

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

for leave of absence from the House, because I see that one of the Ministers never attends the House at all; it is only once in a way that he attends?

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members are aware that, so far as the House is concerned, under the Constitution if any Member is absent for consecutive meetings of the House for 60 days or more his name can be removed and a motion can be made by any Member in this House that his seat may be declared vacant. So, when, hon. Members take leave, though hon. Members may not lose their seats for the simple reason that once in 60 days they may attend and do not attend for another 59 days, the House loses the benefit of their presence. Therefore, naturally we expect that all hon. Members who would not be here for more than a week or so—one or two days does not matter much—would intimate us, and they are expected to do so. But the Government work is carried on though a particular Minister is absent.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** I do not mind if they are absent, there may be pretty good reasons for that. But I have been here for five years now and I have not seen any Minister applying for leave at any time though they are absent on many days. They should set an example.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member has entirely misunderstood the position. Absence from Delhi is one thing and absence from the House is another thing. So far as absence from the House is concerned, many hon. Members sit in the hall there and do not come here at all. I do not worry myself about that. Therefore, I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

**Several Hon. Members:** Yes.

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

## MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up consideration of the motion regarding international situation for which 5½ hours have been allotted. The time-limit of speeches will as usual be 15 minutes for the Members and 20 to 30 minutes, if necessary, for leaders of groups. We will just conclude by 5.30 or 5.45. I shall call upon the Prime Minister to reply at 5.00 P.M.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

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

I am afraid, this has become rather a stock motion which I move regularly and periodically before the House. The international situation naturally changes somewhat from time to time. The present one is not quite the same as it was yesterday and yet, fundamentally it is more or less the same. In the same way, as regards the policy of the Government of India, as this House is aware, we have tried to follow the same basic policy adapting it to changing circumstances.

The two questions that directly affect us in regard to international policy are our relations with Pakistan and with that, of course, is inevitably included, more especially, the question of Kashmir, and secondly, the question of Goa. These two, I say, affect us directly, because they affect the integrity and sovereignty of India; of course, the other questions which are really much bigger in their world significance affect us very greatly, for the simple reason that whatever happens there affects us as it affects the world. In fact, almost all our problems are affected directly or indirectly by what happens elsewhere in the world. If the Suez Canal is closed, we are affected; our Five Year Plan is

affected. If something else happens, our defence budget is affected on account of external factors. If military aid is being given to Pakistan, well, our defence, our position, is affected, and a greater burden is cast upon us if something happens which gives solace and help to Portugal in its holding on to Goa, and that affects us.

So, although the two immediate and important points directly affecting us, affecting the sovereignty and integrity of India are Kashmir and Goa, the real matter, which concerns this House no doubt is this, the international situation which seems to be balancing itself on the edge of some sword for a long time and without finding any solution to its many problems. It is true that there is no immediate crisis of possible war. That is a good thing. But, at the same time, it is also true that no basic problem has been solved. They all remain where they are and suddenly new crisis erupt. In the recent months, the biggest crisis perhaps has been in what is called the Middle East, and in fact since the last year.

Last year, when we discussed these matters, the Suez Canal crisis was dominant. Well, fortunately, the Suez Canal is functioning now, working; not that the problems of all have been solved but they have gone a long way towards a solution, and the declaration that the Egyptian Government has made in regard to Suez Canal appears to us to be a fair and good declaration, acknowledging the Suez Canal as a waterway in which other nations participate and it should function as an international waterway in that sense. And we hope that that declaration will be the basis for the final settlement of this problem if any matters still remain to be settled.

But, after that, we see this crisis shifting a little from the Suez Canal, from Egypt, to Syria and other parts of the Middle Eastern countries. It is not for me to discuss the position in Syria or any other parts of the Middle East, but, I do feel more strongly than ever before that the types of approaches which are made to many of these countries in the Middle East or to other parts of Asia

are approaches which do not facilitate a solution of any problem and which have progressively make conditions worse there.

We have a record of a few years now, a few years of this policy of military pacts—well, these are attempts to gain influence or power over various parts of Asian or African territory, one move leading to a counter-move with the result that instead of some kind of security, insecurity prevails, in Western Asia,—especially the Arab nations which are split up—and generally Asian conditions much worse doubt that conditions in Western Asia than they were two or three years ago. I do not think anybody can doubt that conditions in Western Asia are more insecure than they were two or three or four years ago.

In these years, the chief development has been the development of these military alliances, the Baghdad Pact and the rest. NATO was a little far off; the Baghdad Pact comes nearer to us. The result was, this has been, what we see; these pose in different directions, and because one great power attacks the other, another great power tries to counter that step by some other step that it takes. Unfortunately, this policy continues and these conflicts continue. Behind all this, we see this development of terrible new weapons of warfare. The Disarmament Conference and its committee meet somewhere in London and they work hard and I believe they are earnestly bent on having some way out, but the fact remains that the world really is conditioned today by these rival power conflicts and there are attempts—I would not say balance of power politics, because the old idea of balance of power which existed in the 19th century no longer exists, when there were a number of countries which tried to find some balances with alliances—today, when these two huge countries, very powerful ones, each, if I may say so, with all respect to them, trying to become stronger than the other. There is a phrase now—"negotiating from strength". Well, if one party tries to do so, the other party also tries to do so, and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the result is strength, as measured by the latest type of nuclear or super-nuclear weapons and the piling up of these weapons goes on.

We have just heard of a ballistic weapon which the Soviet Union has produced. A little before, the United States were experimenting with some such weapon. No doubt whatever one country produces in the shape of horrible, weapon, the other will produce a few months later if not sooner. And now, we have got at the stage of what is called the ultimate weapon. Evidently, there is some stage, presumably, in the ultimate weapon but there appears to be no stage about the ultimate folly of human beings!

So, we have to face this, and we have to face this not in a spirit of being wiser than others or in any sense better than others. I would like to make that clear. It is not that we try to tell others what to do. We are very conscious of our own failings and all that, but we are absolutely conscious of this, that in our own interests,—if you like, call it opportunist interests—peace is better than war. We are convinced that for the world, peace is better than war. We are convinced that peace is not going to be preserved by policies which hover round war by these military alliances and the like. And in our own interests, we are naturally concerned with the techniques when cold war comes right up to our borders and attacks us, which it has done as the House knows. It is done because of these alliances.

SEATO—NATO did not concern us—did concern us; it comes up to our borders on the eastern side. The Baghdad Pact concerns us infinitely much more so, and added to that, when the other bilateral agreements for arming our neighbour country and thus upsetting all the balances that exist there, are made, well, they concern us very much. It is not a question of some kind of theoretical opinion, but it is a practical proposition before us which is concerning us and which is casting great burdens

upon us in the shape of defence and other matters.

So, in this world situation as we see it, all I can hope is that the experience of the last two or three years at least will convince everybody that the approach that has been made through military alliances and through great powers pushing themselves into the concerns of other nations is not successful. In the Middle-East, we find that—I have not a shadow of doubt about it—conditions in the middle-eastern countries would be much better if they were left to themselves. If those countries, either of these great military blocs, whether it is the Soviet Union or whether it is the western nations, if they left matters to take their own course, without military interference or without any other type of interference, things will gradually settle down.

