the corpses of Bhagat Singh and Raj Guru be there, so I am sure, whatever Government may be in power, who-soever may be the Prime Minister, the fact will remain that the sacrifices of those who gave their lives on the 15th of August will not permit that Government or that Prime Minister to arrive at a settlement which will be less even by a grain than the full settlement everyone of us has in view. They will be remembered and requited. Nothing will be forgiven and nothing will be forgotten. And if the 15th of August incident has done anything it has put the Goa problem by and large before the whole world and it has given spiritual strength to the Government, to the people, and once more I thought we have recaptured that spiritual urge which was so much in evidence in the 1942 movement and earlier movements of non-co-operation. People were saying that after independence everybody is after money, ministership, parliamentary membership and membership of this committee and that committee. But I am glad to find

that there are so many people who without any thought or without any reference to self-interest, are capable of showing so much sacrifice, so much patriotism. This is my real capital, not the capital that my friend Shri C. D. Deshmukh may gather—but this is the capital, the spiritual capital, which guarantees the progress of the country throughout. I request Members of the opposition parties just to watch the situation and decide whether it would be good to take that attitude in the highest interest of the country, however much they may not like the decision. Follow the Prime Minister; but keep your powder dry follow the Government; give them some time, reasonable time, and show the world that you are absolutely united.

One thing I am certain. The decision was taken not because of any fear. This decision was taken because we are conscious of our strength.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Of what?

Shri Gadgil: Strength of that very weapon of satyagraha to which, for the first time, Mr. Chatterjee paid such tribute. So, we are conscious of the strength of the weapon of satyagraha. My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta analysed the position saying this is not possible, that is not possible, and he came to the conclusion that satyagraha was the only way. I agree with him. But when that step should be taken, you must leave it to Government—as we often say we must leave something to the man on the spot. Therefore, whether in this particular context of circumstances, satyagraha should be allowed to be continued or there should be a stop for the time being, should be left to be decided by Government. We only mark time: we stop for a while so that we may march with greater strength, when the proper time comes. We are waiting for that proper time. We will succeed here, as the policy of Government has succeeded in the matter of French possessions.

Here is a challenge to the whole world. Other nations utilised India's good offices when they wanted their chestnuts to be taken out of the fire. Here is a test of their sincerity for world peace; here is a test of their sincerity that they are against colonialism and they are for democracy everywhere. If they fail, if they fail to help us in solving the Goa problem, the consequences will not be limited to Goa, but they will assume a far-reaching character and I am certain that every country in the world will have to regret. It is in their own interest, it is in the highest interest of the world peace, that they should come to the help of India and help her in solving this important problem satisfactorily.

Meanwhile this is the situation and if you take any other decision, that decision will create problems of law and order here and there and political stresses and rains. I am sure that in calmer moments and with the political acumen and judgment with which I credit my friends here, they will come to the right conclusion, that whatever be their personal or party feelings, they have risen to the occasion and they have said: all right, we suspend it and we reserve the right to review it when the proper time comes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I have spoken often enough in this House on foreign affairs and I have been very often critical of the policy of the Government of our country. Sometimes, perhaps, I have been denunciatory,—whether picturesquely so, or otherwise, I do not know, and I care less—but I feel that on this occasion participating in this debate a little suddenly, I must confess I have a sense of shame in regard to the policy of the Government of my country.

Shri Alagu Rai Shastri: It is unfortunate that you should have that feeling.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not think I ever used that particular word when I have discussed the foreign policy. I think sometimes I

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

have offered bouquets to the Prime Minister and I am very sensible of the great work which he has done as far as international affairs are concerned. But, today our minds and hearts are overwhelmed by one thought and that is the thought with regard to the problem of Goa. That is why, Sir, like almost every speaker in today's debate I shall confine myself to the problem of Goa.

It is not necessary for me to go into any chronological details in regard to the Government's attitude a few months ago or a few weeks ago and the attitude of the Government which we have seen degenerating from day to day from the 15th of August. My friend Shri Gadgil—who has unfortunately gone away after having made his oration—said: "We are all proud of what happened on the 15th of August." It is a matter which to me is a mystery, that it was exactly from after the 15th of August that the Prime Minister's tone changed. The contents of his statements in the House proved to be something of which I am ashamed.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee has said that on the 15th of August, the Prime Minister on the ramparts of Red Fort gave his *mubarak bad*, greetings and Godspeed to the satyagrahis. He said, of course, certain other things which to our way of thinking were extremely undesirable, but he gave his *mubarak bad*—there is no doubt about it—and wished Godspeed to the satyagrahis.

Today he comes and says—and there have been certain other statements, where also the Government and the ruling party have tried to make it clear—that he has always disapproved of mass satyagraha. I quite understand the Prime Minister of my country on National Day giving his greetings and wishing Godspeed to the satyagrahis who were going on a mass satyagraha. He knew all about it. He gave his *mubarak bad*. Why did he do so? He did so because, after all, unlike me—I must confess that I am

not a man of the people, but he is—he is a man of the people and possibly he responded to what was in the air of the country. He offered *mubarak bad* to all those people who were going on mass satyagraha. On the 17th of August he came to this House angry beyond what statement I will. I controlled myself and for that I was upbraided by many people in this House as well as outside. He gave a statement. He and I, know how to use the English language. He gave certain figures. I am sorry I have not got the statement here. He said, so many people entered Goa on the 15th of August, so many came back; 12 people were missing or something of that sort. That expression "came back" from the Prime Minister, I could never imagine. I told some of my friends in the lobby that I could never imagine the Prime Minister using that language. Our dead were brought back; they did not come back. The Prime Minister with a superb mastery of the English language chose to say "they came back".

If I had something to do with the Portuguese Government I would jump at the opportunity of using that statement. It was as if we had a holiday, we had an excursion when our people went to Goa and came back and only 12 did not come back. That was the attitude which he showed by that statement. I do not have that statement but I remember, as true as I am speaking now—you can refer to that document—he said "so many people came back". I do not understand the Prime Minister saying that. I have respect for sensitivity. I still have a great deal of respect as far as his sensitivity to things that carry value in life are concerned, but I do not understand why this could happen. Why did it happen? Why did certain changes occur? Shri N. C. Chatterjee has argued this question and he has given chronological references. Why did these things happen? He has said in this House that the continuation of these Portuguese settlements

in India, these Portuguese territories in India is an attack on the political system of this country, an affront on the political system of this country. I have no time, no inclination, to refer to my notes. We have a certain very important person, who is our roving Ambassador. He went to Bombay and made a speech. I am quoting from his statement on the 9th September when he said—that we should not talk in loose political terms and that the Goa problem was something which was absolutely a problem in regard to international diplomacy. "Goa is part of the Indian mainland, but not a part of the Indian political system." This is a new kind of vocabulary, a new kind of language, which Government has begun to use. Even the Prime Minister has begun to use this kind of language. One day the continuation of the Portuguese territories in Indian soil is an affront to the political system,—perhaps he said "attack"; "affront" may be my synonym for attack—and later he says, "Geographically Goa is part of India; but politically not." Mr Asoka Mehta said, "we knew very well all about it." We need not be told that Goa is not part of the Indian Union. We know that very well. But what was the point in saying so long that the continuation of these Portuguese possessions was an affront to the political system of India and what was the point in making so many protests to the Portuguese Government? I have here sheaves of questions asked in this House. Once during the last session, the Prime Minister was not here and the Home Minister, Pandit Pant was answering questions on Goa. I asked him a specific question, "what are the international complications which you have in mind, as far as the solution of this problem is concerned?" He was telling us of fairly big things they were going to do. The Prime Minister had often enough given answers on Goa which made us thump the table.

We did so, because we appreciated what he said. When I asked Pandit

Pant that question, he said: "It is a very hypothetical matter." It is not a very hypothetical matter; it is a very pertinent matter and that is our charge against the Government today; and that is why I want the Prime Minister to tell us categorically—he has already told us, but I want him to explain it, because it is inexplicable as far as our understanding is concerned—that we made a decision really and truly and entirely on our own initiative. We want to know why after the 15th August the Prime Minister decided to tell the country's people that they had been behaving badly and that they must change their minds altogether and everything must be left to Government. I would like to know whether behind this there was not foreign influence, and not particularly influence of Britain. I may show him: I have got the numbers of certain West Bengal State Transport buses which were put at the disposal of the British Gurkhas who have their office in Calcutta; they were transporting Gurkhas to Malava from Calcutta and these West Bengal Government buses were put at their disposal. There in Bombay, Mr. Morarji Desai says that the transport system of the State will not be permitted to be utilised for the satyagrahis who are going to Goa.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Even if you are willing to pay.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Perhaps the British Gurkhas may have a lot of money and possibly they paid for it. But I do not want to make much of a point of this. I do not know the real international position legally speaking, but there are some good lawyers in this House. I find from the proceedings of the other House that a question was asked by a Member and the Prime Minister did not in his reply refer to that question at all. It was a woman Member and she said that when Sir Stafford Cripps was here at a Press Conference a question was asked "whether there is an arrangement between Britain and Portugal that when the British

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Government considers that an emergent situation has arisen in the Portuguese territories in this country, then the Indian Government can take possession of those Portuguese territories."

Then, it seems, according to what the statement purports to say, the answer was that it will be for the Indian Government to decide what the Indian Government does. Internationally speaking, we have inherited whatever treaties and other arrangements were entered into on behalf of India, as rulers of India, by the British Government. I want to know what are those treaties. I want to know if there is any treaty between Britain and Portugal which binds us in some way, which perhaps should not be revealed. Anyhow, we want to know today whether we are bound by those treaties. I have heard the Prime Minister say, I do not care for those 16th century treaties and so on and so forth. But, I do want a categorical assurance that we are not bound by any Anglo-Portuguese treaty in regard to India's maintenance of the inviolability of these Portuguese possessions. I want also to know,—I repeat that question asked in the other House,—if under the British system it was open to the British Indian Government of those days, on an occasion of emergency, to grab or get hold of Portuguese possessions in this country, surely it is open to us to do so. Why shan't we do so? Shall we disturb the peaceful atmosphere of our country? Shall we bring about a context of things which goes against our international policy of peace and negotiation across the table? I say, No. It does not go against that policy of peace, because of what has happened.

What has happened? Our people have gone in a body sometimes, sometimes individually, in order to practise satyagraha. The Prime Minister has paid a tribute to their superb courage. The Prime Minister, however has sometimes made oblique observations as to their being novices

in satyagraha. Possibly he had a fling at Opposition parties who have not always accepted the so-called philosophy of satyagraha. That is a different matter. They have accepted for the moment satyagraha which has a tradition in our country and because of that tradition, is an active force and an active weapon in our hands. That is why our people took resort to this satyagraha. They went. What happened? Did one man or one woman in the crowd of satyagrahis budge an inch? Was there any stampeding anywhere? Has anybody, any of these foreign or Indian or Portuguese reporters been able to say that these satyagrahis behaved badly? They never behaved badly. They behaved superbly. On the 16th and 17th August, the country responded to that nobility in the behaviour of the satyagrahis. What did they get in return? They got stones from the Government of India. The Government of India chose on the 16th and 17th to malign the people of this country. The people had risen in anger. In their anger, possibly they did a few things which none of us would wish. We do not want to damage legitimately held foreign properties in this country, especially foreign diplomatic property. In their anger, our people went beyond certain limits. As Shri Asoka Mehta pointed out, the students and others went in a procession in Bombay and wanted that at least some gesture of condolence, some kind of homage to the martyrs of Goa must be paid by the half-masting of the National Flag. They do not know the protocols and the rules in regard to the National Flag as well as the Prime Minister does. Are you going to stand on protocols when the mind and heart of the people is overwhelmed by a tragedy, which tragedy has injected a new nobility into their heart? Are you going to restrain and check that nobility and obliterate it out of your people? Is this the way in which you fight for peace? Is this the way in which you fight for freedom?

So many facts and figures have been given about the way the Portuguese are behaving in this country. We know how the N.A.T.O. powers are behaving. The Prime Minister said today something about so many foreign Ambassadors, Presidents and Vice-Chancellors coming to this country, including somebody from Canada. Eighteen months ago the Prime Minister of Canada,—I expect he is still there as the Prime Minister of Canada—came to this country and gave a certain interpretation of a clause in the N.A.T.O. treaty, which he repudiated as soon as he landed home. These are the people who are supposed to be our friends. These N.A.T.O. people may have their own schemes: who knows? That is why the Prime Minister in his better mood had said that the existence of these Portuguese possessions is not only a blot on the fair face of India, but it is an affront to the political system of India. That affront was sought to be removed by our people by their own methods. The Prime Minister says, you don't do that, you only trust me. That is why Shri Gadgil says, we must only trust the Prime Minister. We are prepared to trust the Prime Minister. I have faced obloquy, my party has faced obloquy in some quarters by standing alongside the Prime Minister in regard to certain aspects of international policy. We are not ashamed of doing so. We shall not hesitate to do so. We are prepared to trust the Prime Minister. We are even prepared to understand the Prime Minister if he had said after the 15th of August, look here, I understand your temper, I admire your nobility, but you know there are certain difficulties, don't go ahead, don't act precipitately, suspend satyagraha, I am doing certain things, in the meantime, don't do anything very special. I could have understood him, provided that was accompanied by a very positive statement by the Prime Minister that he was going to take definite steps, that he was going to give an ultimatum to the Portuguese in this country, that he was going to set a

target date, and that he was going to reserve to himself and his Government action of all sorts, including police action. I do not say here and now you start police action. Nobody wants that. Nobody suggests it. But surely we have the right in the circumstances which Portugal has imposed upon us to take recourse to police action when our nationals are treated so barbarously so much against the canons of international law and all civilised international intercourse. That is why we wanted from the Prime Minister categorical assurances about what he was going to do.

Shri Gadgil says: "We are a Government, and therefore we cannot tell you what these economic sanctions are going to be." I do not want a detailed particularisation of the economic or other sanctions which Pandit Nehru might have in mind, but what I want is that the Government should come forward and tell our people that their cause is the Government's cause, and this is not merely a sentimental effusion on the part of Government, but that Government is taking some very definite and positive steps and telling the Portuguese to get out before a certain date, because so far Government have been very patient. The Prime Minister had told us in the beginning: "We are prepared to tell the Portuguese—let us have *de facto* control, *de jure* settlement will ensue". They said 'No'. Then we said: "*De facto* or *de jure*, let all that be blowed for the time being. What we want is discussion." They said: "To Hell with you. We do not propose to discuss anything with you." After that, our people went in. Government did not do a thing. Government, on the contrary, tried to stop them. The people went in in pursuance of certain of their rights. They were massacred, butchered, and certain steps were taken against them that no international law can possibly countenance. In this state of things, it is certainly open to our Government to say: "You have behaved so badly, you have put

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

yourself outside the pale of civilisation, and that is why, though we have tolerated this blot on India so long, we are not going to tolerate it any longer." That is why we wanted definite, categorical, positive assurances from the Prime Minister regarding the policy which he pursues.

We do not doubt his sincerity, or Government's sincerity. Nobody has a sincerometer. The Prime Minister does not know what my sincerity is, I do not know what his sincerity is. I cannot measure his sincerity. But it, is the result, the objective result of what he does or what I do which really matters, and from that point of view, this stupendous movement which has been started in this country has been stabbed in the back. This movement has been sabotaged, this movement has been discouraged in such a fashion that our people whose hearts had been raised to a level of quality by which many felt so exhilarated, are now demoralised. They are now feeling that they have been let down by our own Government. In as far as the people of Goa are concerned, they are facing a destiny which is excruciating to contemplate, and that is why I say unless Government comes forward with very definite assurances of support to the movement of the people—Indians and Goans all being one, the movement is of the totality of our people—unless the Government comes forward with positive statements giving target dates, giving ultimatums and so on and so forth, this demoralisation shall go on, and the people of Goa would feel that they have been stabbed in the back, that they have been let down by our Government and a situation has been created which is a matter of shame. That shame we wish to see wiped off, and that is why even at this late stage I am wishing, absolutely hoping against hope, that something is done.

Let it not be said against us that we act in a huff, we give expression

to sentiments, that we merely shout from the house-tops, shout our lungs out because we are emotionally disturbed and that international politics is something very highfalutin which is not conducted merely on the basis of emotional disturbances. But sometimes a period comes when emotions are terribly important. Sometimes twenty years are but as one day, and then there come days which are the concentrated essence of twenty years. In the history of our country after 1947 a few days came which contained the essence of the patriotism of our people. That essence is sought to be nullified by Government action, and that is why we want a revision of that action. That is why we want some kind of positive assurance from Government which will give some kind of satisfaction to our people who are feeling absolutely hurt, who are feeling absolutely down and out, and who want, who demand of Government, that something ought to be done by Government which would be in tune with its responsivity to public opinion.

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : भाज जिस प्रश्न पर हम विचार कर रहे हैं, वह प्रश्न ऐसा है जिस पर बोलने के लिये बड़ा उत्तरदायित्व होना चाहिये। इस विषय में बड़ी संयत भाषा में और बड़े विवेक के साथ कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता है। अब तक जितने भाषण हुये हैं। वे सब अंग्रेजी भाषा में हुए हैं। इस देश की जनता हिंदी जानती है। उसको इस बात का ज्ञान हो कि हमारी नीति क्या है और उस नीति का हमारे जीवन पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ता है, इस कारण मैं हिन्दी में बोल रहा हूँ और मेरा विश्वास है कि मेरी इन थोड़ी-सी बातों को ध्यान से सुना जायगा।

जब मैंने इन मित्रों को यहां पर अभी बोलते सुना और उनके उत्साह और जोश को देखा, तो मुझे किरातार्जुन का वह संवाद स्मरण हो आया, जबकि द्रोपदी, भीम और

अन्य पांडव युधिष्ठिर को लत्कार रहे थे और कह रहे थे कि "आप इस कायरता में क्यों पड़े हुये हैं? दुरशासन ने द्रोपदी का चीर हरण किया है और उसके कोश बिखरे हुये हैं, क्या आपने यह नहीं देखा है? जुए में हारकर हम लोग यहां पर बंधे हुये बैठे रहे, क्या आपने यह नहीं देखा? क्या आपको ज्ञात नहीं है कि हम लोग बारह वर्ष तक बनवास और एक वर्ष भ्रजात-वास में रहे हैं? कब आपको क्रोध प्रायेगा? आप कब उठेंगे और शस्त्र धारण करेंगे? कब आप युद्ध की पुकार लगायेंगे?" इस तरह की मार्मिक भाषा में जब भीम और द्रोपदी चीत्कार मचा रहे थे, उस समय युधिष्ठिर ने केवल इतना ही कहा,

"ददामि देयमित्येव यजे यष्टव्यमित्युत
नाहम् कर्मफलाकांक्षी "

आप इस बात को जानते ही होंगे कि युधिष्ठिर का नाम युधिष्ठिर इसलिये हुआ कि वह युद्ध में स्थिर रहने वाले थे और छोटी मोटी बातों से विचलित होने वाले नहीं थे—वह तिनके के समान नहीं थे कि जरा-सी हवा चली और उसके साथ उड़ गये।

उसी तरह आज अटर्जी साहब भी लत्कार रहे थे—युद्ध और पुलिस एक्शन की बातें कर रहे थे। और मुकर्जी साहब की भाषण कला का तो मैं आज कायल हो गया हूँ—इतने जोश से, इतने उत्साह से, इतने उत्तेजित ढंग से और इस प्रकार के नृत्य के साथ उन्होंने अपना कथन सुनाया है। मुझे खेद है कि हमारे गाढगिल साहब ने उनके प्रगल्भ भाषण को नहीं सुना और उनका झींझना नहीं देखा। मुकर्जी साहब ने भी यह समझा कि मैं हिन्दी में बोलूंगा और भला हिन्दी का भाषण भी कोई भाषण हुआ करता है, और इसलिये वह भी अपनी पुस्तकें उठाकर चलते बने! मैं तो उनके भाषण को सुनकर हैरान था कि वह कह क्या रहे हैं। कैसी कैसी विचित्र बातें

उन्होंने कहीं! उन्होंने कहा कि "हम बड़े एशेम्ब हैं"। लेकिन किस बात पर? एशेम्ब तो उन्हें होना ही चाहिये। उनके सारे कारनामे ही ऐसे रहे हैं। आप भारतीय इतिहास को देखिये। उनके दल ने ऐसे ऐसे कार्य किये हैं कि अगर आज वह लज्जित हैं, तो इसमें आश्चर्य और आपत्ति की क्या बात है? वह बतायें कि उनके दल ने भारत के स्वातंत्र्य-आन्दोलन में कौनसा कार्य किया? क्या योग दिया? जिस समय इस विशाल देश ने—अविभाजित देश ने, जिस भाग में इस समय पाकिस्तान बना हुआ है, उस समय वह भी भारत में सम्मिलित था—अपनी स्वतंत्रता का प्रश्न उठाया और उसके लिये एक महान् आन्दोलन प्रारम्भ किया और बम्बई में कांग्रेस के नेतृत्व में आवाज लगाई कि "अंग्रेजो, भारत छोड़ो", उस समय इन लोगों ने कहा कि "नहीं, यहीं रह जाओ।" आज ये लोग जरा अपने पुराने कारनामों को तो याद करें। आज वह कहते हैं कि गोआ के प्रश्न पर भारत का सारा प्रेस्टीज टिका हुआ है और भारत की सारी जनता ध्वस्त हो रही है, उसमें निराशा उत्पन्न हो गई है, उसका जीवन नष्ट हो गया है और चारों ओर अन्धकार छा गया है। वह मानते हैं कि राष्ट्र नेता जवाहरलाल जी जनता के नेता हैं। जरा देखिये कि जनता के सम्पर्क में राष्ट्र-नेता जवाहरलाल जी हैं—और आप नहीं हैं, तब जनता क्या कहती है और क्या चाहती है, इसका ज्ञान जवाहरलाल जी को नहीं है और आपको है और इस समय जनता में फ्रस्ट्रेशन आ गया है, निराशा आ गई है, इसके मापदंड वह नहीं हैं, आप हैं! कितनी हास्यास्पद बात है। इसको कहते हैं "नानी के आगे ननियोरे का बखान।" जवाहरलाल जी को पता नहीं है कि जनता के मन में क्या है और आपको इस बात का पता है! यह कितनी विचित्र बात है। मैं कहना चाहता