Certainly, they can be helped. But when there is this cold war going on and they declare that if any of these blocs takes a step in the Middle-East or anywhere else, then the other one naturally thinks of taking a similar step itself to counter the other one and so it goes on. Either one party should be powerful enough to crush the other by military means; that means a great war, a world war and that is ruled out. Then, if you rule out a war, if a war is not there, are threats of war going to do it? Surely not. If wars and threats of war have to be ruled out too, why adopt an attitude which just irritates and which induces the other to do something irritating to you, without producing any other good result? So, that is, broadly speaking, if I may say so, the analysis of this continuing crisis, which changes here and there, but basically remains the same.

Last year there was the trouble in Hungary. We understand that this matter is going to be brought up soon before the General Assembly of the United Nations, which is being convened again. In regard to Hungary and in regard to other matters, our

general approach has been one—we have declared our general policy in regard to it. For instance, we said then and we have repeated it often that in our view the rising in Hungary was essentially a nationalist rising; in our view foreign forces should not be kept in a country; in our view, the people of the country should be left to fashion their own destiny. We said it then and we said it repeatedly. At the same time, all our efforts had been bent during the past year to help and not merely to condemn. We want to help Hungary. We want to help the Hungarian people. We want to follow a policy which will help in removing some of the tensions, some of the burdens from which the Hungarian people suffer and not merely to condemn loudly the many things that we do not like.

There are many things happening in the world from year to year, and day to day, which we have disliked intensely; we have not condemned them. Sometimes when circumstances have compelled us, we have expressed our opinion in the United Nations or here or elsewhere. But generally speaking, we have avoided this business of condemnation, whether of small powers or big powers, not because we thought that we would gain anything thereby ourselves, but because when one is trying to solve a problem, it does not help calling names and condemning. Our effort whether in Asia or in Europe has been to the extent we could to do something to create an atmosphere for solution. That has been our general approach to these problems.

That is going to be our approach now if this matter is discussed in the United Nations. I have no idea what form it will take, in what form the discussions take place and in what form the resolutions come up. But the main approach is there. We are not anxious merely to have a discussion there. In fact, when this commission was appointed, we were not clear in our minds if in those circumstances the commission would be very helpful. The commission has now presented a

report, which is an able document, a well-argued document, but which inevitably is a document which is based on a good deal of evidence of one side. It is perfectly true that the other side did not facilitate the enquiry; that is perfectly true. But the fact remains that from a purely judicial point of view they looked at this picture, from the point of the number of refugees. That may, to some extent, vitiate some of their conclusions or not, but that is a small matter. As I said, we ourselves believe that this rising was essentially a nationalist rising; that is the main issue; the other things may follow. But the problem has been before us since the last year.

How can we be of any help? We cannot do much, of course, situated as we are. But we did wish to help to some extent and we have tried in our own way through diplomatic exchanges and in other ways to try to lessen the tensions there and to bring about a normal atmosphere as far as possible. It is obvious that in the circumstances that exist there, a country may go on and condemn the Hungarian Government or the Soviet Government or others. But having condemned, is one going to take armed action? No. It is obvious that by condemnation—it is just conceivable and it depends on how it is done—tensions still further increase and the burdens on the poor Hungarian people become worse, instead of relaxing and lessening. There is that difficulty one has to face in all these matters. So, we shall approach this matter in the United Nations, as we have done in the past, by making our attempts to find a way to help the Hungarian people. We shall express again our views, as we have expressed, that we do not approve of foreign powers remaining there and the people should control their own destinies. I do here also express the hope that the Hungarian Government will also work towards normalising conditions there and lessening the burdens which, to some extent, should exist on many people who are arrested or who are imprisoned and the rest.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Coming back to some of our own problems, I referred to the two major problems that affect us, that is, Pakistan's relations in Kashmir, and Goa. Pakistan's relations means many things, but essentially the question of Kashmir. This question is coming up, I suppose, soon before the Security Council. So, I do not wish to say anything about it, except to repeat what I have said very often and the House knows that very well, that in spite of the confusion about Kashmir that is sought to be introduced, the issue is an exceedingly simple one.

The issue is one of aggression, committed, abetted and continuing aggression by Pakistan. I did fail to understand—I hope I am not rigid in mind not to see an argument against me, to close my mind to an argument against me—but I have yet failed to see an atom of justification even put forward, much less accepted, as to why Pakistan is there except by invasion and aggression. Whatever justifications may be placed about matters, Pakistan's position there is clearly by aggression and invasion. That has been stated repeatedly on previous occasions, and in fact the United Nations Commissions proceeded on that basis. And the resolution they passed was clearly on that basis. The first thing they said was that Pakistan should vacate that aggression. There it is. And all the subsequent arguments—no doubt due to the fact that partly we ourselves were anxious to explore every possible avenue of settlement, and other countries were also anxious to help us—cannot cloud this basic issue. Therefore, there is this basic issue, and I cannot imagine the United Nations, or any country in fact, calling upon us to do something which no self-respecting country can ever do, that is, tolerate aggression and submit to aggression and invasion.

Apart from the big arms race that is going on in the wide world, of atomic weapons and all that, we are faced and we have been faced in the last two years with this development

of Pakistan getting very large quantities of military aid; maybe that they get it because they are in the Baghdad Pact and other Pacts, but principally they have got it by bilateral agreements with the United States. According to our information—and our information is fairly accurate in this matter—the aid that they have received is very considerable. It is not a small aid, as is sometimes said; it is very considerable. And we view that with great concern.

Now, we are going into an arms race with Pakistan or with any other country. Nevertheless, as the House knows, we have been compelled, at a moment of great difficulty, to spend much more than we ever intended to on defence, and the House has accepted it. Because, in some matters one can never take a risk.

I should like in this connection, to show how conditions have changed, to read a sentence or two from the report of Dr. Gunnar Jarring, the U.N. Representative who came here some months back. He wrote:

"In dealing with the problem under discussion as extensively as I have during the period just ended, I could not fail to take note of the concern expressed in connection with the changing political, economic and strategic factors surrounding the whole of the Kashmir question, together with the changing pattern of power relations in West and South Asia"—

that is, these military pacts and this military aid to Pakistan have changed the whole position, the whole pattern of power relations in this area, and changed it in a manner which gives us concern.

So, whatever reasons we had—and we had adequate reasons—to take up a particular attitude in regard to Kashmir, which is our basic attitude, these new developments have strengthened and solidified that attitude. And it seems to me clear that any

person or any organisation like the United Nations considering it must take this factor into consideration.

Now, in regard to Goa I confess that I have not said much—I can say very much—to my satisfaction or to the satisfaction of the House. There can be no doubt that the Indian Revolution will not be complete till Goa is part of India, and we can never accept the fact that Goa or any other part of India can remain or fall into some other power's dominion. Obviously when we talk about Goa, our struggle or our trouble is not with the people of Goa, it is with the Portuguese Government. The people of Goa according to us are, well, our own people. Our quarrel is with Portugal. Now, it should be remembered that because our approach to the question of Goa is a peaceful one, that does not indicate a lack of determination; nor does it indicate that this question is not going to be solved in our favour. It is possible that the Government of Portugal, living in some past century, does not understand modern developments and may not quite understand this; it functions in a peculiar way. But so far as the Government of India is concerned, and I am quite sure so far as every Group and Party in this House is concerned, there is this fixed determination on our part to see that this outpost of Portugal in India must be freed, must be liberated, and that no foreign power should ever be allowed to have any kind of outpost in India.