[श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री]

हूँ कि इस तरह नाचने से और इस प्रकार के प्रगल्भ भाषण देने से जनता के हृदय का, जनता की इच्छाओं का, माप नहीं किया जा सकता है। कांग्रेस दल ने अपना फैसला करके सरकार के जिम्मे जो काम सौंपा है, उस का महत्व जनता के सामने आ गया है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह प्रश्न इतना घासान नहीं है। दस पांच भादमियों को रंग-रूट बनाकर इस प्रकार सत्याग्रह नहीं चलाया जा सकता है। जब हम लोग सत्याग्रह करते थे, जब कांग्रेस सत्याग्रह करती थी, तो उसकी वर्किंग कमेटी पहले पकड़ी जाती थी, गांधी जी पहले पकड़े जाते थे और तब जनता की बारी आती थी, तब वालंटियर्स की बारी आती थी। किन्तु जरा ध्यान दीजिये कि आज क्या हो रहा है। नेता लोग यहां बैठे हुये हैं, प्रोफेसर लोग भाषण देते हैं और सत्याग्रह जारी है—नेता लोग बाहर हैं और सत्याग्रह चल रहा है। यह तो नई किस्म का सत्याग्रह मीने देखा है। भोजपुरी में बहुत सी भ्रष्टी भ्रष्टी बातें मिलती हैं। उसमें एक कहावत है “भ्रानक लरिका पाई त कीरा के वियरी में हाथ नवाई”—अगर दूसरे का बच्चा मिल जाय, तो हम देखें कि सांप किस तरह काटता है और किस तरह उससे खेला जाता है। नये नये अभिनय किये जा रहे हैं, नये नये अनुभव हासिल करने की कोशिश की जा रही है, लेकिन भोले तो दूसरे के सिर पर पड़ रहे हैं।

मैं तो आज अपने इन मित्र—मुकर्जी साहब—की बात सुनकर बड़ा हैरान हुआ। यह तो कभी बड़ी शान्ति के उपदेश करते थे, शान्ति की राय देते थे। आप जरा पिछली बातों को याद कीजिये। जब कोरिया का प्रश्न उपस्थित हुआ था, तब राष्ट्र-नेता जवाहरलाल जी ने संसार को चेतावनी दी और दक्षिण कोरिया को बताया कि ३८वीं

अक्षांशरेखा के आगे मत जाओ। उस समय उन्होंने एक राजनीतिक भविष्यवक्ता की बात कही थी। संसार ने आगे चलकर अनुभव किया कि वह बात सही थी। इसके बाद उन्होंने इन्डोचाइना में शान्ति की स्थापना की चेष्टा की और सारे संसार ने उनकी सराहना की। उस समय मुकर्जी साहब ने भी अपने हृदय के उद्गार प्रकट किये और प्रधान मंत्री की शान्ति नीति की भूरि-भूरि प्रशंसा की। आज मुकर्जी साहब दूसरी ही बात कह रहे हैं। सत्याग्रह किया जाय, लोग कष्ट उठावें, सुभद्रा बाई और दूसरे लोग गोलियां खावें और प्रयत्न करें, लेकिन उसके बाद क्या हो? मुकर्जी साहब कहते हैं कि वह आप जानें, क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट में आप हैं।

मैं इस बात का जिक्र करके अपना महत्व नहीं बढ़ाना चाहता था। पिछले दिनों मैं रूस गया। वहां के राष्ट्र-नेता, जो कि उस राष्ट्र का शिरोमणि है, से मुलाकात का मुझे मौका हुआ। उन्होंने कहा कि “हम आपके नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को प्यार करते हैं, इसलिये प्यार नहीं करते हैं कि वह हमारे मित्र हैं, इसलिये करते हैं कि वह मानव मात्र क मित्र हैं। हम जवाहरलाल को प्यार करते हैं इसलिये कि वह विश्व में शान्ति चाहते हैं और यह दूसरी बात है कि वह विश्व में शान्ति स्थापित करने में सफल हों या न हों, लेकिन कम-से-कम विश्व युद्ध को टालने के लिये जो उन्होंने प्रयत्न किया है, उसके लिये हम उनको प्यार करते हैं। हम उनको इस लिये प्यार करते हैं कि हम शान्ति को मानवता के विकास का एक साधन समझते हैं।” रूस की तानाशाही, प्रजातंत्रीय तानाशाही, श्रमिकवर्ग की तानाशाही का हेड जवाहरलाल जी और उनकी नीति के विषय में यह अनुभव करता है, परन्तु हमारे मुकर्जी साहब ने न जाने

कौनसी किताब कम्यूनिज्म की पढ़ी है, जो इस तरह की बातें कह रहे हैं। आज विश्व शान्ति का सारा खेय जवाहरलाल जी के सिर पर रखा जा रहा है। उन्हीं के प्रयत्नों से आज कोरिया की जनता युद्ध से भाग पा रही है और इन्डोचाइना में शान्ति स्थापित हुई है—अगर वह कायम न रह सके, तो दूसरी बात है। एक महापुरुष आज इस प्रयत्न में लगा हुआ है कि संसार से युद्ध का कतरा दूर हो और शान्ति स्थापित हो, उसको उसके घर में परेशानी में डालने के लिये लोग लगे हुये हैं और फिर देश-भक्ति और न जाने काहे काहे का दम भरते हैं।

इसके बाद मैं उनको और क्या कहूँ ? वह कहते हैं कि पहले यह बयान दिया गया । और फिर यह बयान दिया गया । अगर वह सत्याग्रह से गुजर गये होते, तो सत्याग्रह के टैकनीक को थोड़ा बहुत जानते । उनको शायद भ्रात नहीं कि चौरीचौरा के हत्याकांड के बाद गांधी जी ने सत्याग्रह को बन्द कर दिया था और हम लोग उस समय कहते थे कि यह कायरता है और महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था कि उनसे हिमालयन मिस-कैलकुलेशन हुआ । मैं जवाहरलाल जी को बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने कह दिया कि हमारा दिमाग साफ़ नहीं था और उन्होंने हिमालयन मिसकैलकुलेशन जैसा बर्त ही प्रयुक्त किया है । मैं कई बार कह चुका हूँ कि महात्मा गांधी की आत्मा जवाहरलाल जी में अवतरित हो चुकी है । वह सब समस्याओं को उसी दृष्टि से देखने लगे हैं, इसलिये उनके मुखसे वही वाक्य निकलते हैं । कोई मनुष्य परमात्मा नहीं है, प्राम्नीसे-ट नहीं है कि वह हर सचाई को देख ले ।

मैं क्या कहूँ ? ये सब भाई चले गये हैं । इनको लेनिन का टैकनीक आफ़ रेबोल्युशन पढ़ना चाहिये कि “वन स्टैप फ़्रॉम ईंड एंड टू स्टैप्स बैंकबंड ।” एक कदम आगे बढ़ते हैं और

दो कदम पीछे हटते हैं । नदी टेढ़ी-मेढ़ी चलती है—आगे भी बढ़ती है, इधर उधर भी जाती है और पीछे भी घूमती है । वह परनाले की तरह नहीं है कि तीन गज जाकर सूख जाए । वह कभी आगे बढ़ती है और कभी पीछे हटती है, लेकिन उसकी प्रगति बराबर होती रहती है और वह ख्येय तक जा पहुंचती है । अगर जवाहरलाल जी की गवर्नमेंट भी गोआ को आजाद नहीं करा सकती है, तो ऐसे ऐसे तीस भारता तो बहुत-से आये हैं और गये हैं । केवल जबानी जमाखर्च से और लम्बी-बीड़ी बातें करने से काम नहीं चलेगा । काम चलेगा बीस्ता से । मैं देशपांडे जी को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र की राजनीति शिवाजी की राजनीति थी । साला साजपतंराय ने कहा था कि वे महाराष्ट्र की राजनीति के बड़े कायल थे । वह राजनीति शिवाजी के जीवनकाल में मिलती है । शिवाजी ने दाढ़ी बढ़ाई, जानिमाज रखा, वे निमाज पढ़ते थे और फिर अफजलख़ां से लड़े भी । अब कोई कहे कि वे तो मुसलमान हो गये, उन्होंने तो धर्म छोड़ दिया तो वह कहां तक धीक होगा ।

3 P.M.

एक आन्वीय सवाल : आपको यह कहा से मालूम हुआ ?

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : आप मेडीवल. इंडिया का इतिहास पढ़िये तो उसमें आपको यह मिलेगा । उन्हें अफजल ख़ां को हटाना था, उन्होंने तरह तरह के यत्न करके उस ध्येय को पूरा किया । जो लोग केवल सीधे रास्ते चलते हैं उनका यह हाल होता है कि अगर बीच में ताड़ का पेड़ भी आ जायगा तो वे उस पर चढ़ेंगे और उतरेंगे । ऐसे लोग शान्ति नहीं कर सकते । ऐसे लोग राजनीति नहीं चला सकते । राजनीति चलाने के लिये सब चीजें देखनी पड़ती हैं, मौका महल देखना पड़ता है और आने वाले परिणामों को

[श्री भल्लू राय शास्त्री]

देखना पड़ता है। आज हमें यह देखना होगा कि अगर यह व्यक्तिगत सत्याग्रह चलता रहा तो उसका क्या परिणाम होगा। कुछ लोग भरती हो चलते जायेंगे, बाकी लोग गवर्नमेंट चलायेंगे। वहां जाने पर कुछ लोग मारे जायेंगे। जनता कहेगी कि कृष्णा के बाले खींचे जा रहे हैं, उसके वस्त्र उतारे जा रहे हैं, तुम बन्दूक चलाओ। तो यदि यह सत्याग्रह चलता रहा तो हम एक प्रकार से लड़ाई को आम्हान देंगे। परन्तु हमारी यह नीति नहीं। हम चाहते हैं कि राष्ट्रों के बीच की समस्यायें शान्ति से सुलझायी जायें। हमें देखना चाहिये कि कौन देश किसका है और कौन देश किसका नहीं है। वास्तव में सारा विश्व मानवता का है, और जो हम एक एक देश को भ्रमण लिये बैठे हैं इसीलिये लड़ाई होती है। तो हमको शान्ति से चीजों का हल करना होगा। हमको हर प्रश्न को शान्ति से डिबेट करके, शान्ति से बातचीत करके देखना होगा, और यह देखना होगा कि अगर हम इस समय सत्याग्रह को इसी रूप में चलने दें तो इसका क्या परिणाम होगा। हमने पहले उस चीज को चलाना दिया लेकिन उसके बारे में हमारा कुछ इल कैलकुलेशन था। हम नहीं जानते थे कि उसके यह परिणाम होंगे। परिणामों को देखकर आदमी अपनी नीति को बदलता है। किन्तु हमने उस प्रश्न को छोड़ तो नहीं दिया है। जवाहरलाल जी ने यह तो नहीं कह दिया है कि गोम्हा पुर्तगाल का है, और सालाजार का है। वह तो अब भी कहते हैं कि गोम्हा भारत का है, लेकिन सोचना यह है कि भारत का झंडा वहां पर किस प्रकार लगाया जाय। सारा प्रश्न इसके प्रासेस का है। क्या यह ठीक होगा कि हम अपने सत्याग्रहियों को वहां जाने दें और वे जाकर वहां पर हमारा झंडा लगायें? यदि ऐसा हमने होने दिया तो याद रखिये कि हमारे पास-पास भी दूसरे देश हैं।

वे बिला फौज के और बिला अस्त्र-शस्त्र के यदि हमारे देश में प्रवेश करें तो क्या हम उनकी भारती उतारेंगे और उनको वहां अपना झंडा लगाने देंगे? कौन इस तरह से झंडा लगाने देगा। टिड्डी तो अस्त्र शस्त्र लेकर नहीं आती लेकिन लोग उसके बच्चों तक को गाड़ देते हैं। तो यदि हमने सत्याग्रह जारी रहने दिया तो एक अजीब चीज हो जायगी और हम अपने ही बनाये हुये घेरे में घिर जायेंगे। गोम्हा का प्रश्न हल होगा तो वह राष्ट्र के स्तर पर हल होगा। वह भारतीय राष्ट्र और पुर्तगाल राष्ट्र के आपसी वातालाप से होगा। आज संसार में शान्ति का वातावरण बन गया है और राष्ट्र अपने झगड़ों को शान्ति से हल करना चाहते हैं। आज चीन इतना बड़ा राज्य है। उसके पास कुछ छोटे छोटे टापू पड़े हैं, जिन पर वह चाहे तो आसानी से बलपूर्वक कब्जा कर सकता है। लेकिन वह ऐसा नहीं करता। इसका कारण यही है कि आज संसार में एक शान्ति का वातावरण पैदा हो गया है, और इसके पैदा होने में हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल जी के नेतृत्व और प्रेरणा का बहुत बड़ा हाथ है। यह उन्हीं के प्रयत्नों का फल है कि आज राष्ट्र प्रेम से बैठकर अपने मामलों को हल करने के लिये तैयार है। आज उन देशों के जो आपस में एक दूसरे के विरुद्ध थे तरह तरह के बयान निकल रहे हैं। आज आइजनहावर का बयान निकलता है कि अमरीका के अस्त्र-शस्त्र बनाने के कारखानों को रूसी लोग देख सकते हैं और रूस की ओर से बयान निकलता है कि उनके कारखानों को अमरीकी देख सकते हैं। कुछ ऐसा परिवर्तन आज संसार में हो गया है कि जो लड़ने वाले देश थे वे आपस में प्रेम की बातें करने लगे हैं। यदि आज इस गोम्हा के प्रश्न को लेकर हम उस शान्ति के वातावरण को विषाक्त बना दें तो जो राजनीतिक बुद्धिमता का स्थान हमारे राष्ट्रनेता को संसार में प्राप्त हुआ है उसको हम समाप्त कर देंगे

और उनक हाथों को बांध देंगे । हमारा यह प्रयत्न वैसा ही होगा जैसा कि भीम आदि का युधिष्ठिर को उकसाने का प्रयत्न था । उस समय भी श्रीकृष्ण को बीच में पड़ना पड़ा था । हम जानते हैं कि राष्ट्रों के बीच में, यह सब शान्ति के उपाय होते हुये भी, एक ऐसा समय आ सकता है कि अस्त्र शस्त्र का प्रयोग करना अनिवार्य हो जाय, हम इसको असम्भव नहीं मानते । लेकिन वह सबसे बड़ा अभिशाप होगा । लेकिन यदि वह भाने वाला ही हो तो उसके पहले हमको और बहुत से काम करने होंगे और वे किये जा रहे हैं । भारत की जनता को अपनी सरकार की नीति पर पूरा विश्वास है ।

कुछ लोगों ने विद्यार्थियों पर गोली चलाने की घटना को इसके साथ मिला दिया है । इस प्रश्न को इस घटना के साथ मिला देना बहुत ही दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण बात है ।

श्री बी० जी० देशपांडे : राष्ट्र के इतिहास में आज एक अत्यन्त गम्भीर समय पर एक गम्भीर विषय पर हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं । हम नहीं समझते थे कि हमारे मित्र माननीय श्री अलगू राय जी इस गम्भीर विषय पर इस स्तर पर चर्चा करेंगे । एक विदेशी शक्ति जिस ने आज से चार शताब्दी पूर्व हमारे देश में पदार्पण किया था और हमारे देश के एक भाग पर अपनी सत्ता स्थापित की थी उस के विरोध में राष्ट्र के सब दलों ने सम्मिलित हो कर एक महान आन्दोलन इस देश में शुरू किया था, और हम समझते थे कि यह आन्दोलन भारतवर्ष की सरकार के हाथ मजबूत कर रहा है । परन्तु इस आन्दोलन के चलते चलते एक समय ऐसा आया कि भारत के एक दल ने कहा कि यह आन्दोलन समाप्त होना चाहिये, भारत की सरकार के नेता ने कहा कि यह आन्दोलन समाप्त होना चाहिये । परन्तु आज भारत की सरकार के नेता ने यहाँ भाषण करते

हुए हम को यह नहीं बतलाया कि यह आन्दोलन क्यों समाप्त होना चाहिये । न उन्होंने ने हम को यह बतलाया है कि सरकार की नीति इस के खिलाफ है । उन्होंने ने केवल यह कहा है : "Policy of Government has now changed". मैंने प्रधान मंत्री का और श्री गाडगिल का अभिभाषण सुना । उस में उन्होंने ने यह तो स्वीकार किया है कि उन की नीति में कुछ असंगतता तो अवश्य थी । उन के भाषणों में ऐसी उद्दतता नहीं थी जैसी कि हमारे मित्र श्री अलगू राय जी के भाषण में थी । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और श्री गाडगिल ने कहा है कि जो आज तक सत्याग्रह चलता था उस का हम समर्थन जरूर करते थे, लेकिन आज हम चाहते हैं कि आज उस को बन्द कर दिया जाय । पर उन्होंने ने यह नहीं बतलाया कि इस निर्णय का क्या कारण हुआ है । क्या उन को किसी बाहर की शक्ति ने आश्वासन दिया है कि वह उन का समझौता करा देगी ? क्या जैसा हमारे मित्र ने अभी कहा, हमारे पंडित जी शिवा जी की नीति के अनुसार बाहर से समझौता दिखाते हुए कुछ ऐसा करने वाले हैं जैसा कि शिवाजी ने अफजल खां के साथ किया था ? मैं ने पंडित जी की एक किताब पढ़ी है "ग्लिम्लेज आफ बल्लड हिस्ट्री" । उस में पंडित जी कहते हैं कि शिवाजी के बारे में मेरे दिल में बड़ी नफरत पैदा हुई । जब मैं ने पढ़ा कि शिवा जी ने घोखे से अफजल खां को मारा । लेकिन हमारे अलगू राय जी कहते हैं कि आज हमारे पंडित जी शिवा जी की नीति पर जा रहे हैं । शायद पंडित जी कहेंगे कि "God save me from my friends". बात यह है कि शिवा जी की नीति पर चलने में तो पंडित जी को लज्जा मालूम होती है । मैं यहां शिवाजी की नीति की बात नहीं लाना चाहता । सबाल यह है कि हम जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या आज पंडित जी गोधा के सबाल को समझौते

[श्री बी० जी० देवपाण्डे]

से चलाने वाले हैं, या पुलिस ऐक्शन के द्वारा आप इस प्रश्न को चलाना चाहते हैं। पंडित जी ने आज सत्याग्रह को तो बन्द कर दिया है। श्री गडगिल साहब के भाषण से यह मालूम हुआ कि यह किसी को शिकायत नहीं थी कि गोष्ठा का सत्याग्रह हिंसात्मक रूप से चलाया जा रहा था। मुझे याद है कि जब मैं अपने जत्थे के साथ सत्याग्रह करने जा रहा था तो गोष्ठा विमोचन समिति के मंत्री ने हम को एक स्थान पर बुलाया और कहा कि आप लोग सत्याग्रह के लिये तो जा रहे हैं लेकिन अगर आप के हृदय में अहिंसा और शान्ति की भावना न हो तो आप यहां पूना से वापस जा सकते हैं, यदि आप को अन्दर जाना है तो शान्ति से और अहिंसा से काम करना होगा। हम ने आज तक सालाजार की ओर से या किसी की ओर से यह शिकायत नहीं सुनी कि सत्याग्रही हिंसा के मार्ग पर चल रहे हैं। न यह बात मैंने पंडित जी के अभिभाषण में सुनी। हम आज यही जानना चाहते हैं कि जो उन्होंने ने हम से सत्याग्रह बन्द करने को कहा है उस का क्या कारण है। उन्होंने ने हम से बिना पूछे ही इस आंदोलन को बन्द करने का आदेश दिया है। हम को इस की शिकायत नहीं है। हम छोटे धावमी हैं। हम को क्यों नहीं पूछा यह सवाल करने वाले हम कौन हैं।

कहा गया कि महात्मा गांधी भी एक-दम सत्याग्रह को बन्द कर देते थे। लेकिन वह यह भूल जाते हैं कि महात्मा गांधी उस सत्याग्रह के संचालक होते थे। परन्तु कांग्रेस पार्टी या पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू इस सत्याग्रह के संचालक नहीं हैं। पूरा देश उस का संचालक था। और देश का एक अंग होने के नाते से कांग्रेस उस में आ सकती है। आप हम को निश्चय करने से पहले बुलाते और हम से सलाह मचाविरा करते

लेकिन आप ने बिना हम लोगों से राय लिये एक बिलकुल नया निश्चय कर डाला और देश को सलाह दी कि भारतीयों को सामूहिक और व्यक्तिगत दोनों प्रकार का सत्याग्रह गोष्ठा में बन्द कर देना चाहिये। इस तरह का क्रदम उठा कर आप ने अपने ऊपर एक बड़ी जिम्मेदारी ली है। हमारे भाइयों को जो बिलकुल शस्त्र विहीन और निहत्थे गोष्ठा में सत्याग्रह करने के हेतु जाते थे और वहां पर शान्ति और अहिंसा से डा० सालाजार की पुलिस और फौज की गोलियां खाते थे, तो इस में उन को कोई खुशी नहीं होती थी और वह कोई तमाशे के खातिर वहां पर नहीं जाते थे बल्कि अपना कर्तव्य समझ कर वहां पर जाते थे और सत्याग्रह करते थे। हमें तो इस सरकार से जोकि सार्वभौम सत्ता सम्पन्न है उस से बड़ी आशा थी कि वह हमारे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्नों को सफलतापूर्वक हल करेगी लेकिन मुझे यह स्वीकार करते हुए बड़ा दुःख होता है कि हमें उस में निराशा ही पल्ले पड़ी है। हम तो चाहते हैं कि हम सत्याग्रह बन्द करें और हमारी सरकार कोई क्रदम उठाये जिस का कि हम समर्थन करें लेकिन हमारे पंडित नेहरू के पास कोई भी ऐसा क्रदम उठाने को नहीं है जिस का कि हम समर्थन करें। पाकिस्तान बनने के समय में जब यहां पर झगड़े हो रहे थे तो पंडित जी कहते थे कि आप यहां बगावत कर रहे हैं, दंगा कर रहे हैं, नहीं तो यहां पाकिस्तान में हिन्दुओं को बचाने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान की फौजें पहुंच जातीं और यहां पर आप लोगों ने इस तरह के झगड़े फ़साद और अत्याचार कर के मेरे हाथों को कमजोर किया है, लेकिन मैं पंडित जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि आज तो हम ने आप के हाथों को कमजोर नहीं किया है और हम लोग तो वहां पर बिलकुल