We have recently, in the last few months, relaxed some of our rules, because we felt that they were bearing down rather heavily on the people of Goa, and we did not want them to suffer, in so far as we could help. Of course, we are not fighting those people. Therefore, as a result of experience, and on compassionate ground, we have relaxed some of those rules. We are continually watching the position and if we think that some other rule has to be relaxed so as to bring some comfort to the people of Goa, we shall do so.

We believe, and I should like to repeat it, we believe in conducting this affair in a peaceful way. We do not want violence, sporadic or other. And it is not merely a question of some high theory or moral approach to this problem, but the very practical approach. Because, Goa may be a very small part, a corner, of India; and Portugal is not considered, obviously, among the Great Powers of the world. But the fact is that all these things get tied up with other international questions. You cannot separate it, and any approach of violence is not a violence limited to that particular issue but is likely to spread and likely to entangle us in all kinds of difficulties. Therefore, even from the point of view, if you like, of narrow practical reasons, we have to do that.

Now, we have been greatly interested in the disarmament, in the efforts made for disarmament. And perhaps this House will remember that it was at our suggestion that the Disarmament Sub-Committee of the U.N. was formed, that is as a result of India's initiative in the General Assembly in 1953. Last year we suggested in the U.N. some initial steps for this purpose. These steps were, firstly, that experimental explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear bombs should be suspended pending their abandonment; secondly, there should be at least total dismantling of some bombs—at least of some bombs—and thus a reversal of the process of piling them up; thirdly, the parties concerned should publicly declare to the United Nations and to the world their willingness not to manufacture any more of these dreadful weapons; and fourthly, military budgets should be published in all countries, no further expansion of military strength should be made and any possible reduction should be immediately effected. These were our suggestions.

It is true that any real settlement about disarmament will have to be a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

comprehensive one. You cannot have it in one corner and leave the other free. But it is equally true that, I think, it is better to have a comprehensive agreement or none at all instead of simply making it difficult to have another agreement. The fact that you have a partial agreement does not rule the comprehensive agreement; it is a step to that; it produces the atmosphere and the confidence to go further. Therefore, we have always suggested that a partial agreement is better than no agreement, provided that is a step towards the larger agreement.

Another thing is that if any agreement on disarmament is tied up with political issues, then we are likely to solve neither the political issue, nor the disarmament issue. Disarmament must be considered separately. Now, we find an extraordinary state of affairs in regard to arms. All kinds of new horrible weapons are coming out one after the other and unless all wisdom has left humanity, some way out has to be found.

I should like, and I am sure the House will agree with me, to welcome the advent of the new independent State of Malaya which came into being day before yesterday. We welcome it for a variety of reasons. We welcome it because this is one more step, slowly and laboriously taken, in freeing Asia, or partly freeing Asia, from foreign control. We welcome it because Malaya is a country which has thousands of years of association with India. Even now, if you go to Malaya like the other places in South East Asia, you will find evidence of India or Indian culture all over the place. And in the past few years also our friendship and co-operation in some matters have grown. Now, that is a good thing, Malaya joining the ranks of independent nations, just like Ghana joining them some months previously.

But we have to remember that there are many other countries still struggling for freedom and the one which comes foremost in this connection is that of Algeria, which has suffered

tremendously in the past two-three years—everybody has suffered at that—in that internecine war. I had always a great deal of admiration for the French nation and the French people, for the past history, struggle for freedom, for their tremendous brilliance and I do earnestly hope that the French people and the French Government will get out of this country, getting out of it by accepting the full freedom of Algeria.

This matter came up last year in the United Nations and will come up again, I suppose. Naturally, we stand for their freedom. What else can we stand for? That does not mean that we are against France or anybody. We are not. But we are for the freedom of Algeria, as we are for the freedom of other countries.

One thing more before I end. I referred to the political aspect of the Kashmir problem. At the present moment, Kashmir is experiencing something which is quite unprecedented in its long history—the new floods that have come there which are tremendous and colossal. So I beg to ask leave of absence for tomorrow and day after from the House to go to Kashmir and I hope—and I am sure you will permit me—to convey to them the feelings of this House, the anxious concern of this House and the assurance of this House that we shall be most helpful. Sir, I move.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion is before the House: I have received two notices of amendments from Shri Jaganatha Rao and Shri Raghunath Singh. Shri Raghunath Singh seems to have introduced a number of extraneous matters there. They may now be moved.

**Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput):** I beg to move:

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

“This House having considered the present International situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, fully agrees with and approves the said policy.”

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** I beg to move:

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

“This House having considered the present International situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the encirclement policy of Asia by the interested powers of the world and the creation of naval bases in Indian Ocean and air bases in foreign territory is leading the world towards a third World War, suicidal race of armament and deteriorating peaceful atmosphere of the World.”

**Mr. Speaker:** Now both the motion as well as the amendments are before the House. A number of hon. Members some 20 or 25 have sent their names to me. I therefore, request hon. Members to be brief and confine their remarks to 15 minutes. The leaders of groups, if necessary, will get 10 minutes more.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central):** Mr. Speaker, our debate today is being held at a crucial moment and it takes on an added importance on account of two special circumstances to which the Prime Minister has already made reference. The first is that in a short while the United Nations General Assembly is going to meet and the second is that Malaya has just celebrated the achievement of her Merdeka.

Dark clouds are looming today on the world horizon, particularly with reference to the Arab countries and their freedom and I do wish that the Prime Minister had given us a little more material about the position in that area of the world I say this Sir, because I feel that today particularly it is very urgent that at the United Nations and elsewhere India pulls her weight which, morally at any rate, is formidable. But before I deal with it, I should like to say a few words about Malaya.

We greet the people of Malaya on their freedom and every party and group in this House associates itself

with the sentiments given expression to by the Prime Minister. We wish the Malaya people every success. We are happy that imperialism has been compelled to lose another of its strongholds on Asian soil. And we recall with pride, at the same time, that such defeats of imperialism have always been brought about by the compulsive power of the peoples' resurgence. I feel that we ought to say in this House that it is a wrong reading of history if one thinks that British imperialism, for example, which has just conceded some kind of independence to Malaya, is of a special brand, resilient and wise, parting with power gracefully and willingly to subject peoples. But British imperialism has no intrinsic leaning to the broadening of freedom. On the contrary, it withdraws only when it must and it exacts a price as heavy as it can make it and it keeps to itself whatever it can. When power was transferred, for example, to India and Pakistan, it was not a voluntary and honourable abdication, but an unwilling gesture extracted by our peoples' massive and multi-form upsurge and heavily paid for by partition and its concomitant agonies, a price certainly no less heavy than the price paid by revolutions in many another country.

Malaya today has come into her own principally because her people, Malays, Chinese and Indians all together, have shown for nearly a decade a spirit of relentless struggle. They have shown that they would not suffer imperialist rule any longer. Such people have been branded as bandits by scribes of reaction, and in Malaya many of them continue now to be outlawed.

Whoever cares for freedom and progress in Malaya and elsewhere cannot be blind to the fact that Singapore remains still a centre of British bases in this part of the world. The leaders of the Government in Malaya have agreed that British troops, reinforced by Gorkha recruits who are transported across India, should continue to be stationed. On the 20th August, Mr. Duncan Sandys, one of

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Her Britannic Majesty's Ministers, spoke in Australia of the role in Malaya of British and Australian forces after Malaya's independence, and he announced that numerical diminution will be more than made up by more potent tactical atomic weapon units. The Reuter report uses these words: more potent tactical atomic weapon units.

It is this context of things which our friends in Malaya, naturally rejoicing in newly won freedom, should not forget that, if Malaya with her natural resources and her strategic position is not to be a limb of an imperialist apparatus intended to dominate the Indian Ocean area. Malaya must go ahead with popular and progressive policies. The Malayan Communist Party, for example, whose legalisation has been asked for by the trade union movement there and other forces, should be enabled to function in the open and Malaya will play her rightful role in the Asian fraternity of freedom-living peoples.

More than ever today Asia and Africa cannot remain complacent. Apart from the Middle East which remains a power keg, which imperialist greed and folly may ignite at any moment, there are disquieting reports about the United States trying to turn South Korea into a guided missile base for another war, equipping U.S. occupying troops in Taiwan with atomic tactical bombs as warheads and violating the armistice terms in Indo-China. They all hang together and are a menace to freedom and peace in the Asian continent.

The position is grave particularly in regard to Syria and the Arab countries, for a fantastic fib, a fairy tale of Syria having gone Communist—I wish it had done so, but as a matter of fact, it has not—is made the basis of NATO Council meetings and open United States conspiracy to overthrow the Syrian Government in

pursuance of the notorious Eisenhower doctrine. Mr. Loy Henderson shuttles back and forth between Turkey and the Lebanon, Iraq and Jordan, the idea being to encircle and strangulate Syria which, with Egypt, has given voice and force to Arab aspirations. This is not something which I am kind of manufacturing. Statements have been made by the Foreign Minister of Syria himself which emphasize the point which I am making.

Meanwhile Britain has been having her little war in Muscat and Oman—just completed it, but I do not know how long its aftermath will continue. And she has followed it up by aggressive air attacks on the territory of Yemen, the reason being that with Aden as her base, which Britain, being such a very resilient and honourable imperialism, can never, never give up, she must sprawl more firmly into the oil areas regions of the Persian Gulf region. Anglo-American antagonism in this region sometimes peeps through the squalor, but the imperialists have their overall agreements and plan. From this segment of the Arab world, therefore, right up to Algeria where French atrocities continue, there is a concerted drive to suppress freedom and all struggle for it. And so it is that the United States has joined the Military Committee of the Baghdad Pact, and the whole pack of reaction threatens peace and freedom in the Arab world.

It is in this situation that India, as a moral leader of the Afro-Asian countries, should take some real initiative. We have asked for a U.N. debate on South African ill-treatment of people of Indian origin and we should, I emphasize this, together with other Afro-Asian countries, urge discussion of the British aggression in Muscat and Oman and also in Yemen. We should make it a point to focus attention on the evil machinations over Syria and the shooting war on the people in Algeria.

Apart from India's traditional concern for freedom in the former colonial and semi-colonial countries, it is imperative for us to counteract the ugly effort which is being made by Pakistan to exploit the feeling of Islamic brotherhood against India over the issue, for example, of Kashmir. On this issue the whole country is united behind the Prime Minister, but Pakistan is following certain policies which have got to be counteracted, and this talk about the freemasonry of Islamic countries has already begun to be exploited concretely by the Government of Pakistan. It is disquieting, for example, to learn from the *Statesman*, New Delhi edition of the 27th August, that early this year Morocco and Tunisia, for whose freedom India had raised her voice so stridently, had written to us critically over our Kashmir policy. This is the first fruit of Pakistani propaganda which unhappily is much more efficient than ours abroad. But it is not only in India's interests, but in the interests of all Afro-Asian countries, that we stress heavily the principles of the Bandung conference, and in the United Nations and elsewhere we struggle to safeguard and develop the freedom of our respective countries.

I am sorry to have to say that it was mystifying and also to a certain extent mortifying when we found our Prime Minister rather soft-pedalling on the question of Oman, as he has done earlier on such questions as Kenya and Cyprus. May be, as the Prime Minister said in the other House, the Treaty of Sib dated 1920 is a particularly confusing and equivocal document, but surely British action in Muscat and Oman was by no means equivocal and it deserved full-throated condemnation. I do not agree to the point of view, if that is expressed, that merely by a full-throated condemnation we let off a lot of steam but we produce no results. I do not agree with that at all. On the contrary, there come occasions particularly if these events happen in an area so contiguous to ourselves.

The Persian Gulf area is much more vital to us than it can conceivably be to Britain. Something certainly ought to have been done, and our condemnation should have been much more full-throated. It should not have been somewhat tepid and vacillating. The Prime Minister, of course, did express disapproval, but there was a kind of tepidness about it, there was a kind of go-slow about it which, at least on this occasion, was not called for at all. Let us make up for it in the United Nations by bringing up the Oman issue and the Yemen issue also before that body, and let us actively consult our Afro-Asian friends for convoking a second Bandung conference. It is about time. We find from this end of Asia to the other, from Singapore, from Indo-China, from Korea up to West Asia and North Africa imperialism's preparations are very much going ahead. At this point of time particularly we should try to have another session of the conference which was envisaged at Bandung some time ago.

The coming session of the U.N. Assembly requires of us the utmost possible effort towards ending the deadlock in the disarmament negotiations to which the Prime Minister has already made reference. If the Western Powers had agreed to India's proposal for a stand-still in regard to test explosions, a proposal which the Soviet Union had unqualifiedly accepted, if this proposal which emanated from India had been accepted, then this inter-continental ballistic missile, or whatever it is, could not have been wanted, would not have been perfected.

13 hrs.

Sir, I say it is a good thing for the world that this missile has been perfected first of all in a socialist country, because that socialist country does not proclaim to the world that it is going to destroy other countries, because of its military might. That socialist country has every time proposed that it is willing here and now to ban all test explosions and to ban the use of all kinds of nuclear

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

and thermo-nuclear weapons and all things of that kind. That is why it is a good thing that this missile has been perfected first of all not in a capitalist socialist country. The Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed its support to the idea of banning all nuclear weapons and unconditionally stopping test explosions. Then, we really cannot blame the Soviet Union for advancing in nuclear research, because the Western imperialist powers talk always in terms of global deterrents.

I was reading in the Parliament Library only the other day reviews of a book which is allegedly considered in very high quarters in the United States as of being very great importance and that book says that for the time being we need not fight shy of a little war you can use tactical atomic weapons here and there and later on we can see what happens. This is the kind of thing which is going on. They are talking about a great deterrent; they are flaunting the idea of nuclear superiority. They do not hesitate to start a shooting war, may be a little shooting war, but they are bad enough for the world.