अहिंसात्मक सत्याग्रह करते रहे और यदि आप हम को सत्याग्रह बन्द करने का आदेश देने के साथ और यह कहने के साथ कि आप चुप बैठिये यह भी आश्वासन देते कि हम गोष्ठा को शान्तिपूर्ण उपायों से मुक्त करेंगे और अगर वैसे मुक्त नहीं होता तो हम अपनी फौजें वहाँ पर गोष्ठा को लिबरेट करने के लिये भेजेंगे, तब तो आप की बात हमारी समझ में आ सकती थी लेकिन फ्रौज का नाम लेते हुए यह डरते हैं और कहते हैं कि पुलिस ऐक्शन की बात जबान पर भी मत लाओ, तब मुझे उन की उक्त सलाह से खुशी नहीं होती और निराशा अनुभव होती है। एक बात मैं यहाँ पर बिलकुल स्पष्ट कर दूँ कि "बी आर नाट बार मोंगर्स"। हम कोई गोष्ठा से लड़ाई छेड़ देने को तो नहीं कहते। वह तो अमरीका, इंग्लैंड जैसे बड़े बड़े देश जब अपने साम्राज्य का विस्तार करने के लिये लड़ाइयाँ करते हैं तो उस को "बार मोंगर्स" कहा जाता है। हम तो कहते हैं कि सरकार को वहाँ पर जो गोष्ठा अधिकारियों द्वारा निहत्थे और अहिंसक सत्याग्रहियों पर और लोकल आदमियों पर अत्याचार ही रहे हैं, उस से उन की छुटकारा दिलाना चाहिये और अगर हम कहते हैं कि आप अत्याचार का मुक़ाबला करने के लिये वहाँ पर जाइये, तो ऐसा कहने वाला "बार मोंगर्स" नहीं है। आज सच पूछिये तो गोष्ठा की शासन सत्ता समझौते की बात करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, डा० सालाजार किसी भी हालत में गोष्ठा पर से अपनी सत्ता हटाने को तैयार नहीं मालूम होते और दुनिया का कोई भी पश्चिम का साम्राज्यवादी राष्ट्र इस के बारे में बोलने के लिये तैयार नहीं है और हालाँकि मैं इस को मानता हूँ कि पंडित नेहरू का विश्व के रंगमंच पर बहुत बड़ा प्रभाव है लेकिन मैं यह बात दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि गोष्ठा के प्रश्न को ले कर दुनिया में जो कुछ हलचल

है और संसार भर के पत्रों में जो इस के बारे में चर्चा होती है वह सत्याग्रह और उन वीर सत्याग्रहियों के ही कारण हुई है जिन को कि आप माली देते हैं और यह आशेष करते हैं कि यह अहिंसा से चला नहीं रहे हैं, यह सत्याग्रह ज्यादा जानते नहीं हैं और नये भाये हैं और हम बड़े पुराने सत्याग्रही हैं। हम आप को प्रणाम करते हैं और हम मानते हैं कि आप लोग बड़े पुराने सत्याग्रही हैं और सत्याग्रह का आप को अनुभव है लेकिन मैं आप को यह बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि चीन में या रूस में जो आप का समर्थन हो रहा है, यह उन वीर सत्याग्रहियों के बलिदान के कारण है जो गोली खा कर वहाँ शहीद हो गये और जिन्होंने कि अपने देश का नाम ऊँचा किया। और हमारे देशवासियों ने सत्याग्रह का तभी आश्रय लिया है जब उन्होंने ने देखा कि समझौते की कोई आशा नहीं और वह सम्भव नहीं दीख पड़ता। आप ने इन सत्याग्रहियों को गोष्ठा में सत्याग्रह करने जाने से रोक कर आप ने इस देश का तेजोभंग किया है और जैसाकि पंडित जी ने स्वयं इस बात को कहा है कि कहीं यह डेडलीक न बन जाय, मुझे भी डर है कि कहीं यह डेडलीक न बन जाय, यह एक स्थायी, स्टेटिक, सौ, पचास वर्ष तक रहने वाली चीज न बन जाय और ऐसा न होने देने के लिये मैं नहीं समझता कि आप के पास क्या उपाय है। अगर यह सत्याग्रह चमत्ता रहता, और सत्याग्रह के कारण टेंशन कायम रहता और दुनिया के अन्दर इस के कारण बातें चलती रहतीं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया के सामने यह प्रश्न आता लेकिन हमारी तो हालत मराठी में जो एक कहावत है उस के समान हो रही है। मां जाने को देती नहीं और बाप मील मांगने देता नहीं। लोगों को आप सत्याग्रह करने देते नहीं और लड़ाई करने की आप में ताकत है नहीं, समझौते की आप की

[श्री बी० जी० देशपाण्डे]

बात कोई सुनता नहीं, अब आप ही बतलाइये कि उस हालत में गोआ के लोग बेचारे क्या करें और गोआ विमोचन समिति के लोग क्या करें। गोआ के लिबरेशन के प्रश्न को लेकर इस देश में जो एक बड़ा उन्साह दृष्टिगोचर हुआ और लोगों ने अपने प्राणों की बलि दी तो उस के पीछे कोई दलगत राजनीति या किसी पार्टी के स्वार्थ साधन का भाव नहीं था और न धाज है। मुझे स्मरण है कि जब हैदराबाद में पुलिस कार्यवाही हुई और उस के पश्चात् मैं वहां पर गया तो देखा कि हथारों की सभार्यें होती थीं और सरदार पटेल का अभिवादन किया जाता था जिन्होंने कि पुलिस ऐक्शन ले कर हैदराबाद को इंडिया यूनियन में मिलाया और पुलिस ऐक्शन के कारण कांग्रेस की प्रतिष्ठा हैदराबाद स्टेट में बहुत बढ़ गई और मुझे इस बात के लिये कोई शिकायत नहीं होगी अगर आप गोआ पर कोई कड़ी कार्यवाही करते और उस के कारण कांग्रेस देश में पापुलर होती है और बिरोधी दल पूरी तरह वाइप आउट होते हैं और समाप्त होते हैं तो हमें कोई शिकायत नहीं होगी और हम उन को उस के लिये बधाई देंगे। आज मैं आप पर आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने केवल एक पक्षीय दल की नीति के कारण इस सत्याग्रह को बंद किया है, ऐसा मुझ से कई लोगों ने कहा है। आप कहेंगे कि यह सब कांग्रेस को बदनाम करने के लिये कहा और किया जा रहा था लेकिन मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस को बदनाम करने का न किसी का उद्देश्य था और न है। जो गोली खाने के लिये जाता है वह यह नहीं समझता कि मैं बाद में अगर ऐक्शन में लड़ा हूंगा तो इस की वजह से मुझे १०० या २०० वोट ज्यादा मिलेंगे। यह बात मैं मान सकता हूँ कि जो इस तरह का बीरतापूर्ण और देशभक्तिपूर्ण काम करेंगे उन

को शायद उस का फल मिलेगा। लेकिन क्या मैं पूछूँ कि सन् १९३०, १९०७ या सन् ४२ में जो आप जेलों में गये और अत्याचारों का मुकाबला किया तो क्या वह सब इसलिये किया था कि जेल से छूट कर आने में हम को हुकूमत मिलेगी? यह मैं मानने को तैयार हूँ कि यह सब आप के उन बलिदानों का परिणाम हो सकता है, उसी प्रकार से शायद आगे चल कर इन लोगों को भी अपने बलिदानों का फल मिलता। आज देश में विरोधी दल बढ़ रहे हैं, कांग्रेस के लोग आज इस मूवमेंट में नहीं आ रहे हैं, हालांकि मैं मानता हूँ कि कांग्रेस में भी ऐसे लोग थे जो हमारी मदद करते थे और इस सत्याग्रह की भी मदद कर रहे थे, लेकिन मैं उन को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा कि अब उन्होंने ने अपनी पालिसी घोषित की है और इस प्रश्न को राष्ट्रीय दृष्टि से न देखते हुए एक पार्टी की दृष्टि से जो पंडित जी की सरकार ने और कांग्रेस न गोआ के बारे में अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट किया है और प्रस्ताव पास किया है वह मेरी राय में भारत का मस्तक विश्व के रंगमंच पर मुकाने वाला साबित होगा।

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): The debate on foreign affairs, due to some strange combination of the Opposition, usually takes quite a different channel, and drifts away and it sets a pattern of its own. A good deal of time we spend cruising in a narrow circle, which does not help us in seeing the things in their correct perspective. Why not we judge the success or failure of our foreign policy on the basis of some well-recognised tests?

One of the correct tests to judge our foreign policy will be to see whether it is taking us towards isolation or through it we are going to gain some more ground in the international affairs. Another test can be to see

whether it has tended to decrease the world tension. I intend to apply these tests to the problem of Goa and also to some other problems like the recent Sino-American and German-Soviet *rapprochement* on which a good deal depends whether the world tension is going to increase or decrease. The changes that our foreign policy has brought during the recent months, not only in Asia but in Africa and to some extent also in Europe, are amazing. Only a few weeks ago, I travelled from Afghanistan to the Atlantic Coast and visited about a dozen countries. Wherever I went—let it be Kabul let it be Addis-Ababa, Khartoum or Ankara,—I found that the people and the Government had great appreciation for our foreign policy and great respect for our country. I would like to see the same appreciation as it exists in Asia and Africa also in European countries about our foreign policy. But, it is not so easy to achieve. The European problems are different.

Let us take, for example, the question of Berlin. Perhaps this is one problem on which hangs the fate of a large number of countries. Not only that, perhaps it hangs in balance the fate of war or peace in the world. Therefore, the most important thing to be done is to find out ways how to decrease this world-wide tension, whether in Europe or in Asia, by changing the environment or the atmosphere. In this sphere we have done quite a lot.

The most important work which we have done is that we have brought about sufficient change and realisation, not only in Asia but in Europe also. We have brought an atmosphere of peace and the realisation of the fact—as the Prime Minister has again repeated today—that the use of force or measures of war do not solve any problem in the world. It was from the floor of this very House that a few months ago the Prime Minister stated this and since that time we see that a great number of changes are taking place in the international

affairs. It had contributed a colossal influence in bringing about decrease in the world tension of today. Out of all papers in the world and in all the languages I have come across, the best appreciation of our foreign policy we find, is in *Pravda*, a Russian paper. Here under the heading "Contribution of India for the cause of peace" they analyse step by step our Prime Minister's work and also its effect in the international affairs.

Certainly, it is a great contribution, but our Prime Minister went further and also told the world that the use of nuclear weapons for war purposes will destroy the aggressor and the aggressed, both. This realisation has brought today China and America to talking terms at Geneva and also, perhaps, this is the realisation which has brought West Germany and Soviet Union together at the Moscow talks.

The world has followed with great concern and relief the recent talks which have taken place in Moscow between Dr. Adenauer and Comrade Bulganin. It is perhaps for the first time we see that Panch Shila has been effective. Both have learnt at least one thing; if not panch shila, they have become *shanti sheel* and then they have begun their talk. It is a great contribution which has made them meet in an atmosphere of peace and settle their problems. So, we find that in this atmosphere of peace when both of them met, they have come to certain conclusions and the world hopes that, perhaps, many of the problems which are outstanding today in Europe will be solved. Nobody is naive enough to think that all the problems will be solved in the near future. What I want to emphasise and underline is that in this talk which was going on in Moscow between Chancellor Adenauer and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, the basis was of Panch Shila so to say and they have become *shanti sheel*. This is one of the factors which I want to emphasise once more.

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

✓ This surely is a great success of our foreign policy. Today we find the effect of the foreign policy on us, that we have many friends in the whole world; perhaps, we have no enemies—though we have some opponents.

The recent trip of our Prime Minister to Russia was a trip of friendship in the real sense of the term. Again, here I have got what *Pravada* wrote in one of its leading articles the day our Prime Minister arrived in Moscow. It says in this article:

“May the friendship of the peoples of USSR and India grow stronger and brighter. Jawaharlal Nehru, head of the Government of the Republic of India arrives in our country today. The Soviet people sincerely greet this worthy son of the friendly Indian people and say: ‘welcome.’”

At this stage, will you please allow me to convey to the great Soviet people and also their Government our warm thanks for the great and unprecedented reception they gave to our Prime Minister and also for their proper appreciation of Panch Shila and our foreign policy? Here, Sir, with you I will say:

“Sovietskie Druzya! Krepko Vozmiu Vash Ruki I Peredayu Sami Goryachie Privat.”

It means, “Soviet friends! We hold your hands firmly and convey our warm greetings.” I have said it in Russian, because they will understand it better; that is why I put it this way. Here again, our Prime Minister's winning the heart of Russia was a great achievement, an achievement of which any individual or any country can be proud of with sufficient justification.

In this atmosphere of peace and tranquillity, if we find any disturbing factor, of course, it is greatly from the side of Goa and to some extent from the side of Pakistan. In this respect also, if we go into some details, we will find that the directives

of our Government and of the Congress Party regarding Goa have some mature reasons behind them. Firstly, we do not want to do what the Portuguese would like us to do. It is a strategy never to do what the opponent would like you to do. The Portuguese would like nothing better than to have fodder for their guns; but human material is very valuable to us and we cannot afford to lose it. ✓ Secondly, any use of force from our side in Goa is liable to derail our foreign policy and may throw us ✓ down in isolation. We will be doing just the opposite of what we are aspiring to achieve. The wise policy to adopt is to isolate the Portuguese. We know perhaps more facts about Goa on this side of the House than the hon. Members opposite. They simply go to the border and sometimes their action is also shameful. Satyagrahis are always brave men; their leaders go forward knowing they are going to be shot, they do not stand behind. They go first and then the others follow. But here it has always happened that the leaders have remained behind and they have asked other people to go forward. One hon. Member, an honourable leader of this so-called satyagraha, with whom I had a talk a few months ago, came and vividly described what happened on the Banda border. Of course, we have great respect for those satyagrahis who are brave people; we salute them, no doubt.

But, that gentleman, who was one of the leaders, stood on the border and when his followers and other satyagrahis proceeded 6 or 7 yards, shooting began. At that time, he himself does not go; another lady goes and picks up the Flag and she gets shot. This man has not the courage to pull her back. An American goes and brings the lady back. Is it not shameless for a man to stand there whatever may happen at that time? He is the leader. He should have been the first man to have proceeded, taken the Flag and hoisted it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Where were you?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: These people have no moral strength. What satyagraha needs first is courage. If you have courage, then only you are a satyagrahi. That is Gandhiji's principle. We have no complaints against the people on the Goa side. The bell rings. I think this is the bell for the victory of our policy in Goa. If we pursue a correct policy and do not fall into the trap, into the provocations which are placed before us, certainly we will be creating a very good atmosphere not only in our country, but we will be setting a good example for the world to follow. There is no question of any satyagraha. The provocations are so great that we shall have to isolate the Portuguese to such an extent that they are thrown out into the sea. That would be the day of our victory. That would come.

In conclusion, I would say, we have strong faith in our foreign policy and in our Prime Minister. That is why we are sure that the bright dawn of victory is on the horizon.

Shri J. R. Mehta (Jodhpur): I should like to state at the very outset that there is such a great halo surrounding the foreign policy of our Prime Minister that it sometimes becomes difficult to pick up the weak spots and to have the average citizen of India accept them as such. The force of this observation applies to our policy in regard to Goa. We have every reason to be proud of our foreign policy as a whole. But, I submit that it is up to us not to allow that sense of pride to have the better of us and refuse to see any weakness anywhere in our foreign policy.

In regard to Goa, I do feel that our policy has not exactly been what it should have been. That is to say, it has not been entirely free from reproach. I am constrained to say that in this matter we have not displayed that maturity of judgment which the Prime Minister so often demands from all of us. He has so often re-

minded us, and rightly also, that we are a mature nation and that we should think and behave as such. I regret to have to say that our policy in regard to Goa does not reflect the requisite standard of maturity. It was but natural that people of this great country, awakened from the slumber of ages, and having torn asunder the shackles of slavery in defiance of the might of the greatest empire the world has ever known, should feel acutely the ignominy or shame of having a tiny patch of colonialism disfiguring the face of Mother India. They felt this ignominy and shame very deeply and they conceived the idea of satyagraha as a means of washing off that ignominy and shame. Somebody conceived of this idea and all parties more or less became seized of it. Now, it cannot be denied that, while the Government may not have encouraged it directly, they did nothing to discourage it. They at least connived at it. When preparations were made for mass satyagraha on the 15th August, Government at any rate did not step in to prevent it, but when this resulted in mass massacre and the worst butchery ever perpetrated by any civilised country, Government turned round and said that satyagraha in this case was not desirable—not only mass satyagraha, but even satyagraha of the individual variety. What is more, our police were asked to come to the rescue of the Portuguese and prevent the satyagrahis from entering Goa. I do humbly maintain, and I believe hon. Members will agree with me, that in so far as we did not discourage the satyagraha or prevent it from the very beginning, we did display a lack of maturity of judgment, that degree of maturity which the Prime Minister so often expects from us.

It is implicit in what I have stated that I regard the latest decision of the Government in regard to Goa so far as the banning of satyagraha is concerned as correct. My only regret is that wisdom has dawned on us a bit too late. But I have another

[Shri J. R. Mehta]

regret also, and that is that while our Prime Minister has all along maintained, and I think rightly, that in regard to all such matters we should have a national policy which means, if it means anything, that all the parties in the country should not work at cross purposes with each other, Government have themselves been responsible for sabotaging the idea of such a policy. I am afraid I cannot avoid the feeling that both the Congress as well as the Government have chosen to work at cross purposes vis-a-vis the other parties both in the initial as well as in the final stages of this satyagraha campaign.

All this, however, is past history, and I am not one of those who would cry over spilt milk. All is well that ends well. I think we might rather console ourselves with the fact that we corrected our attitude before it was too late and before much harm had been done. I am here to give credit to the Prime Minister for not standing on prestige and showing moral courage to rectify the mistake at the earliest opportunity. But one is entitled to ask: how do you propose to solve the Goa problem?

Police action, we are told, is ruled out. We are also told that Goa is not a problem over which we should go to war or take other measures. How then are we to solve the problem? Not surely by chanting *Ram nam*. I am bound to say that the Government's policy in the matter does not show the light.

We are told that colonialism is now on its last legs, that the whole world condemns it, that it is against the spirit of the times and that it is bound to find its own grave before long. We are told that its existence is against the spirit of the Pacific Charter or the United Nations Charter or the Bandung conference where Asian nations assembled declared in a body from the house-tops that they would not tolerate colonialism anywhere in Asia. America and the

United Kingdom have probably expressed their abhorrence about it, and so also other nations. So, we are told that world opinion is sure to assert itself. It is in this spirit that we find the Prime Minister telling us—I am quoting his words in the Rajya Sabha:

“I think I can say with confidence that forces are at work, national and international, economic and others, which are bound to bring the solution nearer and which ultimately will undoubtedly solve the problem.”

I wish I can share the Prime Minister's confidence and his optimism, but I shall be guilty of hypocrisy if I did not give expression to my misgivings. I am not a moralist, nor a philosopher. I have no quarrel with the theory that truth and justice ultimately triumph in this world. It is a sublime theory so far as it seeks to sustain and inspire the struggles for the vindication of right and justice in this world. But I submit this theory in itself would not lead us very far. What do we mean by 'ultimately' in this respect? Do we mean after five years, fifty years, or five hundred years? Colonialism is bad; it is a negation of truth and justice. But for how many hundreds of years it has flourished, and how many patches of this world are still under its yoke? Colour bar is bad; it is another negation of truth and justice. But for how long has it survived and disgraced and debased those who practise it as well as those against whom it is practised? We have had bitter experience of the treatment meted to our countrymen in South Africa on grounds of colour and race. How long has that gone on?

This world has grown very old, and I think it is one of the oldest phenomenon of God's creation. I maintain that if this theory were correct that truth and justice will ultimately triumph, then there should be no injustice left in this world at this stage of its existence.

To my mind it appears that it is no use saying therefore that forces are at work, which will ultimately solve the problem. That is only wishful thing. That is only a negative attitude. Whatever be the forces at work, can we afford to sit still? Have we no duty in the matter, and have we to sit still? And if we are to sit still, for how long? Have we or have we not a positive duty to perform in this matter? That is the question we must face and we should face it boldly and squarely without any sentimentalism or hypocrisy.

We are told by the Prime Minister that it is not for him or for Government to enter into the philosophy of satyagraha, and to say how far it could be applied to problems like Goa. I humbly submit that we cannot afford to take up this attitude. If we are to have a national policy in such matters, the nation and the Government must think with one mind. It clearly follows that the nation is entitled to have a clear and positive guidance from him on such a question. The particular question of Goa may not be a big question. But the question of satyagraha *versus* force as a weapon for the vindication of a country's honour is a much wider question on which no nation can afford to think loosely or lightly.

India has suffered a great deal in the past from sentimentalism or lack of realism, from an undue stress on moral values in the abstract. If that sordid history is not to be repeated, the nation must clearly know the circumstances when it must be prepared to go to war for the vindication of its rights, of course, after all peaceful means of vindicating its rights have been exhausted. I dare say that if you rule out war or the use of force in any circumstances or in any shape or form, then you will soon cease to exist as a nation. If satyagraha, or—let me put it more generally—mere peaceful means could solve problems like Goa, why did we march our armies into Kashmir? Why did we think fit to resort to police action in

Hyderabad? Indeed, why did Ramchandra, the *Maryada Purushottam* of the Hindus, not resort to satyagraha to get back Sita from Ravana? And why should Shri Krishna not have thought of applying this weapon against Kansa?

What I wish to emphasise is that it is up to us as a nation to appreciate the limitations of satyagraha or peaceful means, and the inevitability of using force—call it war or police action or what you will—for vindicating national honour and for vindicating justice. This is not to say that we must go to war on the slightest pretext. No. We must exhaust all other sources before we resort to this final weapon.

Applying this to the case of Goa, I have no quarrel with Government that they will adopt all peaceful means. By all means, let us give Salazar a chance, if he is capable of profiting by it. But I must find fault with our policy that we shall not use force in any circumstances, to bring Salazar round, not even if he should prove to be a Ravan or a Kansa. To say this to a man like Salazar is something like preaching Vedanta to a lunatic or a criminal, and it is bound to demoralise him. It is also bound to create a wrong psychology in the minds of the nation.

In this context, I would beg leave to invite the attention of the Prime Minister to a speech he recently delivered at Patna in which he is reported to have said that he would not mind even if ten thousand or ten hundred thousand people were shot in order to save the honour of the national flag. This speech, as the House is aware, has touched off a great controversy. I am not concerned with that aspect of the speech at the moment. For my purpose, its relevance lies in this fact, that it brings out how seriously our Prime Minister takes any insult to the national flag. So much so that he will not mind sacrificing the lives of any number of his own countrymen to save the honour of that flag—those

[Shri J. R. Mehta]

dear countrymen of his for whose sake, I take it, he would be prepared any day to sacrifice even his own life. Now, here is a tiny nation, foreign to this land, headed by a petty-minded dictator called Salazar, hurling insult not only at the national flag but on all the dignity, honour and majesty of this great nation as a whole, and you refuse to lift even your little finger to bring that gentleman to his senses. I ask the hon. Prime Minister to consider how far he is consistent in this policy of his?

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

There is only one more observation that I have to make before I close. In this context, I cannot resist the temptation of referring to an anecdote relating to Churchill during the last world war. It serves very well to illustrate the point which I want to make out. Those were the days of great stress and strain, when the fate of the British Empire was hanging in the balance. In those days, Mr. Churchill was unduly blunt and rough to his critics in Parliament or to the Opposition; and when one M.P. protested seriously, Churchill blurted out:

"My dear friend, don't you know that all the twenty-four hours, I have to be thinking of war and planning for war? How do you expect that I should at once cool down and be as docile as a lamb, as soon as I enter this House, and sit here for a little while".

I do not remember the exact words, but this was the sense. Now, this applies to our Prime Minister, though in a somewhat different sense. He has grown into a great messenger of peace. He has gone, and is going, about the four corners of the world shouting 'peace, peace' at the top of his voice. And what is the result? He has forgotten even how to frown. I am sure this House will agree with me when I say that he has forgotten even how to frown on these benches these days, as he used to do. I humbly advise the Prime Minister that he

must learn to frown, so far as petty-minded people like Salazar are concerned. He may not use the 'danda', but he must know how to flourish it.

श्री टंडन (जिला इलाहाबाद-पश्चिम) :

आज के विदेशी विषयों पर इस वादविवाद में मैं कुछ शब्द केवल गोष्ठा के बारे में निवेदन करने को खड़ा हुआ हूँ ।

सब से पहले मैं अपनी श्रद्धांजलि उन वीरों को अर्पित करता हूँ जिन्होंने गोष्ठा के सत्याग्रह में अपने प्राणों की आहुति दी है । उस के बाद मेरी श्रद्धांजलि उन बहुत से साहसी पुरुषों और नारियों के लिये है जिन्होंने अछड़ी संख्या में गोष्ठा में प्रवेश किया और चोटें खाईं । इन चोटों में बहुतों को गोलियाँ भी लगीं । स्वभावतः पोर्चुगल के इस अत्याचार की नीति पर हमारे हृदय में क्षोभ उत्पन्न होता है ।

4 P.M.

परन्तु साथ ही मुझे इस सत्याग्रह से एक प्रसन्नता हुई । भविष्य की एक सुनहली रेखा मुझ को आकाश में दिखाई पड़ी । अपने राष्ट्रपिता गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में हम ने देखा कितने युवक और अधिक अघस्था के लोग भी साहस से बढ़ कर देश के लिये अपनी बलि अर्पित करने की तैयार हुए । जब जब उन्होंने कोई पग उठाया चारों ओर से उन की पुकार पर सहस्रों नर नारी देश के लिये खड़े हुए । कुछ ऐसा लगता था कि हमारे हृदय की वह लहर इधर ढीली सी हो चली थी । इस सत्याग्रह ने हमें दिखलाया कि हमारे जन समुदाय के भीतर इस समय भी साहस, वीरता और त्याग की वह भावना मौजूद है जो राष्ट्र का मुख्य आधार हुआ करती है । इस कारण मुझ को इस सत्याग्रह आन्दोलन पर प्रसन्नता हुई और मैं ने उन युवकों को जो सत्याग्रह के लिये गये थे, हृदय से आशीर्वाद दिया ।

परन्तु आज विवाद का प्रश्न तो यह है कि सत्याग्रह जो बन्द कर दिया गया वह क्या ठीक हुआ। हमारे कई भाइयों ने इस प्रश्न को इस तरह देखा कि इस में शासन के अधिकारियों के पैर ठंडे हो गये। इस बात को उन्होंने ने अंग्रेजी भाषा में कहा था। मुझे निष्पक्ष भाव से इस प्रश्न को देखते हुए ऐसा नहीं लगा। सत्याग्रह ने अपना काम किया। सत्याग्रह ने साहस की लहर फैलाई। सत्याग्रह ने संसार के सामने गोआ के प्रश्न को स्पष्ट रीति से रक्खा, यह सत्याग्रह का गहरा लाभ हुआ। उस का प्रभाव भी संसार के अन्य राष्ट्रों पर पड़ा, मुझे इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है। परन्तु हमें यह कभी भूलना नहीं चाहिये कि सत्याग्रह एक अनुष्ठान होता है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि अनुष्ठान का अर्थ आप सब लोग समझते होंगे . . .

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Please translate it into English.

श्री डंडन : अंग्रेजी में मैं उस का अनुवाद नहीं कर सकता। अनुष्ठान यज्ञ के समान होता है जो बारहों महीने नहीं चला करता। वह सामयिक होता है और विशेष कार्य के लिये किया जाता है। सत्याग्रह भी एक अनुष्ठान है, यज्ञ है, समय से किया जाता है और समय पर उस का परिणाम सामने आता है। किसी अभिप्राय से अनुष्ठान किया जाता है, परन्तु वह कोई स्थायी कार्य नहीं होता। सत्याग्रह यहां हुआ और उस का कुछ परिणाम हुआ। हां यह परिणाम नहीं हुआ कि गोआ आपको मिल गया हो। परन्तु उस का लाभ हुआ, इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं। गोआ का प्रश्न आगे बढ़ा और संसार के सामने आया। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या यह अनुष्ठान अभी जारी रह सकता था। कुछ थोड़े दिन और भी जारी रक्खा जाना सम्भव था, परन्तु यह तो स्पष्ट है कि ऐसे

अनुष्ठान सदा नहीं चला करते, स्थायी नहीं होते। आप ने गांधी जी के क्रम को भी देखा था कि किस प्रकार से वह चलते थे और फिर समय पर उस अनुष्ठान को खींच भी लेते थे। यहां प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह तो नहीं कहा कि उन्होंने ने उस को चलाया, जो कुछ उन्होंने ने कहा वह तो अपने हृदय की सही बात कही, अर्थात् उन्होंने ने इस अनुष्ठान को चलाने का दायित्व कभी अपने ऊपर नहीं लिया परन्तु इतना तो स्पष्ट है कि यद्यपि उन्होंने ने स्वयं उस को नहीं चलाया, तो भी सहानुभूति उन के हृदय में सत्याग्रहियों के प्रति थी। आदर, सत्कार और आशीर्वाद की भावना उन में थी, यह भी स्पष्ट है। इसीलिये उन को आज यह सुनना भी पड़ा जैसा कुछ भाइयों ने कहा, कि आप की नीति में परिवर्तन हो गया है। उन्होंने ने स्वयं यह कहा कि हमारी नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है। मैं ने जो सुना विरोधी भाइयों की बात और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कुछ कहा, उस में मुझे कुछ बीच की बात सही लगती है। सम्भवतः जान बूझ कर प्रधान मंत्री ने नीति नहीं बदली हो परन्तु उन का पहले जो क्रम था वह आशीर्वादात्मक और सहानुभूतिपूर्ण था, उस में अन्तर पड़ा, जब सत्याग्रह को उन्होंने ने रोका, इस में तो कोई सन्देह नहीं है। उन्होंने ने बताया कि उन के स्वयं मस्तिष्क में बहुत स्पष्टता नहीं थी। उन्होंने ने कहा कि आरम्भ में मैं बहुत स्पष्ट नहीं था कि क्या कर्तव्य है। वह यह समझते हैं कि उन की नीति में अन्तर नहीं हुआ। इधर लोगों ने यह समझा और यह आक्षेप किया कि उन की नीति में अन्तर हुआ। मैं मान लेता हूँ आप की बात कि अन्तर हुआ है। तो क्या नीति में अन्तर करने में सदा बुराई होती है? जो बुद्धिमान पुरुष होता है उस को तो अपनी नीति को समयानुकूल बदलना पड़ता है। जो नीति पांच दिन

[श्री टंडन]

पहले थी वह आज भी उसी नीति पर चलता रहे जब संघर्ष छिड़ा है, यह आवश्यक नहीं है यह तो आप सब स्वीकार करेंगे तो यदि उन के हृदय ने उस सत्याग्रह की नीति को उस समय स्वीकार भी किया हो चाहे बेजाने, जिस को कि अंग्रेजी में सब-कांशस माइंड कहते हैं उस के द्वारा उन्होंने ने तो यह कहा है कि कोई अन्तर नहीं किया है; परन्तु यदि उन्होंने ने उस नीति को अपने मन में स्पष्ट न होने के कारण कुछ दिन के लिये चलाया भी, तो फिर पीछे जब उन्होंने ने देखा कि अब इस को हम बन्द करें, कुछ कारणों से, तो इस में न कोई उन की झूठी बात है और न नीति की बुराई ही है। इस में न कोई उन्होंने ने अपराध किया है और न ही यह कोई अनैति है। मैं स्वयं यह समझता हूँ कि जब गवर्नमेंट ने या शासन ने यह कहा कि अब हम यह दायित्व अपने ऊपर लेते हैं, हम अब गोआ पर सील लगाते हैं, यह उन का अंग्रेजी का शब्द है, अर्थात् उन्होंने ने हर दायित्व को अपने ऊपर लिया और कहा कि अब हम पुर्तगाल के साथ निबटेंगे, अर्थात् रोकथाम लगा कर, अथवा और उन के मन में कई बातें हों जो उन्होंने स्पष्ट नहीं कहीं, परन्तु उन्होंने ने कहा कि शासन इस दायित्व को अपने ऊपर लेता है और द्वार को बन्द करता है, उन को जाने नहीं देंगे और जब उन को जाने नहीं देंगे तो फिर हम कैसे आप को जाने देंगे अंग्रेजी में उन्होंने ने जो लफ्ज इस्तेमाल किया है वह यह है कि यह एप्रोप्रियेट नहीं है कि हम आप को जाने दें तो मुझे तो यह बात नीतिपूर्ण और ठीक लगी है कि उन्होंने ने द्वार बन्द कर के सारी जिम्मेदारी अपने ऊपर ले ली। अभी तक तो सत्याग्रहियों ने यह जिम्मेदारी अपने ऊपर ली थी। अन्तुष्टान उन्होंने ने किया और उन का अन्तुष्टान चलने दिया गया कुछ देर तक। अब यह कहा गया है

कि अन्तुष्टान को बन्द किया जाय और हम स्वयं जिम्मेदारी ले कर सामने आते हैं और हम इस का निबटारा करेंगे। मैं नहीं समझता कि क्यों गवर्नमेंट को, जिस ने बहुत बड़ा दायित्व अपने ऊपर लिया है, अबसर न दिया जाय। आप को चाहिये कि आप अन्तुष्टान को बन्द कर दीजिये। उन्होंने ने अपने ऊपर इस जिम्मेदारी को ले कर एक साहस का काम किया है और आप उन्हें अबसर दीजिये, देखिये वह क्या करते हैं। यह काम एक दो दिन में तो हल हो नहीं सकता। आप को चाहिये कि आप उन को साल छः महीने का समय दीजिये और देखिये वह क्या करते हैं। आप देखें कि उन की कार्रवाइयों का क्या परिणाम निकलता है, उन्होंने ने इकोनॉमिक सैकशन लगाने को बात कही। साधारण रीति से माल के जाने जाने पर जहाजों द्वारा माल के जाने जाने पर रोक लगाने की बात कही है। इन सब कार्रवाइयों के बावजूद यदि आप देखें कि कोई नतीजा नहीं होता है, तब फिर समय आयगा जब आप उन की टीका टिप्पणी कर सकेंगे और कह सकेंगे कि आप सफल नहीं हुए और अब हम कोई दूसरा रास्ता निकालेंगे। सत्याग्रह को उन्होंने ने कुछ दिन तक जारी रहने दिया और फिर उस को रोक दिया, यह अपने में कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है कि जिस के ऊपर हम उन को बुरा भला कहें।

मैं स्वयं यह समझता हूँ कि आप के सत्याग्रह अन्तुष्टान का काम हो गया। यदि आप यह समझते थे कि इस सत्याग्रह से आप सालाजार के घुटने टिका देंगे तो इस की मुझे भी कोई आशा नहीं थी। आशीर्वाद मैं ने दिया था। मैं यह आशा करता था कि सत्याग्रह का कुछ न कुछ असर जरूर

होगा। सत्याग्रह ने भावना जगा दी और अपना काम उस ने कर दिया। आप ने देखा कि गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में कैसे लड़ाइयाँ लड़ी गईं। आप जानते हैं कि कांग्रेसों के समय में भी कितने सत्याग्रह हुए। क्या एक ही सत्याग्रह के कारण कांग्रेसों ने घुटने टेक दिये? यह नहीं हुआ। जब हम इस रास्ते पर चलते हैं तो भाव जगाते हैं, आप के हृदय में एक तरह के, संसार के हृदय में दूसरी तरह के और फिर कुल मिला कर कुछ समय बाद एक वायुमंडल संसार में बनता है। उस वायुमंडल का असर होता है और तब वह अपना प्रभाव दिखाता है। यह बात कुछ समय लेती है। आप ने एक सत्याग्रह शुरू किया, उस का अनुष्ठान समाप्त हुआ। मैं समझता हूँ कि शासन ने समय पर आ कर बुद्धिमानी का काम किया है कि आप के अनुष्ठान को रोक दिया, नहीं तो बहुत सम्भव था कि वह थोड़े दिन बाद अपने आप ढीला होता। उन्होंने आप को सत्याग्रह रोकने का अवसर नहीं दिया, उन्होंने सभी का आदर रखा। उस अनुष्ठान को रोक कर स्वयं अपने ऊपर उस का दायित्व ले लिया। आप को उन्होंने ने बरी उज्ज्वलता कर दिया और अपने ऊपर दायित्व ले लिया। मैं इस को एक बुद्धिमानी की बात समझता हूँ। आप देखें छः महीने या साल भर उन को काम करने का अवसर दें। यह राजनीतिक प्रश्न है, फिर आप के सामने आवेगा और आप जैसे भी चाहेंगे अपने विचार प्रकट कर सकेंगे।

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): I have listened to the speeches from the hon. Leaders of the Opposition benches very carefully. I have come to the conclusion that the decisions regarding the Goa satyagraha taken by the Government and the Congress are the correct ones. That is the impression which I am carrying after their speeches.

It was very interesting to listen to the Mahasabha leader when he was praising the technique of satyagraha and it was equally interesting to listen to praise from the lips of the communist Members for satyagraha. They all said that it was a marvellous weapon. The only thing that I remember is that all these parties stood somewhere 2,000 miles away from us or Gandhiji when that satyagraha was practised in India. Apart from that, independently also, I think that the decision arrived at by the Government is correct because I had myself been associated to some extent with this movement.

The hon. Leader of the Mahasabha said that the general secretary of the Indian National Congress issued a circular and asked Congressmen to join satyagraha and when it was found that congressmen did not join they wanted us to arrive at a certain other conclusion. I was very much surprised to have this information. From where did he get that circular and how did he come to interpret that circular in that manner? I never expected a thing of that type from such a leader who occupies such a position. Anybody who will carefully go through that circular of my hon. colleague of the congress will find that what he has said in that circular is only this, that some enquiries have been made at the AICC office and if certain individuals wanted to join, they could do so, and that too within the discipline of congress. He never issued any circular in which he asked people or invited people to go and offer satyagraha; that was not the thing. Whatever estimate my hon. friend of the Hindu Mahasabha might have of Congressmen, if the Congress would have given a call I have no doubt about the result of the response. But, as I have said I had to a certain extent, within the limit of discipline associated myself with the satyagraha movement in my District and I am very proud of all those who participated in it. There is no doubt about it that what happened on the 15th of

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

August is a matter for which everybody should have appreciation and the whole country, not only this country but the whole world, has appreciated it.

But, what was the demand after the 15th of August. I myself was there in Maharashtra where this thing was being done. Because 200 young men from my District had gone to enter Goa on the 15th of August, I was very anxious to know what would happen to them. I knew what the Portuguese were going to do and it was impossible for me to sit here because I expected that something very serious may happen to them and I wanted to share their misery along with their families. That is why I left this place and went over to my constituency. Fortunately, none of them was seriously injured though one of them, a Harijan boy, had received bullet wound. Some of them had been very badly manhandled and some of them are disabled for their lives. I have every respect for them. But, what was the general demand round about the very place where satyagraha was offered? My friends here from the Socialist Benches—Shri Asoka Mehta—were very much in favour of it. What was the demand? Everybody said, now the time has come when the Government must act. Nobody said that satyagraha was going to liberate Goa. I have faith in satyagraha. I do not mean to say that satyagraha is a weapon which will be impotent before Salazar. I have no misgivings on that point. But, those who really offered satyagraha, what was the conclusion they arrived at? They said, now the time has come when the Government must act. And, when Government says, well, we are entering the field; we are trying to act, you please co-operate with us, then they say: why do you act? If we do not act, then they say, the Government must act and if the Government tries to act, they say: why are you taking charge of the field and not allowing us to carry on our satyagraha. This is a strange thing. Even

in the processions that were organised, what was the cry there?

पंडित जवाहर लाल क्या करे ?
फौज लेकर गौवा चलें ।

Can you say that it is satyagraha? It expects to realise its object by means of organised violence of the State. I do not want to debate on that question.

Somebody said here, what did we do in Kashmir; why did Gandhiji approve of the violence adopted by Poland? That analogy is quite different. The world has changed now. What is the consistent stand we have taken in international affairs. We have said, whatever problems are there, whatever vital interests are involved in it, do not take to violent methods and do not go to war. Goa is very important and very vital to India. There is no doubt about it and therein there are no two opinions. Who comes to conclusion that by this resolution we have given up the fight on Goa? That is a very wonderful interpretation of it. For the last three hours we are listening to speeches as if we Congressmen have no feeling regarding Goa and as if only hon. Members from the opposite side alone are carrying on fight against imperialism. Let us go into history. You will find that this is an old fight between imperialism and nationalism. Is nationalism today not in a powerful condition than what it was 25 years before?

The world owes this to the leader of the Congress and to the Prime Minister of India. This change has come over the whole world. Goa is not an isolated problem. It is a vital problem and there is no doubt about it. I want the liberation of Goa even tomorrow, but one cannot have it by saying it simply. It also ought to be reviewed in the context of world affairs. Even in the world today there is fight between imperialism and nationalism. I have no doubt that a day will come when

nationalism will assert itself and imperialism will become a matter of history. That process is going on in the world. If we maintain peace and calm in India, if internationally we create such an atmosphere in which moral values will be discussed in the world, I have no doubt that it will give us greater strength to liberate Goa. Salazar and the present Portuguese leaders may not be converted. But I am not of the opinion that the Portuguese people will never progress. I have faith in humanity and after all Portuguese are also human beings. If we create a proper atmosphere in the world, it will be too much for them to hold Goa. My friend Shri Asoka Mehta said, "Are you not aware of the 12,000 soldiers that are there?" The very fact that the Portuguese authorities are required to maintain 12,000 soldiers goes to show that their days are numbered. How long can a small power maintain such a huge force there? When we are going to take some economic measures against them, how long are they going to hold on? The only thing that is required is that in the international world, the point must be appreciated very much. If you have any respect for those who laid down their lives on the 15th August, let the world think about it calmly; only if you create a favourable atmosphere, their sacrifices will be crowned with success. There is no doubt about it. I do not want to say, that Goa is an isolated problem. I do want to say that Government is coming forward, taking the responsibility upon themselves; they say, "we are going to solve this problem." Why should we not trust them. As I said, what does history show us? If in the world today imperialism has received a shock and if imperialism today is not what it was 50 years before, to whom does the credit go? There are many eminent individuals living in the world who have worked for this undoing of imperialism and the greatest individual who has done it is the Premier of India.

My friend, the hon. Leader of the Hindu Maha Sabha said that "Congress has given up satyagraha and they have withdrawn satyagraha, because they thought that other parties would win the battle." You may say anything; we have never relied on cheap popularity. Gandhiji has not taught us that conduct. If you read the history of 50 years of this nation, you will find that if at all there was any one organisation which took unpopular but correct decisions, that was the Congress and the Congress alone. This is what history shows us. What is the use of saying "carry on satyagraha" without creating the proper atmosphere for it. I do not want that this matter should be looked at from the party point of view; I do not want to say that that level should be here in the debate. But I do maintain that in spite of whatever they might have said, they are very keen on the liberation of Goa; I have no doubt about it. I do say that every Member of the Opposition is equally sincere on this point as every Member on this side is. But I want to say this, namely, do not look at it from a party point of view. You may discredit us for having withdrawn satyagraha; but if we have withdrawn satyagraha, it is in the interests of the liberation movement. We do think and maintain that by having withdrawn satyagraha, we will be in a better position to carry on the liberation work of Goa and persuade the world in our favour.