In places like Algeria and elsewhere they do not hesitate to equip their occupying forces in strategic areas with tactical atomic weapons. They generally do not hesitate to try to intimidate socialist countries into submission; they do not hesitate to try to resume their former imperialist position. It is against this menace that willy-nilly the socialist countries have to fortify themselves, but they are willing all the time for a total ban on nuclear warfare and a complete stoppage of test explosions.

Last month a World Conference against Nuclear Warfare was held in Tokyo and it does not need saying that the peoples of the world, in every country of every persuasion political, religious, economic or any other, want to be rid of this enormity and this haunting fear. Now, therefore, more than ever it is necessary for us to raise our voice.

After all, last session in this House the Minister for Defence moved a resolution which we passed unanimously in regard to this subject and though we may be charged as fatuous moral crusaders we should not shirk what is clearly our duty and our responsibility.

Nearer home, I am happy that the situation in Nagaland shows qualitative change for the better and I wish Government pursues the ways that will lead to peace in that part of our country. In regard to Pondicherry, the French Government however seems much too busy suppressing Algeria to conclude the *de jure* transfer, but they should be asked to hurry up. About the Portuguese enclaves, whence comes news of regular violation of our territory and beatings up and killings of Goan patriots the less said the better. The Prime Minister has referred to it, but, Sir, it is a very queer thing that this festering sore should persist and now with Pakistan and NATO and Baghdad Pacts and all sorts of other enormities in the offing, this festering sore is developing into a gangrene.

The other day we saw in the papers an interesting statement purporting to emanate from our friend, the hon. the Minister for Defence, who is reported to have made a suggestion that we should appeal to the United Kingdom, the United States and France in order that Portugal may let go of her hold on Goa on our soil. I cannot quite appreciate this statement in the bald form in which it has come, because I cannot quite believe that the Minister made an appeal to the United Kingdom and the United States for intervention on our behalf in regard to Goa. It is clear that the hint of a whisper of a suggestion from the United Kingdom to Portugal would do the trick. It could have happened just like that, but it has not come.

On the contrary, Britain sends her queen on a friendly visit to Lisbon

and when even our Congress Press gets angry over it, the Prime Minister, who is a stickler for protocol and for chivalry, snubs them like anything. This perhaps is the price of our being Members of the British Commonwealth. As I say these two words "British Commonwealth" I fear I shall be told that the inevitable rabbit is springing out of our metaphorical hat. But there is reason for it. We have so often spoken of it and I shall not elaborate. But surely it is more than time for us to examine carefully, not in the sort of airy manner in which we sometimes discuss things in this House; we should examine carefully whether we really gain by Commonwealth membership or not.

After all soon after the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference concluded the Oman attack took place without even a syllable about it having been confided to our Prime Minister. It was not only an attack on Asian freedom but at the same time it was something like a slap in the face for Commonwealth Countries which have interests in the Persian Gulf region. In 1949 some of our friends here who were Members of the Constituent Assembly seriously discussed the *pros and cons* of Commonwealth membership. The Prime Minister on that occasion supported it on the ground of its being a profitable business and at the same time good on moral grounds. He said that at any time we could break the Commonwealth link, if we wanted to. I do not ask Government to do anything in a huff. I do not say: leave the Commonwealth tomorrow. If that could be done, if the situation in the country warranted that kind of action, I would have been happy. But the objective situation in the country does not warrant it. I do not say, therefore, to Government to leave the Commonwealth tomorrow, or to do it in a huff. I do not say that. But it is time that real thought is given to this matter, and not in the airy way of discussion across the table which we are going to have now.

We have to ask ourselves whether politically, economically, culturally or in any other fashion, we are gaining by it. Britain is egging on Pakistan against us, Britain is egging on Portugal against us. Britain is the prime-mover, the chief culprit, the head of the gang as far as Baghdad Pact and SEATO is concerned. There is no doubt about it. Britain is doing all these things with impunity. Politically we do not gain; Britain does not lift her little finger to help us. The Prime Minister knows it very well; the Defence Minister who has been our High Commissioner in the United Kingdom knows it very well. Britain has not ever cared voluntarily to lift her little finger to help us economically. Today our foreign exchange position is bad. But Britain says that her sterling position is not particularly satisfactory. Has any single suggestion yet emanated from Britain in order to help improve our economic condition?

The Prime Minister was in Britain only the other day, and all the British papers almost without exception seemed to be gloating over the fact that India was finding herself in hot water according to their computation in regard to the working of the Plan. That is the attitude they adopt. In regard to supply of capital goods to our country it was only after countries like the Soviet Union and West Germany agreed to help us in regard to the setting up of steel works that Britain came forward with some kind of tardy assistance.

Now our foreign exchange position is bad. Does Britain ever make a suggestion that she is ready for a moratorium on the export of foreign profits from India to Britain? We have not suggested it. The Finance Minister was angry with me the other day and said we observed all the minute forms of international economic ethics. It is all very good. But have we got from Britain the slightest gesture of friendship in regard to helping us over our economic position?

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

In regard to our cultural position, we have been fighting for this India Office Library being returned. In 1956 a question was asked: what has happened to our request for the return of the India Office Library? Government say: Britain does not say anything. The other day there was a question asked in the last session in May: "what has happened about the India Office Library. Britain has not chosen to give us a reply. What is all this. There must be an end to this kind of thing.

I know that some of us have a soft corner for countries like Britain. Personally speaking, I do have a soft corner for countries like Britain and France. But that is neither here nor there. It is important for us to realise that if our country is going to progress, then surely it is necessary for us to break away from this tie-up which is inhibiting us.

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

13-10 hrs.

There are difficulties, but let us try and find out what those difficulties are. Let us try to find out the *pros and cons* of the situation. Let us weigh the difficulties on one side and the advantages on the other.

The Prime Minister, long years ago when he used to inspire the people all over the country, said that we wanted complete independence not merely as a political gesture, we wanted complete independence not merely to show that we wanted our freedom to be absolutely whole, but because we wanted a break-away from our own old moorings of thought and action. Something like that is wanted today when our Plan is in operation, when we are facing difficulties in regard to the Plan.

It is not by appeals to the U. K. or the U.S.A. that we shall get them to help us over Goa, as the Defence Minister is reported to have said; it is not by appeals to imperialist

powers that we are going to get assistance from them in regard to the execution of our Plan projects; it is by relying upon our own people, it is by remembering that the greatest capital a country possesses is its people; it is by relying on the force of our people; it is by lighting that glow of enthusiasm in the hearts of our people, of which the Prime Minister spoke so wonderfully in early years, it is by that process alone that we can solve the problems that confront us, problems at home and abroad.

It is in that perspective, therefore, that I wish the Prime Minister to apply his mind to problems in the country and problems in relations to the international situation.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do confess to a feeling of admiration for my hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee's elopuence. Therefore, it is not a pleasant thing for me to have to try and answer some of his arguments. But that duty compels me, and I find myself in disagreement with the one and the only strong point of criticism that he has sought to make of the foreign policy that is being pursued by our Prime Minister—and that is in regard to our membership of the Commonwealth.