One thing is very important in this matter. Let us not think of opportunist politics. We have to maintain very good traditions, whatever may come. We have told the Chinese, "the Formosa question is very important; but let us try the method of negotiation." But when it comes to Goa, suppose we say, "it is a small power; we will crush it." No doubt it is a small power; I am not afraid of the 12,000 soldiers there; we can overcome them. It is only a question of a few hours or a day. But, is that the problem before us? The problem before us is of a very wide one;

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

we want to see that there will be no imperialism in any corner of the world. This will have to be done in such a way that internationally there will be peace. Unless and until there is peace, moral values will not be recognised. Who can deny that during the last 7 or 8 years we have created a favourable atmosphere? Every day we are making progress in that direction. No doubt this is a vital question, but should we Indians who have done so much, belonging to this young nation of 8 years which had done so much for peace, give up that principle when it comes to our next door? Are these Indian traditions? That is the serious matter to be taken into consideration. My hon. friend Shri V. G. Deshpande has—I am sorry, he has the same name as mine and I have therefore requested the Chair to name the initials also—Shri V. G. Deshpande has moved an amendment. Look at the amendment. While he wants to blame the Government for having withdrawn satyagraha, in the same breath, he has moved an amendment to blame the Government for not having taken police action. Police action and satyagraha are on the same par for him. If such are the people who are going to offer satyagraha, I do not know what success they will achieve or what service they will do to satyagraha. For these reasons, I do want to say that I differ from the hon. Members of the Opposition. I would request and I would urge upon them to take a broad view of this matter. Are you going to win Goa by sending one or two more batches of satyagrahis? I do not want to under-estimate the work the satyagrahis have done. Let us realise what has happened. Let us try to place our case before the world. For that, let there be peace. I have no doubt that in a year or so, we are sure of achieve some results.

Shri Joachim Alva: There can be no two opinions about the barbarity of the Portuguese in Goa. The laws

of man and God and nature seem to have been violated on the 15th of August. The Portuguese fired upon so many of our great patriots including a woman and two American nobly correspondents dragged them from the border. This has a parallel in the massacre of Amritsar though on a small scale. We do not remember having known anything like this on a smaller scale since the Amritsar tragedy. Who was the great man that turned the other cheek? I would like to ask my hon. friends, who was the great man, who was the great leader who turned the other cheek in the Biblical fashion? It was the Prime Minister of India. The strength of a peaceful non-violent man comes like the strength of ten battalions. We may not exercise it. It is within you. Especially when violence is faced with non-violence, then that strength of battalions simply oozes out. India can march into Goa and occupy it in 24 hours. In fact, there had been an agreement between Britain and Portugal that Britain under the Raj in India could occupy Goa in 24 hours in an emergency. If the security of India is threatened tomorrow morning, even the Indian Government will be justified in going into Goa, whatever may be the opposition. However, we cannot have one kind of policy in one part of the world and another kind of policy in another front. We have the Kashmir problem. We have many interesting people from the West who are occupying positions as U.N. Observers. Do you want another set of people as U.N. Observers—the so called U.N. observers—to go and occupy Goa: two parts of our land, Kashmir and Goa, to be occupied by these Observers? If we march there is a small invasion, the U. N. O. will send a team of Observers and they will be the honoured men from the world who will occupy Goa and reside in Goa, walking into Goa, walking into India, walking into Pakistan in the same manner as foreign correspondents who are mostly from America,

have done, walking into Pakistan, walking into India and everywhere in all parts of the world. That is the great tragedy that we will have to face. Everyone must know that they have offended three laws against humanity. They have no right to kill. If a man has done anything, you can kill him if the duly constituted courts of law have decreed that he shall be punished in that way. You can kill a man in self-defence. They have broken all these three laws. I want to ask my hon. friends whether their motives are all unalloyed, uncoloured. We all remember the great raging and tearing campaign waged in the streets of Delhi a few years ago. I had a great affection, admiration and esteem for the late Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. But, you remember, Sir, that on the very floor of this House, he said, he appealed, he almost unconditionally called off that strife. Do you want law and order to be disturbed in such a way that our national Government which is sitting on the saddle, the national Government which is the pride of the East, pride in the matter that we have got security, should be blown away? Do you want law and order to be disturbed as it was done in Bombay? The Chief Minister of Bombay has got broad shoulders. He knows how to take both the brickbats and the bonquets. He will take care of himself and take more brickbats than bonquets. If the law and order situation is going to be disturbed in Calcutta and Delhi in this manner, what will happen to our great but yet an infant State which has had its teething troubles, which has stood them all and is being built up, stone upon stone.

These are problems that we have to tackle. My hon. friends the Socialists want to cash perhaps on their defeats. They have not been so successful at the polls, and they must do something imaginative to capture the public mind. I do not want to say anything more because they are my friends. I have got great admiration for their patriotism, ability, vigour and intel-

ligence, but when it comes to great questions of State policy, when the country has given a resounding victory at the polls for the Congress Party, the Congress Party can also do its job of laying down a policy. If the Congress Party makes up its mind to enter Goa, it will do it through thousands of people. But that day has not come and may not come at all.

Regarding the Communist Party, it is I think a pity from their point of view that the Prime Minister has stolen the thunder out of their sails by the Avadi resolution. These are all facts which we have to note when we make up our foreign policy. No foreign policy can be based except on a strong internal policy.

Having said this, let us turn to the question of Goa. The *American Annual* says the following about how the Portuguese behave in their territories. The last number of the *American Annual*, 1954, states:

"The Portuguese territories are among the least advanced of the non-self-governing territories in economic development, self-government and national education and welfare."

These are words from the *American Annual*. We do also know that the C. NATO powers are building mine-sweepers in the waters of Portugal and that Portugal has been given a large slice for building military material. Those mine sweepers from Portugal—I want to warn this House, not that we afraid of anybody for each one of us do possess the spirit of ten men as we are Mahatma Gandhi's followers—can sweep off our tiny little Navy. Let us also remember that our neighbouring powers like Pakistan and even Ceylon have not shown unalloyed friendship to us in the matter of Goa and will help the Portuguese to harass us in regard to Goa.

There should be a time-limit. I would like to remind the Prime Minister that his great and illustrious father the late Pandit Motilal Nehru also gave a time-limit to the

[Shri Joachim Alva]

British. In the year 1929 he demanded that by the 1st January 1930, the British did not quit, he would march from the banks of the Ravi, and from that day there has not been a single step back in our movement for freedom. After that, his world-famed son, declared Independence on the banks of the Ravi and thereafter went on to the Quit India movement of Mahatma Gandhi until you and I are here occupying comfortable seats.

And in that way, the Government of India shall have to set up a timetable. The time table will not be less than three years perhaps as all reasonable men will agree, when we shall have to ask the Portuguese to mind their own business and leave Goa. Three years is not long in the life of a nation, but they are certainly long enough time to be given to America and Britain. There is a most interesting passage in the *Britannia Book of the Year, 1954*, published by *Encyclopaedia Britannia*. In the year 1953, the prominent visitors to Lisbon were "De Valera, Koprulu, the Turkish Foreign Minister, and Eden, who spent his honeymoon at Urgeirica". There has been the honeymoon within the Commonwealth of Britain with India, and if the British want this honeymoon to continue, they will have to think twice, and not indulge in those nasty attacks against the Prime Minister of India through the British papers, like the *Daily Express*, *Daily Telegraph* and even the *Manchester Guardian*. Are the British not yet reconciled to the loss of India that they must be chagrined over Goa and begin to lecture to our Prime Minister that he behaves like Hitler. Who is behaving like Hitler? There was another man who said the same thing of Mahatma Gandhi. You remember him. He said he would not preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, and when Lord Irwin as Viceroy of India called the conference of Leaders, Churchill sarcastically commented: "I shall not allow the half-naked

fakir with his tooth-less smile to walk on the steps of the Viceroy's House" There are all facts of history. History cannot be reversed. Neither Gandhi, nor Goa nor history can be reversed.

We are grateful to the United States of America for the intervention of the late President Roosevelt in the Indian crisis, during the last war. We are grateful to those men who stood by the principles of democracy. But where are the voices of the men in the House of Representatives today? Where are the voices of the men and women in the Senate of the United States of America? They say they are the great champions of liberty. We admire the Americans, for they have stood by the voices of liberty. They have not become versed in diplomacy as the British have been. The British people are interested only in cutting up every part of the world so that they could just jump in. The Americans have not fully learnt that diplomacy yet; though they are building up bases in North Africa and Morocco especially, having more bases there than in any other part of the world. They are only trying to learn the art of that peculiar diplomacy, perhaps in league with the British. But we do believe that there are liberal voices in the United States of America, men who are champions of liberty and men who are interested in freedom in every part of the world. We are not interested in California, but if any power attacks any part of America, the voice of India shall stand up against it. Hence when Cyprus, or Malta or Formosa or Hongkong are wrenched off from their main lands India will stand always for the cause of liberty. We shall never allow liberty to be erased out or stamped out or sabotaged from our conscience.

To the Prime Minister, we owe a great deal. The philosophy of Hinduism is one of tolerance. The best teaching of Buddhism is one of non-violence. And the same thing is the teaching of Christianity, as preached by Christ, not as practised by the

Christian people today, but as preached by Christ in Jerusalem and never practised by the Christian powers of the world. They are interested only in monasteries, buildings and other worldly possessions and in dominating other countries. But we would like the Christian powers to set a better standard of moral values, and not to adopt one system of violence at one end of the world and another at another end.

We are grateful to President Nasser. We are grateful to President Tito. We are grateful to Prime Minister Chou En-lai. We are also grateful to his Holiness the Pope and to all those who have made declarations saying that this is a political problem. But why did not the Vatican or the Cardinal or Archbishop of Bombay who indulged in these declarations condemn the brutalities in Goa? Why did they not condemn the brutalities which to any civilised man and the conscience of mankind are utterly revolting? These are great facts.

We shall have to see to it that we seal up our frontiers. We shall have to impose a blockade on all the propaganda that is being made against India within our own country. We should not allow any organs in the press today to do propaganda inwardly, unconsciously or even openly and seemingly and in a dirty manner, for Goa. We have been believers in democracy, and we do not want our national organs or any organ or any yellow journal to publish all these things, supported as they are by British and American advertisements. We do not want our national organs to put forth the Portuguese view in India. We should not be tolerant of enemies within the gate, for one enemy within the gate is more dangerous than all the battalions outside the gate. These are stark facts which we must remember. We have got an excellent case, but we have spoilt our case because of our ineffective propaganda. Our propaganda must be dynamic.

When my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee said here that the Members in the House of Commons did not know that the majority of the Goans

were Hindus, I was shocked. The British were here in India; they owned India; they could do whatever they liked in India, and certainly they ought to have known better as what has happened in Goa, and why the Hindus and especially the Catholics in Goa are not able to stand up today against Portuguese rule. Why did the people in Pondicherry stand up against the French people? It was because they remained Indians, and they wore their *Dhoties*. But probably my friends the Catholics in Goa wear the cotton pants and the tie and other things under the Portuguese rule, and they have been changed so much that they probably have forgotten to do their duty by their country. And how did the Portuguese flood this country and destroy all our temples and mosques with their Catholic churches? I would like to say in this connection, that I am a Roman Catholic myself, and am a believer in Christianity. I would like also to worship my religion in my own heart, and if my deeds are good, they shall bear fruits. But that is not the way Christianity was built in Portuguese Goa. It was built there by the sword. But what did St. Thomas do down below in Southern India. St. Thomas was one of the greatest apostles of Christ, and he went about to preach Christianity in Travancore-Cochin. The Christians in Travancore-Cochin today have still retained the culture of India, and they have not changed their culture—because Christianity was preached there by the non-violent method. The bones of St. Thomas are still lying for nearly two thousand years in Madras, because St. Thomas was loved and respected. But what happened in Goa? It was St. Francis Xavier who came and spread Christianity there. And this was done some four hundred years ago. About 80 million people came to India to preach Christianity to about 350 millions in India, and to the people in Goa. But there are more Christians and more Catholics in our territory today than there are in Goa. And the Goans together are more intelligent, and intellectual and dashing than even the Portuguese in Portugal. When they

[Shri Joachim Alva]

know to learn all these things, it will be high time for them to revise their attitude.

Sir, time is on our side. We shall win the battle. Whatever differences we have with our friends in the Opposition time is the greatest healer of all wrongs. We shall win the battle. We shall really see that Goa falls in the lap of India like a ripe apple which cannot remain in the tree for long.

श्री पी० एम० राजभोज (शोलापुर रक्षित अनुसूचित जातियां) : सब से पहले मैं गोआ की पालिसी के बारे में बोलना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश के लोगों ने गोआ के सत्याग्रह आन्दोलन में सब से अधिक भाग लिया है। सरकार की गोआ पालिसी के बारे में यहां पर बहुत से सवाल उठाय जा रहे हैं। एक सवाल यह है कि गोआ का प्रश्न सरकार कब तक हल करेगी और वह कौन शुभ दिन होगा जिस दिन भारतीय सरकार गोआ की फ़ासिस्ट सत्ता को उखाड़ फेंकेगी। इस तरह का सवाल पूछना आसान है लेकिन अगर हम जरा गम्भीरता से इस सवाल पर गौर करेंगे तो हमें समझ में आ जायेगा कि किसी भी गवर्नमेंट के लिये इस तरह की मुद्दा रख सकना और यह बता सकना कि अमुक तारीख तक यह चीज हम तय कर देंगे सम्भव नहीं है। कांग्रेस और भारत सरकार ने ठीक ही निश्चय किया है कि हम गोआ का प्रश्न शान्तिपूर्ण ढंग से सुलझाना चाहते हैं, वरना अगर सरकार अपने आदेशों और सिद्धान्तों को तिलांजलि दे दे और उस पर फ़ौजी कार्यवाही कर देती है तो कुछ ही घंटों में हम गोआ पर काबू पाने में कामयाब हो जायेंगे लेकिन ऐसा कर के हम ने जो आज संसार के देशों में एक अपना नाम पैदा किया है और हमारी प्रेस्टिज बढी है, उस सब को हम मिट्टी में मिला देंगे और साथ ही हम ने जो आदर्श व सिद्धान्त

अपनाये हैं, जिन पर अब तक चलते रहे हैं और जिन को अपनाने के लिये कि दूसरे देशों को भी सलाह दे रहे हैं, वह सब खत्म हो जायेंगे और दुनिया के प्रगतिशील राष्ट्रों के सामने हम अपने को लाफ़िंग स्टॉक बना देंगे।

- ✓ एक दूसरी बात जो गोआ के सम्बन्ध में कुछ भाइयों ने कही है वह हमें उचित नहीं जान पड़ती। हमें सुझाव दिया गया है कि भारत सरकार को गोआ को खरीद कर के यह प्रश्न हल कर लेना चाहिये। ऊपर से देखने में यह कल्पना बड़ी अच्छी दिखाई देती है और गोआ की समस्या का हल भी बहुत आसानी से किया जाना सम्भव दीख पड़ता है लेकिन हमें यह खयाल रखना चाहिये कि सार्वभौम अधिकार खरीदा नहीं जाता। यह कोई बेचने और खरीदने की चीज नहीं होती है। इस में तो कोई विवाद नहीं है पुर्तगाली हुकूमत के पास यह सार्वभौम अधिकार नहीं है। सीवरेनिटी जो है वह तो हमारी है, गोवा के निवासियों की सीवरेनिटी है। हम जब बोलेंगे कि हम गोवा खरीदना चाहते हैं तो और भी कोई देश गोआ को खरीदने की कोशिश कर सकते हैं। हमारा सिद्धान्त यह है कि गोआ का भविष्य गोआ की जनता ही तय करेगी। हम जानते हैं कि गोआ की जनता भारत के साथ मिलना चाहती है लेकिन गोआ को खरीदने की बात करना मैं समझता हूँ कि गोआ की जनता का अपमान करना है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने गोआ के सम्बन्ध में जो पालिसी इस देश के लोगों के सामने रखी है, वही पालिसी सही पालिसी है और मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि अगर हम लोगों ने उस के अनुसार अमल किया तो हम अपने मक़सद में कामयाब होंगे और गोआ स्वाधीन हो कर भारत में मिल

जायगा। हमें सब को मिल कर अपने प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ मजबूत करने चाहियें।

एक और प्रश्न की ओर मैं कुछ संक्षेप में निवेदन करना चाहूंगा और वह नेपाल से सम्बन्ध रखता है। यह बड़े दुःख का विषय है कि नेपाल में भारत विरोधी वातावरण बढ़ता जा रहा है। वहां पर गरीब और अनपढ़ जनता को हिन्दुस्तान के विरुद्ध भड़काया जा रहा है। सरकार को उस बात में गाफिल नहीं रहना चाहिये और उस गलत प्रचार को हटाने के लिये वहां पर अपना प्रचार करना चाहिये जिस से जनता के दिलों में से वह गलत भावना निकाली जा सके। यह देश हमारी सरहद पर स्थित है इसलिये हमें इस सम्बन्ध में विशेष सतर्कता बरतनी चाहिये। भारत के शान्ति प्रयत्नों के कारण आज संसार के देशों में भारत का सिर ऊंचा हो रहा है और सारे देशों में भारत की उस के शान्ति प्रयत्नों के लिये सराहना हो रही है। मेरा खयाल है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जो यूरोप और रूस की यात्रा कर के आये हैं उस के बारे में जो फिल्में तैयार की गई हैं वह नेपाल के कोने कोने में दिखाई जानी जरूरी हैं। नेपाल की जनता को तब पता लगेगा कि भारत का ध्येय आक्रमणकारी नहीं है, भारत सब देशों का भला ही चाहता है।

नेपाल में नया नेतृत्व पैदा करने की जरूरत है, ऐसा नेतृत्व जोकि नेपाल की प्रजा का हित अपने सामने रखेगा। नेपाल को हम हर तरह से मदद देना चाहते हैं और देते भी हैं। कोसी भरष योजना भी उन की ही फलप्रद होगी। हमारे सलाहकार वहां बैठे हैं, हमारा मिलिटरी मिशन भी वहां के लोगों को सहायता दे रहा है। फिर भी नेपाल के जो नेता हैं उन में से अधिकतर लोग भारत के खिलाफ ही कार्रवाई कर रहे हैं। मेरी समझ में नेपाल के राज कुटुम्ब के

लोग इस कार्रवाई में सहायता देते हैं। राणाशाही के लोग भारत के विरुद्ध प्रचार करते हैं। राणाशाही का उच्चाटन अभी तक वहां नहीं हुआ है। पुराने जमाने के लोग भारत का विरोध करते हैं और दूसरे राष्ट्र भी इसी लिये उन की सहायता कर रहे हैं और वे सहायता ले रहे हैं। भारत सरकार को उन कार्रवाइयों को बन्द कराने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। नेपाल की सुरक्षा हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा के लिये जरूरी है।

नेपाल के बारे में मेरे तीन सुझाव हैं। एक भारत की तरफकी का प्रचार करना। हमारी जो विकास योजना है, सामूहिक विकास योजना है उन की फिल्में हमें वहां दिखानी चाहियें। दूसरी बात यह है कि नेपाल का इतिहास, नेपाल की संस्कृति वगैरह के अध्ययन से नेपाल के लोगों की मनोवृत्ति का हमें अच्छी तरह से पता लगेगा। तीसरी बात यह है कि हमारे जो विख्यात कवि और लेखक हैं उन को नेपाल में जाना चाहिये। नेपाल की भाषा और हिन्दी भाषा में कैसा सम्बन्ध है, हमारा और नेपाल का सांस्कृतिक जीवन कैसा है इस बात का ज्ञान यह कवि लोग नेपाल की जनता को करा सकेंगे।

अन्त में मैं एक प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूं। जो हमारी नीति है वह सभी के लिये अच्छी है और उसी नीति को हम सब को अपनाना चाहिये और उस के मुताबिक हमें प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। इसी से हमारे देश का भला होगा और इसी नीति को अपना कर हम आगे बढ़ सकेंगे। इसलिये जो गोष्ठा के बारे में कहा गया है कि सत्याग्रह को समाप्त कर दिया जाय मैं उस को उचित समझता हूं। मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूं कि मैं बम्बई में १६ तारीख को कार में बैठ कर जा रहा था। उस वक्त मेरी मोटर के पहियों की हवा लोगों ने निकाल डाली। मेरे पास एक सड़क की टोपी थी वह टोपी

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

भी उतार ली गई। इस से मुझे बहुत दुःख हुआ कि जैसा व्यवहार किया गया है वह उचित नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सत्याग्रह को चला कर हमारे देश का अहित ही हो रहा है। इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि सत्याग्रह को बन्द कर दिया जाय और जब वक्त प्रायेगा मैं आप को यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि मैं पहला शस्त्र हूँगा जोकि मरने के लिये जाऊंगा। मैं दूसरों से भी प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वे भी इस वक्त इसे बन्द कर दें और कांग्रेस के जो आदेश हैं उन के मुताबिक वे प्रमल करें। साथ ही मैं बम्बई के जो चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब हैं श्री मुरार जी देसाई उन की भी तारीफ करता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत साहस से काम किया है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के सारे सूबों में उन जैसे चीफ मिनिस्टर होने चाहियें।

श्रीमती कमलेन्दुमती शाह (जिला गढ़वाल—पश्चिम व जिला टिहरी गढ़वाल व जिला बिजनौर—उत्तर) : मैं शहीदों के लिये श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करती हूँ। गोष्ठा सत्याग्रह के सम्बन्ध में सरकार की नीति स्पष्ट हो गई, यदि हम इस निश्चय पर ४ सितम्बर के बदले, ४ अगस्त को ही पहुंच जाते तो १५ अगस्त की खूनखराबी न होती, परन्तु जब भारत के अन्दर ही निहत्थे विद्यार्थियों के हत्याकांड जैसी घटनायें भी जब हो कर ही रहती हैं तो फिर क्या कहा जा सकता है।

अब आगे गोष्ठावासियों को पुर्तगाली शासन से मुक्त कराने का सरकार का क्या रवैया होगा यह प्रश्न सब के मन में उठना स्वाभाविक ही है। अतः सरकार की नीति गोपनीय होते हुए भी जनसाधारण के मन की अधीरता कम करने के लिये, उस के बारे में सरकार को कुछ संकेत तो देना ही चाहिये।

मैं सुनती हूँ कि मद्यनिषेध इत्यादि कई असुविधाओं में बंधने के डर से गोष्ठावासी भारत में बिलीन होना नहीं चाहते। अतः जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री कह भी चुके हैं, भारत सरकार भी उन्हें उन की इच्छा के विरुद्ध चलने को बाध्य नहीं करेगी। भारतवासियों ने गोष्ठावासियों को विदेशी शासन से मुक्त कराने के लिये सत्याग्रह किया न कि उन्हें बंधन में डालने के लिये। गोष्ठा पर अधिकार जमाने से पहले तो हमें लाहौर लेना चाहिये जोकि आदिकाल से हमारा था और जिसे हमारे हाथ से गये इतना थोड़ा समय हुआ है।

पाकिस्तान की उलझन बढ़ती ही जा रही है। विस्थापितों की सम्पत्ति के बारे में भी हमारी कोई नहीं सुनता। विभाजन एक वह भूल हुई है जिस का फल हमें न जाने कब तक भोगना होगा। हमारी स्वतंत्रता संघर्ष की जीत में एक वह हार है जो गोष्ठा जैसे प्रश्नों के समय अपना परिणाम दिखाती है। भारत और काश्मीर की जनता अब काश्मीर समझौते पर आशयें लगाये हुए है। प्रश्न यह है कि हमें क्या क्या देना पड़ेगा और क्या हमारे पास रह जायेगा। हमारी शान्ति स्थापना की नीति ने हमें यशस्वी बनाया है। क्या हमारे पास केवल यश ही रह जायेगा ?

चीन और तिब्बत के साथ जो संधि की गई है वह सह-अस्तित्व के आधार पर ही की गई है। आशा है नेपाल, बर्मा इत्यादि पड़ोसी देशों पर इस संधि का अनुकूल प्रभाव पड़ेगा और तिब्बत भारत के बीच के व्यापार की सुविधाओं में कोई कमी न आ कर वे पूर्ववत् रहेंगी।

युद्ध की तैयारी का तो हमारे देश में कोई प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता, हमें न तो किसी पर आक्रमण ही करना है और न किसी के

विनाश हेतु विदेशी अस्त्र ही लेने हैं। जो हमारे पास हैं या हम बना सकते हैं वही हमारे लिये पर्याप्त होने चाहियें।

इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह भी कहना है कि हमारी विदेशों से ऋण लेने की नीति भी हमारे लिये अहितकर है। ऋण ले कर उन्नति करने के बदले बिना ऋण के उस उन्नति में कुछ विलम्ब हो जाना श्रेयस्कर होगा।

विदेशों से आने वाले माल पर भी हमें जरा विचार करना चाहिये। भारत का ४० हजार मन घी जैसी वस्तुओं का विदेशों से आयात भी अनुचित है। इस विषय में भी ३-४ वर्ष पहले की नीति बरती जानी चाहिये थी। जब भारत ने अमरीका से गेहूँ का आदान अस्वीकार कर लिया था। हमें विदेशों से उतना ही लेना चाहिये जितना हम उन को उस के बदले में निर्यात कर सकें नहीं तो इस प्रकार के उपहार और ऋण हमें मानसिक और आर्थिक दृष्टि से स्वावलम्बी न बना कर, निर्बल ही बनायेंगे।

[MR. SPEAKER: *in the Chair.*]

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North): We have heard about the Goa policy as well as the policy regarding the external affairs of our country. Many feelings have been expressed on the floor of the House and some of the hon. Members were found in terrific fits of emotions. One of them, unfortunately, passed very undesirable comments against the administration of the Bombay State and against the Chief Minister of Bombay and his Goa Policy. I humbly submit that it was very unfair. When we discuss the Goa issue, it cannot be, according to my humble opinion, isolated from other international problems. Our Government has been very consistently following its international policy during the last few years and, I believe, even before the advent of

independence, our Prime Minister was in charge of External Affairs in the Congress Party.

Our policy has been consistent. He stands for world peace, international stability. If we think in terms of the international tension arising out of any war, during the last three or four years, at least since the beginning of the Korean War, even the worst enemies of India will give our Prime Minister the credit of helping to lessen the present world tension. It is a matter of credit for all of us in this House that during last year, mainly due to his efforts we have brought about Korean Armistice, armistice in Indo-China war. Our Prime Minister has as well succeeded in bringing about a sort of talk for settling the Formosa issue. All these three issues had threatened world peace—if not world peace, at least peace in the East. Therefore, it is to his great credit that he has developed a particular international policy which has helped to bring about world peace. The great forces of the world are conflicting against each other even on ideological basis. And I am proud to say that because of his intervention all these conflicting forces have begun to come together and they are contacting each other and trying to solve international issues and international disputes by peaceful means of negotiation. Therefore, I humbly submit that our foreign policy, in the larger context, is mainly for establishing international stability and international peace. I may add that as a result of this policy, we have got several visitors, eminent international statesmen, to this capital and to our country—the Chinese Prime Minister Chou En-lai, the Yugoslavian President Tito, the Egyptian Prime Minister, the Indonesian President and several other eminent persons—and our Prime Minister also paid back return visits. That brought about a good situation for discussing world peace. Therefore, I humbly believe that our policy is based on sound foundation, on a foundation which is unshakable, and as a result of this policy,

[Shri Kanavade Patil]

recently in the month of March 1955 we had the Bandung Conference. Bandung Conference has its special features and it was a tremendous success for the people of Asia. It also points out the culmination of colonial warfare against the imperialist powers of the West. At the Bandung Conference about 29 Afro-Asian nations came together and had common discussions about international affairs and internal disputes amongst themselves.

5 P.M.

After Bandung, this process of holding conferences began, and our Prime Minister today has rightly pointed out that there was a conference of the Big Four States in Europe, which was held in the month of July last at Geneva. That conference was attended by the heads of the Big Four States, and the results of that conference, comments show everywhere, were received with profound satisfaction by whole of the world. It has helped to relax tension in the international situation. I may add that this country has desired that such a conference should take place, and our Prime Minister gave his contribution in helping such a conference to be held. Therefore, I humbly submit that our foreign policy is on the whole entirely a success. It is unique and absolutely wise. It does not admit of diplomatic secrecy in the Western term 'foreign policy'. It is in itself an independent policy, which has been chalked out and gradually developed by our Prime Minister during the last so many years, and it is absolutely consistent with the principles and lofty ideals of universal peace, truth and *ahimsa*.

Lastly, I feel that one of the greatest contributions that our Prime Minister has made is in bringing about permanent friendship between the peoples of China and India. He has stated in one of his recent speeches;

"We have, therefore, always thought it of the highest importance that India and China should

understand each other, should as far as possible, co-operate with each other. We are neighbours with 2,000 miles of common frontier and we are progressive nations....

"we are bound to come in touch with each other in many questions. It is our desire and, I believe it is the desire of the Chinese Government, that our contact should be friendly, that we should co-operate in as large a measure as possible."

China and India are the two biggest countries in the East, and we have nearly half the population of the world. It is indeed to the great credit of our Prime Minister that these two ancient peoples have come together now, I believe, on a permanent basis of friendship and cordiality. This in itself is a great contribution to international peace. When Chou En-lai visited this country, our Prime Minister and he chalked out the Panch Shila document, which has been gaining increasing appreciation in all quarters of the world.

That has been the basic thing for bringing about international disputes within the four corners of negotiation, mutual agreement and contacts between the various contending parties. Therefore, I think we have a very right foreign policy and I believe this is all due to the untiring efforts of our Prime Minister. It is a matter of great satisfaction to this country that these five principles have now been accepted by other peoples also as the basic foundations for settling their affairs. I believe that our Prime Minister has a mission to the world and that mission is a mission of peace and therefore in this context we must look at our Goa policy.

There is a demand in the country in certain quarters that our policy should be more dynamic. I do not

want to go into those details regarding the Goa policy. However, I would say that our policy can be justified in the light of the larger issues that we have been debating here since this morning. India cannot preach the virtues of peace to the world and at the same time resort to violent action or military action against Portuguese in Goa. We are all sympathetic towards satyagrahis who have been shot down. I am sure their names will go down in history as patriots of a high order who died while taking part in the satyagraha in Goa. But there are so many reasons as to why the Government of India has adopted the present Goa policy. I do not want to take the time of the House. I thank you very much and I whole-heartedly support the foreign policy and our Goa policy.

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : इस बहस के शुरू में मैं ने कुछ

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He has spoken something. We also want to know the answer. Unfortunately we could not follow.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: No English.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: That is not the reason. We want to understand.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If it is your pleasure, at the end I can say a little in English too.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: That may be so. You must speak in Hindi.

*श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : इस बहस के शुरू में मैं ने दुनिया की तरफ, दुनिया के सवालों की तरफ, कुछ ध्यान दिलाया था और यह भी बताया था कि उस में हमारा क्या हिस्सा रहा है और है, क्योंकि मैं चाहता था कि हमारे सामने पूरा नक्शा रहे। हम एक जिम्मेदार संस्था हैं—एक जिम्मेदार जमायत हैं और इसलिये जरा तराजू बराबर आंखों के सामने रहनी चाहिये। अगर कोई एक सवाल—वह कितना ही जरूरी और आवश्यक क्यों न हो—ही हमारे सामने

रहे और हम उसी में फंस जाते हैं और औरों को भूल जाते हैं, तो तराजू एक तरफ झुक जाता है और वह कदम सही भी हों, तो और गलत पड़ जाते हैं। इसलिये यह जरूरी था। लेकिन एक और बात मैं आप से भर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। आप सब, यहां के मेम्बरान, जो कुछ यहां कहते हैं, हम सब उस को बगौर सुनते हैं, लेकिन उन की भावाञ्ज इस कमरे के बाहर भी जाती है और बाहर दुनिया में भी गूँजती है। इसलिये वे इस बात को देखें कि अगर हम सब दुनिया को—दुनिया के सब सवालों को—भूल गये और एक परेशानी में लिपट गये, तो गालिबान दुनिया की निगाहों में उस का माकूल असर नहीं होगा लेकिन इस के मानी यह नहीं है कि जिस सवाल पर हम ज्यादा गौर करें वह जरूरी नहीं है—वह तो है ही। बहर-सूरत आज की बहस ज्यादातर गोष्ठा के मसले पर हुई। कुछ में भी इस के बारे में भर्ज करूंगा। भर्कर जब यहां विदेशी नीति पर बातचीत हुई है, कुछ बरस हुए, और मैं ने अपनी गवर्नमेंट की जो नीति भी पेश की, तो पहले उस पर कुछ ऐतराज होता था। दो तरह के ऐतराज होते थे, या दो से ज्यादा, उन मेम्बरान के जो इस मेज के उस पार बैठते हैं। ऐतराज होता था कि यह क्या एक बीच की नीति है, न इधर न उधर कुछ तो हमें कहते थे कि कमर कस के, तलवार बांध के, हम एक गिरोह में खड़े हो जायें और दूसरे गिरोह का मुकाबला करें, दूसरे कहते थे कि हम कमर कस कर और तलवार बांध कर दूसरी तरफ खड़े हो जायें, यह बीच की क्या नीति है। यह तो बुजदिली की बात है, यह तो निकम्मी बात है। गजेंकि इस तरह की टीका टिप्पणी उस तरफ के चन्द साहिबान बराबर करते थे। मैं यहां बैठा हुआ सोच रहा था कि

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

आज उस किस्म की आवाज कोई उठी नहीं, बल्कि जो कुछ जिक्र हुआ हमारी बुनिया की नीति का, वह तारीफ ही का हुआ। मैं सोचता था कि शायद आज का जोशो खरोश जो गोष्ठा के बारे में है वह भी खरा ठंडे दिल से सोचने पर कुछ दिन बाद ठंडा हो जायगा और लोग महसूस करेंगे कि यही रास्ता था और यह मुनासिब फैसला हुआ। यह कैसे कहूँ कि जो बात हम करते हैं वह हमेशा सही होती है। जाहिर है गलती हो सकती है, हुई है। मेरा ख्याल है कि जो इस समय हम ने गोष्ठा के बारे में फैसला किया वह ठीक था और आवश्यक था। इस में तरह तरह के पेच उठते हैं, जैसे कुछ तो राजनीति के पेच, और कुछ राजनीति से अलग निकल जाते हैं जब आप सत्याग्रह की चर्चा करते हैं।

✓ अब जहाँ तक सत्याग्रह का सवाल है, गवर्नमेंट का उस में बहसियत गवर्नमेंट के पड़ना कठिन है। आप गौर करें, गवर्नमेंट का सत्याग्रह करना एक बिल्कुल बेमानी चीज है। सत्याग्रह के मानी हैं कि एक आदमी अपनी हिम्मत से पहाड़ का मुकाबला करे, एक हुकूमत का मुकाबला करे, एक ताकत का मुकाबला करे। लेकिन जब गवर्नमेंट खुद एक ताकत है तो यह कैसे हो सकता है कि वह एक आदमी को भेज दे या दस आदमियों को भेज दे और कहे कि तुम मुकाबला करो, और खुद पीछे बैठ कर उस को देखे। यह बात मेरे दिमाग में नहीं आती। यह और बात है कि कोई संस्था करे या कोई व्यक्तिगत रूप से सत्याग्रह करे। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट सत्याग्रह वहीं कर सकती यह मैं आप से बहुत अदब से कहूँगा, जैसाकि मैं ने शुरू में कहा।

बाज साहिबान ने कहा कि हम उस से डर गये और इसलिये अलग हो गये। इस

की निस्वत मैं आप से कुछ अर्ज करूँगा। लेकिन इस बहस के दौरान मैं और बातें कही गईं, किस्से कहानियों का जिक्र हुआ, जिन का इस से कुछ भी सम्बन्ध नहीं था, लेकिन जिन से यकीनन सुनने या पढ़ने वालों के दिमाग पर कुछ असर हो सकता है, कुछ गलतफहमी हो सकती है। तो मैं इस पेच में पड़ गया कि मैं किस्से कहानियों में पड़ूँ या असली मसले पर कुछ कहूँ। लेकिन कुछ न कुछ मुझे कहना ही चाहिये ताकि गलत-फहमी न रहे।

✓ एक तो श्री अशोक मेहता ने और औरों ने भी इस बात का जिक्र किया कि हमारी नीति एक राष्ट्रीय नीति होनी चाहिये, एक नैशनल पालिसी होनी चाहिये। इस के मानी क्या हैं यह आप सोचें। यह तो मैं मानता हूँ कि जहाँ तक हो सके बाहरी मामलों में हमारी नीति एक हो। लेकिन सवाल है कि हम एक नीति कैसे बनावें। मुझे यह स्वीकार है कि हम सलाह मशविरा करें। यह मैं ने पहले भी कहा था। कभी कभी किया भी, कम हुआ, ज्यादा हो सकता है। लेकिन एक नीति कैसे हो जबकि उस नीति की जो बुनियाद है उसी में मुखालिफत हो। तो यह सवाल जो एक नीति का उठता है यह कैसे उठ सकता है। इस तरह का सवाल अमरीका में उठता है जहाँ कि दो बड़े दल हैं जिन में बुनियादी तौर से बहुत ज्यादा फर्क नहीं है। तो वहाँ कमोबेश एक नीति हो जाती है, और वहाँ का विधान भी ऐसा है कि अगर एक नीति न हो तो दिक्कत होती है। इंग्लैंड में उतना ज्यादा अमल इस पर नहीं हुआ। कभी कभी होने की कोशिश की गई। लेकिन बहर सूरत मुझे स्वीकार है। जहाँ तक मैं उस के मानी समझता हूँ वे यह हैं कि हमें कोई भी विदेश-नीति अपनी पार्टी के लाभ के लिये नहीं

चलानी चाहिये, हमें उस में देश का लाभ^५ सोचना चाहिये और उस में जहां तक मुमकिन हो सब पाटियों को साथ ले कर चलना चाहिये । अगर यह मुमकिन हो सके तो बहुत अच्छा है । लेकिन गवर्नमेंट की अपनी जिम्मेदारी होती है और वह अपनी उस जिम्मेदारी को छोड़ नहीं सकती, और कोई नीति ऐसी नहीं हो सकती कि चार आने इधर से लिये और चार आने उधर से लिये और एक चौखूटी या चारपाई की तरह की नीति बना ली । इस तरह की नीति नहीं हो सकती, वह एक चीज होनी चाहिये जिस के टुकड़े एक दूसरे में मिलते रहें^५ । मैं मानता हूँ कि सलाह मशविरा से अक्सर^५ रोशनी पड़ती है । मैं तो बहुत खुशी से सलाह मशविरा करूँ, लेकिन इस गोआ के मामले में कुछ खास वाक्यात हुए नहीं तो और भी सलाह की जाती । कुछ आखिरी चन्द दिनों में वाक्यात तेजी से चलने लगे^५ ।

श्री चटर्जी ने शायद बयान किया कि^५ किस तरह से मैं ने एक वक्त में एक बात कही, और दूसरे वक्त में दूसरी, और फिर मेरे पैर ठंडे हो गये और दिल बैठने लगा और इसलिये मैं दूसरी तरफ देखने लगा । वाक्यात यह है कि इस हाल में बहुत^५ कम लोग ऐसे होंगे, शायद दो एक हों, मुझे मालूम नहीं, जिन का पिछले दो तीन बरस में गोआ के मामले से इतना सम्बन्ध रहा हो जितना कि मेरा । बाज साहिबान जोकि इस वक्त जोशो खरोश दिखाते हैं वह महीने, दो महीने, तीन महीने से इस मामले में दिलचस्पी लेने लगे हैं ।

टंडन जी ने कहा, औरों ने भी कहा, कि अब इस फैसले से गवर्नमेंट ने इस की जिम्मेदारी ले ली है । यह बात सही भी है और सही नहीं भी है । सही इस मानी में है कि गवर्नमेंट ने जिम्मेदारी ली है, और सही नहीं है इस मानी में कि यह

पहले भी गवर्नमेंट की जिम्मेदारी थी । यह कोई नई जिम्मेदारी तो नहीं है । क्या कभी गवर्नमेंट यह कह सकती थी कि चूंकि वहां किसी समिति ने या कमेटी ने जिम्मेदारी ले ली है इसलिये हम उस जिम्मेदारी से बरी हो गये । हमेशा इस मामले में गवर्नमेंट की पूरी जिम्मेदारी थी । चुनावे पिछले कम से कम दो बरस में शायद ही कोई दो चार दिन गये हों जबकि हम ने अपने साथियों से गोआ के मामले में सलाह मशविरा न किया हो, या उन लोगों से जिन का सम्बन्ध इस मामले से था । बम्बई सरकार का तो इस से सम्बन्ध था ही, और भी गोआ के लोगों की कमेटियों वगैरह का जिन का इस से ताल्लुक था उन से भी हमारा सम्बन्ध रहा । उन से हम ने सलाह मशविरा भी किये । हम उन से साफ कह देते थे कि बाज बातें हम नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट ऐसी बातें नहीं कर सकती, बाज बातें जोकि हम कर सकते हैं हम करेंगे । यज्जेकि हमारा उन लोगों से करीब करीब बराबर ताल्लुक रहा । और मैं यह तो नहीं कह सकता कि उन्होंने ने हमारी हर एक बात मानी, लेकिन इतना कह सकता हूँ कि उन्होंने ने हमारी अक्सर बातें मानीं ।

फिर यह सिलसिला पिछले अगस्त से जरा पहले कुछ बदलने सा लगा । शायद तीन महीन हुए डा० लंकासुन्दरम् मेरे पास आये थे और उन्होंने ने मुझे से कहा था वे कन्वेन्शन्स करने वाले हैं, यहां पर, बम्बई में, मद्रास में, कलकत्ते में । इस बारे में उन्होंने मेरी राय पूछी और यह पूछा कि क्या इन में कांग्रेस वाले शरीक हो सकते थे या नहीं । मैं ने उन से कहा था कि जहां तक मेरा ताल्लुक है मुझे इस में कोई गलत बात नहीं मालूम होती, लेकिन मैं मशविरा कर के बतला दूंगा और मैं ने मशविरा कर के उन से कहला दिया कि हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है अगर कोई ब्यक्तिगत रूप से इन कन्वेन्शन्स

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

में शामिल हो। चुनावे कुछ लोग उन में शरीक हुए। और वे कन्वेंशन भ्रम भ्रम शहरों में धूमधाम से हुए।

✓ फिर एक दफा डा० लंकानुन्दरम् ने मुझ से पूछा। सवाल यह था कि क्या कुछ पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर भी इस सत्याग्रह में शरीक हों, और क्या कांग्रेस वालों को उस में शरीक होने की इजाजत मिलेगी। इस पर मैं ने कहा कि मामला पेचीदा है, मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता, कांग्रेस के प्रेसीडेंट इस का जवाब दें। और फिर बाद में कांग्रेस के प्रेसीडेंट ने कहा था, चूंकि उन से पूछा गया था कि जो सत्याग्रह करना चाहते हैं वह कर सकते हैं, उन को रोका नहीं जायगा, यहां तक बात पहुंची थी। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस के भलावा और क्या बात थी जो / चटर्जी समझ गये थे।

एक बात श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी ने कही थी या किस ने कही थी, मैं समझता हूं कि शायद श्री अशोक मेहता ने कहा था कि मेरी नीति यहां दिल्ली में एक थी गोष्ठी के बारे में और बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री श्री मुरार जी देसाई की नीति दूसरी थी और उस में खैचातानी होती थी। मैं बिलकुल सफाई से इस बात को कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बुनियादी तौर से बिलकुल गलत खयाल है। और कम से कम सौ मर्तबा उन से इस बारे में मशविरा हुआ होगा, मिल कर या जत के जरिये या टेलीफोन के जरिये और चर्चा भर भी फ्रॉक उन की राय और मेरी राय में इस पिछले साल या डेढ़ साल में नहीं रहा।

✓ एक और दूसरी बात मैं यहां पर साफ़ कर दूं। मैं ने पहले भी कहा था, लेकिन लोग शायद उसे समझे नहीं। यहां पर यह इशारा किया गया है कि मेरे ऊपर इस फ़ैसले के करने

में कोई दबाव पड़ा, मैं अर्ज करता हूं कि दबाव तो बहुत दूर है, किसी मुल्क ने या किसी शास्त्र ने किसी मुल्क की तरफ से इशारे से भी दबाव नहीं डाला, सीधे तौर पर तो छोड़ दीजिये, इशारे से या किसी और तरह से दबाव या और किसी क्रिस्म की बात नहीं हुई। भ्रमभार वाले जो लिखते हैं, उसे भ्राप भी पढ़ते हैं और हम भी पढ़ते हैं और भ्रमर भ्रमरों के लिखने के ऊपर कोई बड़ काम हों, तो शायद दुनिया चौपट हो जाय।