I wish to assure him, his Party as well as other Members of this House, that so far as I am concerned, I have no soft corner, as he seems to have—I do not know whether he is making any distinction between the British Government and the British people; I have no soft corner for the British Government. Certainly, we all have soft corners for the British people, as we have soft corners for the peoples of all nations in this world. I am certainly not very enthusiastic about our membership of this Commonwealth. I am sure if the British people or anyone on their behalf were to go incognito in this country, to any part of this country, and interview any cross-section of our people, they would find

many people not in favour of continuing this Commonwealth tie. Nevertheless, our Prime Minister, in whom we have faith, in whom the great majority of our people have placed their faith during the last elections, who is expected to know more than any one of us, including individual Ministers in the Cabinet, in regard to the international situation in relation to India, wants us to continue this bond with this Commonwealth for sometime longer, and I am prepared—and I am sure the people in this country are also prepared—to repose our faith in his wisdom and his decision. It is in that manner that I offer my justification for my own support to this Commonwealth link.

I am also of the opinion, along with many other Members, that the Commonwealth, especially England, has not been very friendly towards us in many things in the international situation during the last ten years. Indeed, the very manner in which India was accorded her independence could not be speak of too much goodwill towards India. We would not have had this Kashmir trouble if it had not been for that unwanted partition that was inflicted upon us. We accepted this partition as a kind of price that we had to pay for the freedom that we were to enjoy at the time that we got it. But we did not bargain for the Kashmir trouble. When the Kashmir aggression took place and Pakistan troops rushed into India and we of our own accord made our appeal to the United Nations to see that Pakistan was prevented from continuing to give assistance to those raiders on Kashmir, we knew—we know now—how the United Kingdom Government had behaved. And at that it was a socialist Government that was in power.

Therefore, we could not be expected to be so very happy and so very enthusiastic about this Commonwealth link. Even today, in all the things that are happening in the western countries of Asia, in the recent aggression that had taken place in those small areas of Arabia, the role that

England has been playing is something which is not to the taste of India, to say the least about it.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, wanted to take our Prime Minister to task for soft-peddalling. The Prime Minister has certainly condemned it. He has expressed the opinion of this country against it. We have to be more than satisfied with that. The Prime Minister had expressed himself too strongly, as many on the other side of this House had felt. On an earlier occasion, when worse things had happened in Hungary, nevertheless, at that time the Prime Minister thought that he was voicing the conscience of India. Similarly, he voiced the conscience of India when England and France carried on their aggression on Egypt. Therefore, why find fault with our Prime Minister over this latest aggression that had taken place? As the Prime Minister had stated, the position was confusing. There were all sorts of treaties under which England was supposed to have the right or the duty to intervene there. Therefore, all that could be said and all that could be done had been said and done by our Prime Minister so far as that particular position was concerned.

We are not very enthusiastic about the Commonwealth tie; nevertheless, we would prefer to accept the wisdom and advice, and also the policy of our Prime Minister in regard to this. I trust that Great Britain, and all those who are responsible for the framing of our policy, would take hint from this expression of opinion of a private Member belonging to this House; it does not matter to which particular political party he belongs. I think I have voiced my reaction and that of our own people in regard to this matter.

Secondly, I am extremely unhappy about the role that the USA has been playing. So many friends in this country have been finding fault with the Defence Minister and also the Prime Minister for having been so very soft towards the USSR and all

[Shri Ranga]

those other countries which are associated with them; similarly our friends here from the Communist Party are angry with them because they are supposed to be soft towards the U.S.A. England and all those other countries associated with them. I am sure—and I think I speak for large numbers of people in this country—different sections—that almost the same set of people go on making both these accusations against our Prime Minister. One moment, they accuse him of leaning too much towards the USSR....

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** We always want to be soft with everybody.

**Shri Ranga:** Another moment, the same people accuse him again of leaning too much towards the U.K. and U.S.A. Actually the position is this; if they are leaning towards anybody at all, I am convinced about one thing, that they lean towards India, that they are loyal towards India, and it is in the interest of India that I consider they have been taking any particular stand that they have taken during the last ten years on any one of those issues that came up for discussion at the UNO and also at other forums.

Having said that, I would like to warn the U.S.A. that although she has been giving us a tremendous lot of economic assistance, she has, on the other hand, contributed to the un-settlement of things, to the upsetting of political situation, to the un-settlement of political balance of power in this part of the world and India has been obliged to spend very much more than what she has been able to get as economic aid either from the United States or from the United Kingdom or from all the other countries in the world on her Defence. Our Defence Budget has been swelling.

I remember those days—I recall those days—and those discussions which we used to have from these benches as against the British Government that they were spending over too much on our Defence Forces, as much as 50 per cent and sometimes

more. We are doing more or less the same today. All these 10 years, as independent India, we have been anxious to reduce it and in spite of that we have not been able to reduce this proportion of the total national revenues that we have had to spare for our Defence Forces. Why, Sir?

It is not because we are war-mongers. We have no designs against any other country. We have gone out of our way to repeatedly make an offer to Pakistan our neighbour of a no war proposal, that we would not go to war against them and let them also say that they are not prepared to go to war against us. It is Pakistan who refused to give the proper response.

In spite of all these things, we have been obliged to spend these funds, precious funds because we are now engaged in the implementation of our Five Year Plan. We want every rupee for that. We are prepared to tax ourselves to the teeth. More than Rs. 100 crores of additional taxation has been imposed on our own people. We have done it willingly but all the same bleeding in our hearts because we are unable to pay all this money. We want to raise more money and all this money we would like to utilise. As Eisenhower at one time had said in support of his own proposal for disarmament and all the rest of it, we want to use it for peaceful purposes, for more schools in our towns and villages, for hospitals in those distant hills and valleys where masses and masses of people have not been reached by modern medical assistance. We want to introduce compulsory elementary education. We want to satisfy the condition laid down in our own Constitution that we should introduce compulsory elementary education within 10 years after the coming into force of the Constitution.

We have not been able to implement it. We want this money and yet we are obliged to spare all this money for Defence. We started with Rs. 107 crores in 1946 and we are prepared to

spare this year Rs. 252 crores. Wherefrom are we to get all this money? We are getting it. Why? Because of the SEATO Pact and the Baghdad Pact, because of the U.S.A. and Pakistan Pact, because of the unsettlement that the United States, according to me in their unwisdom have created, in their zeal, and not in warmongering but in their political foolishness they have created.

Because of that Pakistan and her unwise leaders have begun to talk of going to war with India. They are not ashamed to talk of *jihad*. In these days of the United Nations and the talk of disarmament and so on, one would think that the responsible leaders of a great nation like Pakistan would be unwilling to mouth this word *jihad*, they would be ashamed of using it especially when they happen to be on a military pact with U.S.A.

Sir, I am not prepared to blame Pakistan so much as I am prepared to blame the United States of America. They have been angry, many of their newspapers as well as their statesmen are angry that our Defence Minister expressed himself rather strongly. They do not know how much more strongly our people are feeling here in this country. I for one who feel so very much for the speed with which we should raise the economic and social developmental level or our own masses feel so strongly and so bitterly that because of this unsettlement want only brought about by the United States of America, in spite of repeated protests made by this Parliament and also by our Prime Minister, all this money we are obliged to waste on our Defence Forces.

There is disarmament and all the talk about it. We hope that these disarmament talks would succeed. As our Prime Minister reminded us, it was at the initiative of India that these disarmament talks had begun. We want them to succeed. But, is there much of a chance?

My friend is prepared not to be so much dissatisfied with U.S.S.R. having

certainly discovered this new weapon. I am not prepared to trust any country, any nation with such a dangerous weapon, whether it is U.S.S.R. or U.S.A. The other day we were so much against England going on with these tests and indulging in them. There is in this country universal feeling against these tests. Now, has Soviet Russia given not notice that she is going to make any test. She simply does it; that is all. Now, are we to accept this *fait accompli*?

As our Prime Minister reminded the whole world today it does not take a very long time before a weapon equally strong or may be stronger than this to be discovered. The race goes on. But people would not be so foolish to go on with this race of production. World opinion would not be so very foolish, undignified and barbaric as to think of the total annihilation of the whole human race. But yet they are carrying on this race.

What is there behind it? My fear is, whatever may be behind it, in the meanwhile during these five years of cold war—I do not know how long it is going to last—small nations like us—we may be big in population and size and in our moral courage and moral stature, but from the point of view of power we are small nations—small nations go on suffering because of their economic and social development being retarded. These people suffer from this pall of fear that any day all these strenuous efforts that we are putting out on these great multi-purpose projects which we are building can come to nothing at all, can come to be blown up. All our efforts honestly and sincerely made in our country at terrible sacrifice may all be torn to pieces. That is the fear that the United States and the U.S.S.R. and all these great nations and their satellites today are responsible for

I accuse them for this cold war; I accuse them for this terrible sense of frustration that they are creating. They are responsible for this fear which is eating into the very vitals of millions and millions of people all

[Shri Ranga]

over the world. Therefore, I sincerely hope that they would heed the voice of our Prime Minister.

My hon. friend, one of the leaders of the communist party was good enough to say that India enjoys a very high moral stature today in the world. I attribute it very largely to our Prime Minister. I am proud of it because he happens to be our national leader chosen by the electorate. When would this moral stature be of much use? It is, I agree, used in our country. Will it come to be used in the rest of the world? It will be only when the leaders of these so-called powerful nations come to recognise it. If they do not recognise it, they do so at their peril. That is the voice, as far as I can see, of every self-respecting, every freedom-loving Indian and I sincerely hope that the peoples of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. would heed this voice and would listen to our Prime Minister.

He was hard put to it today to say to the whole world that is mere business, more opportunist politics to go for peace. It is simple truth. We should be all peaceable; we should live now-a-days as nation with nation, individual with individual and society with society peacefully. Such a simple truth has to be said today. And how? In a kind of begging fashion. Please, for God's sake, listen to this voice of reason. It is only opportunism; even if you want opportunism from an opportunistic point of view, it is better than war. This is a slogan. This slogan, I am sure, in a very few months would begin to reverberate all over the world, that peace is better than war from an opportunistic point of view, from a human point of view, from the point of view of the perpetuation and the continuation of the development of civilization that has come to us down the generations, down all these generations from Buddha to Mahatma Gandhi. Sir, I have done.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda):  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, events have

moved as rapidly since India attained her independence that we are apt to forget that it was only ten years ago that we got the freedom to mould our own policies, internal or international. In these intervening years many other countries have also become free and today, this morning, the Prime Minister mentioned, and this House supported, the welcome to Malaya as the newest nation which has emerged into freedom.

How has India moulded her foreign policy in these years? There was a time, I remember, in this very House in earlier years, when many scoffed and railed against it and said things, particularly regarding this issue that has been brought up by Shri H. N. Mukerjee, about remaining in the Commonwealth. They said and thought that if we remain in the Commonwealth, an independent foreign policy, our independence in the country itself would not really be a possibility. I think we have shown that this is not true. The foreign policy of India has been so carried out that there is nobody who can say that India being a member of the Commonwealth does not follow the objectives for which she stands and shape her own policy.

Some years back, in 1949, when I was going via England to the United Nations as a delegate I met my old Professor—Professor Harold Laski. This is what he said only two years after India had attained independence:

"May be, you have many ills, many things you have to do; but you are in one aspect the most fortunate country in the whole world, for you are the only country in the world who has at the helm of its affairs not only a man who is an outstanding statesman comparable to the best in the world, but a man of rare vision, and imagination and, therefore, it is from India that we expect the stand, an objective stand to help weaker nations, to bring better understanding in the world."

If he were alive today, I am sure, he would acknowledge that what he had expected of India was not belied. I think that in these few years, to the extent possible, on many questions, in spite of the fact that we have no arms and armaments and nuclear weapons, India has had a soothing influence when tensions were high and has helped those who have struggled and have now won their freedom.

It is true that ticklish problems mainly remain and are charged with dynamite. Such problems the Prime Minister has referred to this morning. I do not want to reiterate those things except to say one thing, that it is strange that my hon. friend Shri Mukerjee when he spoke was able to support certain actions whereas similar actions on other sides he cannot support.

In Western Asia at present it is the vying between the power blocs that has brought the situation to such a pass. It is no use seeing merely one side and not the other, and it is in a humble way that India has been trying to bring this before the world. The Panch Sheela doctrine over which she has taken a leading part has been enunciated by many nations and when it is implemented we shall be able to get out of much that takes place even today.

Sir, in the ultimate analysis, India's policy must be judged by the manner in which she deals with those problems which affect her own vital interests. First of all, as the Prime Minister mentioned today, there is the subject of Goa and other foreign settlements in India. How did we tackle the problem with France? These were small areas which India could have easily taken over, but through peaceful negotiations she has come to an agreement with France. What about Goa? That is a problem which everyone is thinking about. It is natural that the passions of the people are roused in this matter. It is natural, and with the provocation that

lingering remnants of brutal imperialism bring in Goa, we should all feel agitated. But, nevertheless, what is the policy that India has followed? It is not a policy of appeasement. Of course, there are some people who say that it is a policy of appeasement. It is not that. It is that, believing essentially in the doctrine of non-violence, believing essentially that so far as it is possible we must try to come to agreement on a mutually satisfactory way, for ten long years she has waited. And, as the Prime Minister said today, Goa is really a part of India. Although it may be that we are still leaving the path of negotiation open, it does not mean that our determination is weakened in any manner.

Now I want to turn to Pakistan where India has shown the greatest amount of forbearance. A great deal is talked about Kashmir. As the Prime Minister said, Kashmir where Pakistan was the aggressor seems to be lost sight of. That is the most important part of the issue which is lost sight of. Is it deliberate, I ask, because we do not join the military pacts such as SEATO or Baghdad, or is it for any other reason that this Kashmir is raised as a question again and again, and truth is distorted in this way.

I should like to say that there is another issue in the relationship between Pakistan and India which needs to be raised. I do not understand why the world outside, which is so concerned about Kashmir where Pakistan has been the aggressor, does not ever think of concerning itself about the treatment of minorities in the two countries, does not ever think of the fact that year after year, month after month and day after day, people have to flee from Eastern Pakistan to India for shelter and succour. Is that not an issue which the world outside should think about? Some people say, and to some extent it may be true, that, perhaps, our propaganda machinery in this matter has not been as vigilant as it should have been. May be, to some extent

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

that is true, but it is surprising that this matter is never referred to by even those countries who know much about it.