श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी ने अपनी स्पीच में कुछ सुलहनामों और ट्रीटीज का जिक्र किया और कुछ उस का जिक्र किया जो सर स्टैफ़ोर्ड क्रिप्स जब भारत में आये थे और जो उन्होंने ने एक प्रेस कान्फ़ेन्स में कहा था, मुझे बिलकुल नहीं मालूम कि उन्होंने ने क्या कहा था और आसानी से मैं उसे देख नहीं सकता। मैं यह साफ़ कर दूं कि मुझे किसी क्रिस्म की ट्रीटी का इल्म नहीं है जो हमारे रास्ते में आती हो। मैं ने पहले भी इसे सफ़ाई से कहा था कि हम किसी ट्रीटी के पाबन्द नहीं हैं और और मुल्क जो ट्रीटी करें, हम उस के पाबन्द नहीं हैं, वह चीज हमारे सामने बिलकुल नहीं आती है।

एक और बात पर जोर दिया गया कि यहां कैनाडा के प्रधान मंत्री श्री लुईस सेंट लारेंट आये थे और यहां पर उन से गोष्ठी और नाटो के बारे में कुछ सवाल किये गये और यहां पर उन्होंने ने जो गोष्ठी और नाटो के बारे में कहा था, वहां जा कर उन्होंने ने उस से इंकार किया। यह बात बिलकुल गलत है कि उन्होंने ने उस से इंकार किया। मैं चाहता हूं कि सब लोग बहुत सफ़ाई से उस को समझ लें और मैं इस को अच्छा नहीं समझता कि इस तरह की बात एक ऐसे बुजुर्ग आदमी के लिये कही जाय, खाली बुजुर्ग

ही नहीं बल्कि एक ऐसा शस्त्र जिस की कि सच्चाई की मैं कम से कम दिल से भादर करता हूँ और उन की तरफ से जो शुभ कामनायें हिन्दुस्तान के लिये भेजी जाती हैं और उन के जो विचार हमारे देश के निस्वत हैं और उन से बार बार हमें यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में हमारे कामों में हर समय मदद मिली है, ऐसे शस्त्र के लिये यह कहना और समझना कि जो बातें वे यहाँ कह गये हैं, यहाँ से जा कर वह उन से मुकर जायेंगे या इंकार कर जायेंगे, सही नहीं है और मुनासिब नहीं है और ऐसा कहना उन के साथ नाइंसाफी करना होगा। यहाँ प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस में कुछ सवाल किये गये जिन के कि उन्होंने ने जवाब दिये और वहाँ जाने पर जो कुछ उन्होंने ने कहा, उस में बहुत फर्क नहीं था, खाली कुछ ज्यादा प्रीसाइस्वी उन्होंने ने बताया कि नाटो क्या चीज है। इसी सिलसिले में श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी ने एक सवाल किया था और अक्सर यह सवाल आता है कि हमारे यहाँ से मलाया में अंग्रेजों के लिये फ़ौजी सामान भेजा जाया करता है या हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से जाने बेटे हैं, इस का भी जवाब बार बार दिया जा चुका है कि फ़ौजी सामान यहाँ से नहीं जाता है, लेकिन कोई भी मुल्क हो, हर एक के साथ समझौत होते हैं और मुलहनामे होते हैं और उन के जहाज हमारे मुल्क में चलते हैं और हमारे जहाज उन के मुल्क में जाते हैं, इस तरह का समझौता मुल्कों में आपस में होता है। गोकि हमारे जहाज इतने ज्यादा नहीं हैं लेकिन तो भी काफ़ी तौर पर हमारे जहाज यूरोप के मुल्कों में हर महीने जाते हैं, चाहे वह हमारे सिविल के हों या एयर फ़ोर्स के हों, वह तो म्यूचुअल एग््रीमेंट रहता है कि वह एक दूसरे के देश में आ जा सकें लेकिन उस के साथ शर्त यह रहती है कि उस में हम फ़ौजी सामान न भेजें और फ़ौजी सामान नहीं भेजते हैं।

हां यह जरूर है कि उन में छुट्टी पर जाने वाले लोग भेजे जाते हैं या जो एक जगह से दूसरी जगह बदली पर जाते हैं, उन के कुछ लोग, उन के सिपाही इधर उधर जिन को भाना जाना होता है और उन के खानदान आते जाते हैं, लेकिन वे फ़ौजी हैसियत से नहीं जाते, तो ऐसे लोग आते जाते हैं लेकिन फ़ौजी सामान नहीं जाता और न फ़ौजी वर्दी में लोग जाते हैं, तो यह बात होती है। चूकि उन्होंने ने मलाया का जिक्र किया है इसलिये मैं श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी और उन के साथियों को इतना याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले चन्द महीनों से मलाया में कुछ नई बातें हुई हैं। मलाया में और सिंगापुर दोनों में चुनाव हुए हैं और वहाँ की चुनी हुई लोगों की हुकूमतें वहाँ पर काम कर रही हैं, यह मैं ने माना कि उन हुकूमतों की पूरा अधिकार नहीं है और वह सोलह महीने आजाद नहीं लेकिन मुझे इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि साल दो बर्ष में बहुत जल्दी पूरी तौर पर आजाद हो जायेंगी। बहरसूरत बहुत कुछ अधिकार उन के हाथ में हैं, और मैं समझता हूँ कि हलके हलके एक पुरानी शिकायत और जो शिकायत वहाँ पर अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद के फैलने की थी, वह भी मुझे आशा है हट जायगी।

एक और बात कही गई थी कि आखिरी वक्त में बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री ने बेलगांव में ट्रान्सपोर्ट रोक दिया या नहीं दिया। इस के लिये सफ़ाई से यह बात कही जा चुकी है कि बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री श्री को उस का पता भी नहीं था और न किसी और को था। एक मामूली क़ायदा है कि जो कि बसेज जाती थीं, वह मुसाफ़िरो की नहीं थीं। अब पुलिस का क़ायदा है उस की तो उसे पाबन्दी करनी है। वैसे मैं आप को बतलाऊँ कि पहले जब एक, दो, या तीन

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

आदमी इस तरह से पहले सत्याग्रह करने जाते थे तो उन में बैठ कर चले गये लेकिन जब एक साथ सैकड़ों आये, सत्याग्रहियों के काफिले आये और उन्होंने ने जाद्वे से उन में जान के लिये जगह मांगी तब पुलिस ने अपने बड़े अफसरों से पूछा कि क्या करना चाहिये और पुलिस के अफसरान की हिदायत के मुताबिक मुकामी पुलिस ने भ्रमल किया। पहले तो जब यह लोग १ या २ आते थे तो झाड़वर उनको बैठा लेते थे, लेकिन यह तो सैकड़ों इकट्ठा आये थे और इसलिये ग्रह सवाल पैदा हुआ कि जो क्रायदा बनाया हुआ है उसे हम कैसे तोड़ें। इसके लिये कोई नया क्रायदा या कानून नहीं बनाया गया और गवर्नमेंट ने कोई नया हुकम नहीं निकाला और वगैर गवर्नमेंट को मालूम हुये वहाँ के पुलिस हैड-क्वार्टर ने मुकामी पुलिस को अहकाम जारी किये कि यह क्रायदा है और इसकी पाबन्दी की जानी चाहिये, और चुनावे वह चीज की गई। अब आप गौर फरमायें कि अगर बम्बई की गवर्नमेंट उस क्रायदे को हटा देती और उन को जाने देती तो उसके मानी यह होते कि बम्बई की गवर्नमेंट सत्याग्रह करवा रही है, और कोई दूसरे मानी नहीं होते। अब यह सवाल नहीं है कि सत्याग्रह अच्छा है या बुरा है, लेकिन यह एक बेमानी बात है कि बम्बई की गवर्नमेंट या भारत की सरकार वहाँ जाकर लोगों को सत्याग्रह करा रही है। अरे साहब, गवर्नमेंट क्या बेवकूफ हो गई है कि लोगों को पकड़ पकड़ कर वहाँ भेजकर उनसे सत्याग्रह करवाये, तो यह तो एक अजीब तमाशा हो जाता है अगर वह ऐसा करती है। यह गौर करने की बात है। अब जितनी बहस हुई, उस में आप गौर करें तो पायेंगे कि बाज साहबों ने बहुत साफ़ साफ़ कहा कि पुलिस ऐक्शन या फ़ौजी कार्यवाही होनी चाहिये थी या होनी चाहिये, बाज

साहबों ने कहा कि हम यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि फ़ौजी कार्यवाही हो लेकिन अगर जरूरत हो तो वह हो। अब बात तो यह है कि अक्सर लोग जो सत्याग्रह का नाम इस वक्त ले रहे हैं, मुझे माफ़ करेंगे अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि उन्होंने ने सत्याग्रह के बहुत माने शायद नहीं समझे हैं कि सत्याग्रह क्या चीज है। यह दो चीजें साथ साथ नहीं चलती। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि किसी मामूली ढंग से हिन्दुस्तान को फ़ौजी कार्यवाही करने का अधिकार नहीं है। मैं कोई पैसिमिस्ट नहीं हूँ और मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हिंसा हमेशा हमेशा के लिये हटा दी जाय। महात्मा जी तक ने कहा था कि हिंसा करना कायरता, वुज्रदिली और गुलामी की अपेक्षा अच्छा है। वह तो एक मुक़ाबला हो जाता है कि कौन ज्यादा बदतर है लेकिन इस मौके पर सवाल यह है कि बलिहाज हमारी सारी नीति के बलिहाज हमारी नीति के हिन्दुस्तान में और बाहर क्या उचित है और क्या मनासिब है और किस से लाभ होगा।

अब शुरू से ही हम ने एक नीति रखी है, हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर और बाहर, कि शांति से मसले हल करने चाहियें। अगर हम उस नीति के खिलाफ़ खुद चले जायें तो इलावा इस के कि हम एन झूठे करार दे दिय जायें दुनिया के सामने और लोग कहें जैसेकि बहुत से लोगों ने पहले कहा भी है, अब तो वे चुप हो गये हैं, कि हम चालबाज हैं, हम धोखबाज हैं, हम एक बात कहते हैं और दूसरी बात करते हैं, और क्या हो सकता है। अगर यह बात साबित हो जाये कि हमारे कोई उसूल नहीं और हमारे कोई सिद्धान्त नहीं है, जिस बात में हम उस वक्त फायदा देखते हैं वही करते हैं तो इस का क्या नतीजा निकलेगा। हमारी जो हैसियत इस वक्त

दुनिया में ऊंची है, वह इसलिये है कि हमारे लफ्फों में वजन है, हम जो कहते हैं और जो हमारे उसूल हैं उन की कद्र की जाती है। अब आप कहें कि हम एक दम से आप के कहने पर उस पालिसी से फिर जायें और दुनिया को यह कहने का मौका दें कि यह धोखे बाज है, जिस बात में फायदा होता है वही कर लेते हैं, करने को तो लम्बी लम्बी बातें करते हैं और जब उन को भ्रमल में लाते हैं तो जिधर फायदा होता है उधर ही चल पड़ते हैं और वक्त आने पर जमीन पर बैठ जाते हैं, और इस का क्या नतीजा निकल सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह बात साफ हो जानी चाहिये कि हम क्या करेंगे, किस रास्ते पर हम चलेंगे, चाहे वह रास्ता अच्छा ही या बुरा, लेकिन हम को उस रास्ते पर चलना ही होगा और यह एक बुनियादी बात है जिस को हर एक को साफ तौर से समझ लेना चाहिये क्योंकि हम कहें कुछ और करें कुछ और, यह दोनों बातें आपस में मिलती नहीं हैं।

एक बात हमारे भाई देशपांडे जी ने इधर से कही कि अक्सर लोग, मैं बुराई नहीं कर रहा हूँ, जो सत्याग्रह करने गये उन का यह बिचार था या उन से यह कहा गया था कि उन के पीछे हिन्दुस्तान की फौज आयेगी, तो आप देखें जब ऐसी बात होती है तो सत्याग्रह का सिलसिला ही बदल जाता है। सत्याग्रह क्या है? यह एक मुकाबला है, एक इन्सान की आत्मा की कुव्वत का एक बड़ी ताकत के खिलाफ, वह न सिर्फ दुश्मन को भगाता है और या इस बात के लिये भी तैयार रहता है कि उस का सिर कट जाय, जो कुछ भी हो, यह एक ऐसी चीज है जिसका असर बहुत जबर्दस्त होता है। यह उस के सिद्धान्त का असर होता है कि लोगों का दिल बढ़ता

है, दुश्मन का दिल ठंडा होता है। खैर जो भी हो, जब लोग यह जानते हैं कि उन के पीछे फौजें आ रही हैं तो सारा नक्शा ही बदल जाता है, वह सत्याग्रह नहीं रहता है। इस तरह का सत्याग्रह वह असर पैदा नहीं कर सकता है, वह हिम्मत नहीं दिखा सकता है जोकि इसे दिखानी चाहिये। अब यह बात बिल्कुल साफ होनी चाहिये कि हम इस मसले को शान्तिमय तरीकों से तय करेंगे या किसी और तरीके से। यह एक मोटी बात है जोकि तय हो जानी चाहिये। जैसे मैं ने आप से कहा यह बात नहीं है कि मैं कोई हमेशा के लिये शान्तिमय रास्ते पर ही चलता रहूँगा। अगर हमारे मुल्क पर हमला हुआ तो यकीनी तौर पर हम को उस का जवाब देना पड़ेगा और यही वजह है कि हम ने फौज रखी है। अगर ऐसी बात न हो तो हम फौज को ही खत्म कर दें। लेकिन साथ ही साथ यह बात जरूर है और हम नै कहा है कि हम अपनी फौजों का इस्तेमाल उस वक्त तक नहीं करेंगे जब तक कि हम पर कोई हमला न करे, जब तक कोई और लड़ाई हमारे खिलाफ न छेड़े। यह बात हम ने पाकिस्तान से कही है और दुनिया से भी कही है। यही सलाह हम ने औरों को भी दी है और अब दुनिया में यह बात तसलीम होती जाती है कि लोग लड़ कर मसलों को हल न करें।

श्री चटर्जी ने कहा है कि गोष्ठा की लड़ाई क्या है, यह तो एक दिन में या दो दिन में खत्म हो जायेगी, यह तो चन्द घंटों की बात है। यह बात सही हो सकती है कि अगर लड़ाई हो तो वह एक, दो या तीन दिन में खत्म हो सकती है चाहे उन के पास १२,००० सिपाही हों या २४,०००, इस से कोई ज्यादा फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। एक बात जरूर हो सकती है कि जिन लोगों की छाती पर वे लोग बैठे हैं उन को वह

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

- श्री सतार्ये, श्री कोई फौजी ताकत इस्तेमाल करने से फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। यह कहा गया है कि यह छोटी सी लड़ाई होगी और वह छोटा सा मुल्क है, इसलिये कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह एक उसूल की बात है, एक सिद्धान्त की बात है। और अगर आप की बात को तसलीम किया जाता है तो इस का मतलब तो यह होगा कि जो बड़े बड़े देश हैं दुनिया के, वे उन देशों को जोकि उन के मुकाबले में छोटे हैं, उन को यह हक है कि वह उन को दबा लें।
- ✓ यह एक गलत बात है। एक दफा अगर आप तसलीम कर लेते हैं कि हम मसले को हल करने के लिये अपनी फौजें दौड़ा सकते हैं तब आप अगर दूसरे मुल्क भी ऐसा ही करें तो उन को इन्कार नहीं कर सकते हैं।
- ✓ यह एक उसूली बात है।
- ✓ हमारे श्री अशोक मेहता ने मिसाल दी, या इशारा किया, एक बात तो फारमोसा, ताईवान के बारे में और दूसरी बार गोआ के बारे में। उन्होंने कहा कि हम गोआ में तो सेल्फ डिटेर्मिनेशन की बात करते हैं और फारमोसा के बारे में हमारी क्या राय है। फारमोसा तो दूर नहीं है, मुबारिक हो उन को सेल्फ डिटेर्मिनेशन का हक। कौन लोग इस बात से राजी नहीं हैं। हम तो यही कहते हैं कि जो फारमोसा का मसला है वह शान्तिमय तरीकों से हल होना चाहिये, लड़ाई से नहीं, और यही मैं ने कहा था।
- दूसरे यह कि फारमोसा तो दूर है, जो दो टापू हैं मल्लू और क्युमोय, उन की निसबत मैं ने यह कहा था और अकसर लोगों ने इस को स्वीकार किया कि वे चीन के ही हैं लेकिन फिर भी वह मसला अभी तक हल नहीं हुआ है। तो जो मोटी बात है हमें उस को अपने दिमाग में साफ रखना है और वह यह कि गोआ का मसला हमें शान्तिमय तरीकों

से हल करना है और कोई फौजी कार्रवाई हम नहीं करेंगे। यह बात साफ हो जानी चाहिये और इस के बारे में कोई गलतफहमी नहीं रहनी चाहिये। जिन उसूलों और सिद्धान्तों को आप ने अपनाया है उन को आप न छोड़ें। जिन बुनियादों के ऊपर आप ने सारी इमारत बनाई है, जिन के ऊपर आप ने काम किये हैं और अपनी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति तय की है, अगर आप उन बुनियादी उसूलों को छोड़ देते हैं तो सारी इमारत ही गिर जाती है। लेकिन उसूलों को अलग रख कर आप इस बात पर गौर करें कि आप को आखिरकार क्या फायदा होगा, क्या लाभ होगा। आप एक अपरचुनिस्ट तरीके से देखें। मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप इस पर गौर करेंगे तो आप देखेंगे कि हमें फौजें दौड़ा देने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा, काफी नुकसान ही होगा और दूर दूर तक नुकसान पहुंचते हैं, इस के। चुनावे न हमें इस से कोई फायदा हो और न कोई और बात हो, खाली एक जोश और गुस्से में आ कर कोई बात कर दें, तो यह तो बहुत बुर अन्देशी की और समझ की बात नहीं है।

उधर एक मैम्बर साहब बैठे हुए हैं, उन्होंने ने दो चार बार फरमाया कि गवर्नमेंट की या मेरी पालिसी में कोई मैच्योरिटी नहीं दिखाई देती है, कोई दानिशामन्दी दिखाई नहीं देती है, कोई बुजुर्गी नहीं है। जो कुछ मैच्योरिटी का तर्जुमा है वह मैं नहीं जानता हूँ। अब मैं क्या कहूँ। साहब नाबालिग समझ लीजिये मुझे, और मैं क्या कहूँ।

एक बात मैं और कहूँगा। श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी ने कुछ यह कहा था मेरी निसबत कि कुछ मेरा जनता से है, मैं आप दी पीपल जैसे मुझे कहा है। इसके माने तो यह नहीं है कि मैं गलती न करूँ या मैं

उनको गलत न समझूं। यह बात तो है। लेकिन कम से कम मेरा जो विचार है इस मामले में वह मैं आपको बता देना चाहता हूं। बाबजूद इसके कि जो बात हमने कही और जब शुरू शुरू में जब हमारा फैसला शायी हुआ तब कुछ लोगों को आश्चर्य हुआ और मान लीजिये कि हमारा कसूर था। टंडन जी ने कहा कि जो मैंने कहा और जो दूसरे साहब ने कहा, उन दोनों के बीच की बात हो। वह बीच का रास्ता हो सकता है इस माने में, इस माने में नहीं, जहां तक मेरा खयाल है, हमने कोई राय बहुत तबदील नहीं की, हालांकि एक मौके पर छोटी तबदीली भी बड़ी मालूम होती है। यह बात मैं मानता हूं। लेकिन बात यह है कि हमारी राय ने नहीं लेकिन वाकयात ने और अखबारों ने और अक्सर लोगों के बयानात न इस कदर एक हवा पैदा की थी, मुल्क में, जोरों की, कि उसके बाद कोई ऐसी बात हमने कही, तो उस हवा के खिलाफ पड़ी, इसलिये लोगों को आश्चर्य हुआ न कि हमारी पहली बात के खिलाफ। खैर वह बात नहीं है। तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि उनको आश्चर्य हुआ और कुछ लोगों को भ्रका भी लगा। लेकिन साथ ही साथ जिन लोगों ने ज्यादा ठंडे दिल से सोचा तो उन्होंने पाया कि यह फैसला ठीक था, यह फैसला सही था।

मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि अक्सर साहबान ने भी यह बात कही, जो कि उन पार्टीज के सदस्य हैं जो कि उधर बैठी हैं और उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि पब्लिक में यह नहीं कहेंगे बात-चीत में कहेंगे।

श्री बी० जी० बेशपांडे : क्या उधर के लोग कहते हैं कि पब्लिक में नहीं कहेंगे ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं नाम तो नहीं ले रहा हूं।

जो बात मैं कह रहा था वह यह है कि लोगों ने जितना ठंडे दिल से इस बारे में गौर

किया, उतना ही अच्छी तरह उन्होंने समझा कि बात ठीक थी। मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि फ्रेंच कीजिये कि हम लोग— यह गवर्न-मेंट — वहीं पर रहते जहां पहले थे, यानी हम जरा ढील दे देते कि दो चार बीस आदमी कभी कभी जाकर सत्याग्रह करें और कोशिश करें, तो उसका क्या नतीजा होता ? वे लोग क्या करते, किस ढंग से करते और कब तक करते, ये कई सवाल हमारे सामने आते। क्या किसी सुरत में या किन्हीं हालात में हमारी फौज भी उनके पीछ जाये, यह सवाल भी पैदा होता। अभी टंडन जी ने बहुत अच्छी तरह सत्याग्रह के एक दो पहलुओं को हमारे सामने रखा। इस बारे में मैं आपको एक फौजी मिसाल देता हूं। आप बन्दूक लेकर चलें और उसकी सब नालियां चला दें, तो फिर बन्दूक जरा कार-आमद नहीं होती है, जब तक कि वह फिर से न भरी जाय। गरजे कि महज हवाई बातों से कुछ नहीं होता है। ये जिम्मे-दारी के सवाल हैं। इन पर हमको गौर करना है। इस बारे में महज जोश-खरोश दिखाने से यह मसला हल नहीं होगा। श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने कहा कि “मैं शर्म के मारे गल गया”। मुझे तो यह ज्यादाती मालूम होती है। मैं उनसे क्या अर्ज करूँ सिवा इसके कि वह बहुत नाजुक दिमाग होंगे।

यह भी बार बार कहा गया है कि हम एक चुनौती दें—एक अल्टीमेटम दें, एक टारगेट मुकर्र कर दें और एक तारीख मुकर्र कर दें कि इस तारीख तक ये कर दो। आपके सामने इस वक्त दुनिया के बड़े बड़े सवाल हैं, एशिया के, तेवान के, इंडोचाइना के, जर्मनी के और मराको के — चारों तरफ सवाल ही सवाल हैं। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि कहीं पर भी इस किस्म का अल्टीमेटम दिया गया है। और कौन किस को दे ? फिर अल्टीमेटम के मानी क्या है ? धूम फिर कर हम वहीं पहुंचते हैं कि अगर वे लोग अल्टीमेटम को नहीं माने तो फिर फौज

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

भेज दी जाये। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है। सत्याग्रह का पर्दा सामने खड़ा किया जाता है और उसके पीछे फौजी कार्यवाही और पुलिस एक्शन की बात होती है। और फिर यह भी सवाल उठता है कि सत्याग्रह है क्या? मैं ने और जगह भी कहा है कि सत्याग्रह एक डायनामिक विचार है, जिस की अभी तक पूरी खोज भी नहीं हुई है। वह कहां तक जाता है और कहां तक नहीं जाता है? कम से कम मैं तो नहीं कह सकता कि वह कहां तक जा सकता है और कहां तक जाएगा। मैं कहने वाला कौन हूँ? लेकिन इस वक्त मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि कम से कम इस समय यह मुनासिब नहीं है और इस समय इस को चलाना एक गलती होगी, क्योंकि इस से मुल्क को नुकसान पहुंचेगा।

मैं यह भी नहीं कह सकता हूँ—हालांकि मैं जानता हूँ—कि इन वाक्यात का गोभा के रहने वालों पर क्या असर होगा। वह असर अच्छा भी हो सकता है और बुरा भी हो सकता है। बुरा इस माने में कि चूंकि इस सिलसिले में वे लोग कुछ बहुत ज्यादा सीखे हुए नहीं हैं, इसलिये डर कर वे दब भी सकते हैं। अगर ऐसा हो जाय, तो हमारे लिये यह मुनासिब बात नहीं होगी।

श्री अशोक मेहता ने बताया—और उन्होंने ने ठीक कहा है—कि वहां पर इतनी ज्यादा फौज है और वे लोग थोड़े से आदमी हैं, इसलिये हमारा यह समझना कहां तक मुनासिब है कि वे इन हालात में सत्याग्रह करेंगे। लेकिन मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि श्री अशोक मेहता के शहर में भी गोभा के बहुत से लोग रहते हैं और वे भी हाथ-पैर हिला सकते हैं। कोई वजह नहीं है कि वे हाथ-पैर न हिलायें। एक लाख के करीब वे लोग हैं। श्री अशोक मेहता उन को हिलायें, उन की पीठ ठोंकें ताकि वे भी कुछ काम करें।

मैं बहुत अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि इस वक्त हमारे इस फ्रंसले का असर अच्छा हुआ है—बुनियादी तौर से अच्छा हुआ है और गोभा के रहने वालों के लिये भी अच्छा हुआ है, क्योंकि उन के ऊपर जिम्मेदारियां पड़ी हुई थीं, जिन्हें हम छुड़ा नहीं सकते थे।

यहां पर मुझ से सवाल किया गया है कि हम क्या कर रहे हैं, जबकि सौ दो सौ आदमी जेल में पड़े हुए हैं और और मुल्कों में भेजे जाते हैं और बैनिश किये जाते हैं। बात सही है, लेकिन मैं इस का क्या जबाब दूँ सिवा इस के कि मैं कुछ नहीं कर सकता हूँ सिवा रंज का इजहार करने के और शिकायत करने के। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त दुनिया में ऐसी बहुत सी बातें हो रही हैं, जो मुझे पसन्द नहीं हैं, जो बहुत नागवार गुजरती हैं, लेकिन मैं उन के बारे में क्या कर सकता हूँ? घूम फिर कर वही बात आ जाती है कि वहां पर अपनी फौजें ले जाओ। आप पहले इस बात का फ्रंसला करें कि आप इस मसले को फौजी तरीके से हल करेंगे या नहीं और अगर आप यह फ्रंसला करें कि यहां पर फौजी तरीके इस्तेमाल करना नामुनासिब है—और उन से नुकसान भी हो सकता है—, तो आप को फौरन दूसरे ढंग से सोचना पड़ता है।

आप यह भी ब्याल कीजिये कि श्री सालाजार और उन की हकूमत की जो नीति है, उन के जो तरीके हैं, उन को सामने रख कर ऐसी हकूमत और ऐसे शास्स के खिलाफ सत्याग्रह कहां तक कामयाब हो सकता है। इसलिये बहुत अदब से मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि हम ने यह जो प्रस्ताव पास किया था, वह बहुत सोच समझ कर पास किया था और मैं फिर कहूंगा कि हमारी पहली नीति

में और इस नीति में कोई फर्क नहीं है,—
 हां उन्नीस और बीस का फर्क हो सकता है,
 इम्प्रेसिस का फर्क हो सकता है। जहां पहले
 हम ढील देते थे, वहां बाद में हम ने सोचा
 कि इस ढील को रोक दिया जाय। वाक्य,
 यह है कि लोगों के दिमाग में कुछ ज्यादा
 फर्क मालूम हुआ और अगर आप कुछ कहना
 चाहें, तो आप को हक है कहने का। आप
 पूछ सकते हैं कि हम ने पहले ढील क्यों दी।
 बहरसूरत पहले जो कुछ भी गलती हुई हो,
 इस वक्त तो यही एक मुनासिब कदम था
 और इस को न लेना एक गलती होती और
 एक कमजोरी होती। श्री चटर्जी ने कहा कि
 यह हमारी कमजोरी थी, हमारी कायरता
 थी और हम में इतनी हिम्मत नहीं थी कि
 हम वहां पर एक फ़ौज भेज दें। मैं कहना
 चाहता हूं कि ऐसा फ़ैसला करने के लिये
 मुझ से कहीं ज्यादा दिमागी हिम्मत की
 जरूरत थी।

अगर आप कहें, तो कुछ अंग्रेजी भाषा में
 कहूँ ?

May I now say a few words in Eng-
 lish?

Sir, there was so much in the
 speeches of Members opposite, so much
 of exuberance and sometimes over-
 whelming eloquence that I found it a
 little difficult to follow the meaning
 behind at all. In fact, I began to
 doubt if there was at all any meaning
 behind except just a certain irritation
 and annoyance at things as they were
 and a desire to exhibit their irritation
 and annoyance. Because, after all, it
 does not help much in understanding
 an issue, in the modern age at least, by
 a flood of words which have not too
 much of meaning. I got a sense of
 complete unreality in listening to
 some of those speeches. They were
 very eloquent, sometimes very mov-
 ing but completely divorced from the
 issue before us.

After all, I have gone into this
 question. Whether we changed our

policy or not, whether we did this or
 not, it is not a matter of much impor-
 tance. The major thing is: what is
 the right policy to adopt? As I have
 said, if we had adopted the right
 policy, well, it is there and it is the
 right policy, whether it marks a
 change or not. If we had adopted a
 wrong policy, it is a wrong policy;
 whether we have changed it or not,
 it is immaterial. I do submit that in
 the circumstances as they developed,
 it became thoroughly undesirable to
 carry on that drift, because it was a
 drift previously, and one had to pull
 it out.

The first thing that has to be un-
 derstood quite clearly is that a gov-
 ernment, as a government, cannot
 undertake satyagraha. As an indivi-
 dual I might—that is a different
 matter—give up the government, and
 go and do it; but as a government it
 is quite absurd to talk of satyagraha,
 because satyagraha is not two equal
 forces coming into conflict in the
 material sense, but the spirit of man
 facing material might and not bound
 by it, whatever the consequences
 might be. If that man has a govern-
 ment behind him pushing him, then
 there is no spirit of man doing it; it
 is a government exploiting the situa-
 tion by sending one man, ten men or
 a thousand. No government should
 indulge in this thing without disgrac-
 ing itself. Therefore, a government
 cannot do it. At the most, a govern-
 ment can permit others to do it if it
 so chooses—others moved by conscie-
 nce or whatever it may be. A gov-
 ernment may permit them or may
 connive at it and not take action if
 you like. So, right from the begin-
 ning in this matter I have been closely
 following—naturally all through
 these years, and more especially dur-
 ing the last 15 or 16 months, and
 conferring among our colleagues, con-
 ferring with people in Bombay, con-
 ferring with Goanese organisations
 and others. I have been in the clos-
 est touch with them, not always
 agreeing with them, explaining to
 them our viewpoint and the rest, and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

laying stress on the major decision that we have made that this must be peaceful and that there must be no mass satyagraha or mass entry, because the moment you think in terms of mass satyagraha or mass entry, you have to think of the next step. It is no good thinking of mass entry one day and nothing afterwards, and I need not remind the House of the consequences of mass entry one after another. I could understand as an individual, not as a Prime Minister, individual satyagraha or a few persons doing it. So, I was connected with this matter all this time, and then came the last week or ten days or so before the 15th August, when I saw things taking shape which were contrary to what I had expected in numbers and other things. I am not blaming anybody because nobody was particularly responsible for that. Things happened that way and it was a matter which roused strong feelings in India and it is not surprising from one point of view. As Shri Chatterjee said, it was gratifying that so many people and many more were prepared to face all kinds of risks, bullets, etc. in this cause. That was gratifying regardless of the fact as to whether it was right or wrong—whatever it was. We were much concerned what to do and what not to do, and frankly in doubt we allowed matters to proceed. Then came the 15th August. After that too I did not say anything definite. I spoke at one or two places—Sitapur and elsewhere. But I did not precisely and definitely say what should be done. It is too serious a matter. But I might inform the House that my mind was fairly clear that this type of policy at that moment should not be carried on whatever the future policy might be. I felt that this must be stopped and we must review the situation and decide what to do in the future. So these decisions were clearly made.

I may inform the House that there was no intention at any moment of thinking of this matter on party lines

or Congress lines or any such thing. It is true, naturally, that I consulted my senior colleagues in the Congress, in our organisation. It so happened that they were here for other purposes. We consulted them and we passed a resolution about that. That is true. That was both natural and accidental because they happened to be here.

In this connection Shri Asoka Mehta urged what he called a national policy—foreign policy. I should very much like to accept his suggestion to have a national policy. But what does this mean exactly? If it means consultation with the leaders of parties here on important issues, I am certainly agreeable. It cannot always be done because big issues do not come up suddenly. It is a day-to-day matter; day-to-day things develop. Sometimes big issues may come up.

✓ In regard to foreign policy, hon. Members opposite sometime ago used to criticise it from two entirely different points of view but both were criticising this policy of non-alignment because one group thought that we should line up with one side and another thought that we should line up with the other side. That criticism is no longer heard because presumably it is generally recognised that that policy has been a success, which it is.

Shri Asoka Mehta is quite right when he said that the success of the policy was not due to the Congress only. Certainly not. It was due to many things—certainly the Congress, certainly non-Congress and other parties. If I may say so, essentially it was due to the fact that it was the right policy. Rightness and correctness ultimately justify themselves before the world.

✓ But I have this difficulty. As I said, consultation is all right. But you cannot have any policy, any important policy which is made up of patches picked up here and there. It must be an organic whole; it must be a whole together. It could not be a bit

taken from this party, a bit from that party—contrary bits pieced up together. That is no policy. It is just a make-shift at the most. When there are basic differences it becomes difficult to have that organic whole as a policy.

Shri Asoka Metha will forgive me if I make a reference now to one thing which has pained me greatly. His party or some members of his party have taken up an attitude in regard to Kashmir and carried on some propaganda in regard to it which has amazed me. I am not justifying any policy. But I do submit to him that association with known opponents and indeed co-operation with those people who are not just opponents but much more than opponents of India—does seem to me very extraordinary and odd. I have no doubt that it is done with the best of motives, and not with any desire to do a wrong thing. But the fact is that this has led to these wrong results in a matter of infinite moment to us. In the same way, I submit, we may be driven to wrong results if we are not careful in other matters in the country, whether it is Goa or elsewhere. I think I have said in my speech in Hindi that our decision in regard to Goa was not influenced in the slightest even by a suspicion of the gesture of any other country or power.

6 P.M.

Then there was some reference to treaties. Shri H. N. Mukerjee, I think referred to them. We are not bound by any treaty at all. There is no treaty, in fact, with India. They are treaties, old or new, between other powers—United Kingdom and Portugal. That is their look-out and not ours. He referred to Sir Stafford Cripps. I really do not know what it was; I have no recollection nor have I seen any report of it anywhere. I do not think it is of much importance.

Shri Asoka Mehta expressed his resentment at what he called 'our deliberate misunderstanding of his or

his party's patience and goodwill' and said something about my maligning his party.

An Hon. Member: Maligning?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think that was the word he used and that is why I use it. I do not quite know what he referred to. I have no desire to malign any party or any individual. To him I say that his party or other parties opposite are not very soft of tongue in referring to Government and he should have a little thicker skin, I do believe, when I say here that many of their policies are counter revolutionary. If I say so, it is not maligning, it is a straightforward statement. Many of the parties opposite—almost all—I consider in the strict, accurate sense of the term "counter revolutionary." That is what I say, because it is so.

Shri Kamath: Congress is 'reactionary' if we are counter-revolutionary, that is all.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But, nobody knows that Shri Kamath is. (*Interruption*). Words may be hurled this way or that way. Words have a very powerful meaning or may have no meaning at all; but I do submit that this is, what is often called a militant policy because it is outwardly aggressive in language or action. Surely, if I may use the word used by a Member opposite, it is not always a policy of maturity or mature judgment. We are, I hope, a mature nation. Whether I am mature or not, as a nation, I hope, we are so and we have gained a good deal of experience even in the last few years and a policy merely of trying to show our strength by so-called militancy does not deceive anybody inside the country or outside. What others expect and the yardstick with which others judge a country are different. Some of us, perhaps, still have not quite wholly realised that India is an independent country. It is extraordinary—how difficult it is to get out of all grooves of thought and action. The world has changed, and you talk about military action.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and police action when the world has changed even in the last six or seven years.

We live on the threshold of the atomic age which means a great deal in terms of military action and other actions. There are a hundred and one aspects of this question and I cannot go into them. Forgetting all this, are we merely to lose ourselves in words of oratory and condemnation and in spite of our nation's policy, which is an international policy, talk in terms of an emotional outburst? I submit that this shows lack of maturity. We have faced many problems, international problems, and faced them with a measure of success and created an impression all over the world that there is some wisdom in this country in dealing with international problems, wisdom and patience as well as strength, not military strength—that we haven't got compared to the big nations—not financial strength, but some other kind of strength. That is the reputation which is a precious one; I do submit that we should keep that in our view and govern all our actions accordingly.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): May I seek a clarification on one or two small points?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: A number of Indian satyagrahis are now imprisoned and are under trial in Goa. Is there any attempt to secure their release?

✓ The second question is this. I have heard that a large amount of assistance is being given by Pakistan and Ceylon to Portuguese in Goa. Has there been any attempt to find out the truth about it and see whether there is any possibility of preventing it, if there is a need for it?

The third point is, we hear reports about satyagraha being resorted to

by Pakistan to secure Kashmir. What would be the reactions of this Government in that respect? Of course, for the last point, the answer will be "wait and see"; but anyhow I want to know it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My present answer to that is, "ignore it; do not attach any importance to it."

The first question was about release of prisoners. Really I do not know how we can ask the Portuguese Government to release them. We have no representative there; we are not, if I may say so, on talking terms; not only are we not on talking terms, but we have in a sense isolated them so far as India is concerned. We have appointed some good friends of ours, Christian priests in Goa, to look after the interests of the prisoners there; and the report we have received is that they are doing this work as competently and consciously as possible.

✓ The next question is about help from Pakistan and Ceylon to Goa. I do not think it is at all true, so far as I know, that any kind of help is coming from Ceylon. I am not aware of that at all; in fact I am not also sure of that. About Pakistan I cannot say. I am talking about matters of trade and other things, goods coming etc. I cannot say; it is possible that they have been getting supplies from Pakistan to some extent.

Mr. Speaker: There are three substitute motions—(1) by Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah, (2) by Shri V. G. Deshpande and (3) by Shri N. C. Chatterjee.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: May I request you to put ours first?

Mr. Speaker: I shall put the Opposition motion first.

As regards the motion of Shri V. G. Deshpande, does he want to press it? I am ruling out a part of the motion.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Which part?

Mr. Speaker: The part which unnecessarily brings in something with which this House is not connected, that is, from the words, "but after the resolution of All India Congress Committee....." up to the end. That is one thing. That is entirely irrelevant and outside the scope of this House. Then, of course, the other point to which I will invite his attention is that substantially the motion becomes the same as that Shri N. C. Chatterjee, though of course there is some difference.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I do not press it.

Mr. Speaker: I do not put it to the House then.

The only motion that remains from the Opposition benches is that of Shri N. C. Chatterjee.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, while appreciating the efforts of the Prime Minister in the direction of liquidation of colonialism in Asia and Africa, disapproves of the policy of the Government with regard to Goa and other Portuguese colonies in India."

The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes 26; Noes 156.

Division No. 5

AYES

6-15 p.m.

Amjad Ali, Shri
Basu, Shri K. K.
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
Das, Shri B. C.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Deshpande, Shri V. G

Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
Kamath, Shri
Kelappan, Shri
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Mehta, Shri Asoka
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Raghavachari, Shri
Rao, Shri P. R.

Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal
Reddi, Shri Madhao
Saha, Shri Meghnad
Sharma, Shri Nand Lal
Shastri, Shri R. R.
Singh Shri R. N.
Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Verma, Shri Ramji

NOES

Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Shri H. L.
Agrawal, Shri M. L.
Ajit Singh, Shri
Akarपुरi, Sardar
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Ayyangar, Shri M. A.
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Balmiki, Shri
Banerjee, Shri
Basappa, Shri
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Dass
Bidari, Shri
Bose, Shri P. C.
Brajchwar Prasad, Shri
Chalius, Shri Bimalaprosad
Chanda, Shri
Charak, Th. Lakshman Singh
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chavda, Shri
Chettiar, Shri S. ramaniam

Choudhuri, Shri M. Shafiq
Damodaran, Shri G. R.
Damodaran, Shri N. P.
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri K. K.
Das, Shri N. T.
Das, Shri Ram Dhani
Das, Shri S. N.
Datar, Shri
Deb, Shri S. C.
Deogam, Shri
Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Deshpande, Shri G. H.
Dholakia, Shri
Dhusiya, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dube, Shri U. S.
Dwivedi, Shri D. P.
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
Bacharan, Shri I
Fotedar, Pandit
G^a dg t, Shri

Gandhi, Shri M. M.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Ghose, Shri S. M.
Ghulam Qader, Shri
Giri, Shri V. V.
Gopi Ram, Shri
Gounder, Shri K. P.
Gounder, Shri K. S.
Gupta, Shri Badahah
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Hembrom, Shri
Hyder Husein, Ch.
Ibrahim, Shri
Iqbal Singh, Sardar
Iyyunni, Shri C. R.
Jafware, Shri
Joshi, Shri Jethalal
Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya
Joshi, Shri M. D.
Joshi, Shri N. L.
Kajrolkar, Shri

[Mr. Speaker]

Kamble, Dr.
 Karmarkar, Shri
 Kasliwal, Shri
 Katju, Dr.
 Khan, Shri Sadath Ali
 Kirolkar, Shri
 Lakshmiyaya, Shri
 Lal, Shri R. S.
 Majhi, Shri R. C.
 Majithia, Sardar
 Malviya, Shri Motilal
 Mandel, Dr. P.
 Mehta, Shri B. G.
 Mishra, Shri Bhubuti
 Mishra, Shri M. P.
 Misra, Shri B. N.
 Miera, Shri R. D.
 Mohiuddin, Shri
 More, Shri K. L.
 Mudaliar, Shri C. R.
 Nair, Shri C. K.
 Narasimhan, Shri C. R.
 Natawadkar, Shri
 Nathwani, Shri N. P.
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Shivarajvati
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Neswi, Shri
 Palchoudhary, Shrimati Ila

Pannalal, Shri
 Patakar, Shri
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patel, Shrimati Maniben
 Patil, Shri Kanavade
 Pillai, Shri Thanu
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Radha Raman, Shri
 Raghbir Sahai, Shri
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramaiah, Shri
 Rahman, Shri M. H.
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Rajabhoj, Shri P. N.
 Ram Saran, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramananda Tirtha, Swami
 Ramaswamy, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
 Rane, Shri
 Raut, Shri Bholu
 Saksena, Shri Mohanlal
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sankarapandian, Shri
 Setish Chandra, Shri
 Satyawadi Dr.
 Sen, Shrimati Sushama
 Swal, Shri A. R.
 Shahnawaz Khan Shri

Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
 Sharma, Pandit K. C.
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Shri R. C.
 Shastri, Shri Algu Rai
 Siddananjappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar
 Singh, Shri M. N.
 Sinha, Dr. S. N.
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan
 Sinha, Shri K.P.
 Sinha, Shri S.
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
 Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu
 Syed Mahmud, Dr.
 Telkikar, Shri
 Tivary, Shri V. N.
 Tiwari, Shri R. S.
 Tiwari, Pandit D. N.
 Tripath, Shri V. D.
 Uikey, Shri
 Upadhyay, Shri S. D.
 Vaishya, Shri M. B.
 Verma, Shri B. B.
 Vodeyar, Shri

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I now put to the House the remaining substitute motion.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

“This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves the foreign policy pursued by the Government, which has led especially to the acceptance by

many countries of the principles of Panch Shila and to the easing of the international tension, thus promoting the cause of world peace.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: Now, there is no need to put the main motion which does not survive.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Monday, the 19th September 1955.