In 1950-51 the Nehru-Liaquat Pact was signed at a time when some disturbances had taken place. There were some Muslims who left India at that time. But each one of them, practically everyone of them, who left India has come back and the Pact has been honoured by India. Has any single Hindu been able to go back to Pakistan, or, is it not that the numbers are more than double and treble of those who have come over here? It is a very important issue, because, today when India faces difficult situations as Shri Ranga was talking about, when we have to develop our country, we have to make arrangements for this fleeting population who have come to India, and give them succour, shelter, and there is no finish to it. Is it not time that Pakistan should be asked either to make such arrangements in her own country that the minorities can live there in safety and honour or to find from her own resources, the funds and that the land that are required for the rehabilitation of those who are sent out to India? It is not an unknown fact and I think the people of East Pakistan know this—that this exodus of the minorities is continuing because of the policy that the Bengali-speaking population of Pakistan must be reduced. That is one of the factors which has its play today. Why is there no election as yet in Pakistan? There will be elections only when West Pakistan is in a majority over East Pakistan. These are the internal problems of Pakistan itself. But, so far as India is concerned, it is a fact that when we are hard pressed for funds, when we have to raise taxes even from those elements of society who find it difficult to pay, when we have to build a nation anew and when we have teeming millions of our own, we have to make provision not only for those who have come over here but we have got to make

provision for future years for those who are yet to come. Surely, the time has come when this cannot be tolerated. The international world must take it up. Many people are not aware that today India pays for her refugees out of her own resources. There are people who come and say "Oh, you get your resources from the UNO, don't you? —or from some other place". They are not aware that nearly 300 crores have been spent by India herself on the rehabilitation of persons who have been deliberately squeezed out of Pakistan. This matter, I think, needs much more attention than the *fait accompli* like Kashmir where people have decided for themselves through two General Elections and yet this is brought up in the international world time and again. The truth, as I said, is distorted and yet there has not been concern over this problem of minorities' treatment in Pakistan. I would like this House, this country to realise this and I think that it is necessary that this should be brought forcibly before world opinion.

I know that difficulties would face a country that keeps to its objectives, that practises what it preaches. There are great difficulties. Our position is apt to be misrepresented. Sometimes, it is misunderstood and sometimes deliberately misunderstood by many countries, because we have not joined any power bloc, because we keep out of military alliances, as I said before. Is this the reason for this kind of treatment of India? It is strange, and I cannot help referring to it. The history and traditions of the United States—the earlier history—was an inspiration to people in other lands, people struggling for freedom at one time. I cannot understand that this nation which followed a complete isolationist policy through all the years, till practically 1917-18, should not be able to understand India.

First of all, India is free in the modern world where isolation is not possible. But surely if she announces and practises this—that each nation should be left to develop according to

its own desires, that no strings should be attached, that should be understood by people who found their freedom and established it for themselves by keeping themselves entirely aloof. Surely, whichever power bloc is concerned, these nations should understand the stand that India is taking today.

Before I conclude, there is one matter to which I would like to refer. It is rather a sad matter, I think, in a way. Everybody in this world of nations, says that they do not want this experimentation in nuclear weapons to go on, that is something terrible and dreadful. That is true. That is the feeling of the people of all countries, and yet, what do we find? A volume of literature, for instance, from different women's organisations belonging to one power bloc or the other is sent out. Scores of pamphlets are distributed telling us to join them in the issue of supporting a stand where peace can prevail. Yet each one of these pamphlets depending on which power bloc countries these organisations belong accuse and place the guilt on the other. Is this a stand that can help to bring about the stoppage of nuclear experimentation? Is that a stand that can stop warfare in the world? I would appeal through this House to the people of all countries and more especially those belonging to the countries who go in for nuclear experimentation that they should bring pressure on their own countries to stop this. It is that way only that it can be done. It is time that national frontiers and power block frontiers should be over-ridden by men and more especially by women who are the mothers of the race and they should try to bring pressure on every Government that goes on with this experimentation, so that they may stop that experimentation and support the stand that India has taken in this matter led by our Prime Minister—the first lieutenant of Gandhiji. It is in all humility that I say this. I do not say that India is better than other countries. It is not, I am sure, its people are the same

as those of other countries, but there is no doubt that the stand that we have taken in international affairs is one which all right thinking people will support and which is the only that can prevent destruction of mankind and can bring peace and tranquility in the world.

With these words, I support the motion.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I begin with the directive principle of State policy. In article 51 of the Constitution, the chapter on Directive Principles of State Policy—it is said as follows:

“The State shall endeavour to—

- (a) promote international peace and security;
- (b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations;
- (c) foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another; and
- (d) encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration.”

These are abstract principles and they constitute, in a sense, our foreign policy. Now then, this policy of non-alignment is a most welcome thing for a newly emerging nation. That was the case in the United States of America as well. But, at the same time, our foreign policy, which started with a bang, is now thinning into a dim whimper, because we profess too much and we profess almost vaguely on the idealistic plane. Though, of course, professing on the idealistic plane carries us to some extent, it is not the end of the highway. About this aim, namely, maintaining just and honourable relations between nations, which is one of the avowed aims of our foreign policy and of our Constitution too, may I know how far have we succeeded? I do not say that we should play the role of Messiahs of peace. Our Prime Minister condemns this idea of going about lecturing in other countries.

[Shri Hem Barua]

But at the same time, since we are adopting a policy of peace, freedom, democracy and all the valued possessions of mankind, have we been able to rouse the conscience of the world in favour of all these valued possessions of mankind? We have not. I have come across dogmatic and cocksure statements concerning international life, but I am afraid these cocksure and dogmatic statements would not carry us very far.

Let us come to the Middle-East. The Prime Minister has made only a passing reference to the Middle-East, but I want that the reference of the Prime Minister to the Middle-East should be fuller. What is happening today in the Middle-East. We can neglect the Middle-East only at our peril. The Middle-East area, particularly the area around the Suez Canal and the Persian Gulf is like a powder-magazine today surcharged with battery for some ingenious hand to pull the wire; and, ingenious hands are already at work. The petty States in this area, some of them feudalistic in structure, because of the rich deposits of oil therein, have to depend on this power block or that power block. These petty States are today tossed between these power blocks like so many rubber balloons and we have to take note of that. Only a passing reference to the Middle-East question would not solve our problems, because in the Middle-East we find vestiges of colonialism and semi-colonialism.

The Prime Minister made just a passing reference to the Algerian problem. What is happening in Algeria? The people of Algeria are demanding freedom from the shackles of French colonial rule, but France has instituted the most savage tragedy in Algeria. What is the total booty that these French forces claimed in human blood, do you know, Sir? They have so far killed 35,000 men, women and children, and they have so far captured 20,000. So far as the civilian casualty is concerned, 6,000 have been killed, 3,700 wounded and

2,300 missing. When the French security forces killed these patriots, they have found a word for these patriots. They call them 'bandits'. That is the popular word used by the imperialists.

What do we find in Algeria today? The Prime Minister has made only a passing reference to Algeria and that is my quarrel with him. There should have been a fuller reference. We find that in Algeria there is political gangsterism stalking the land, like the giant shadow of death. I venture to say that the rape of Algeria is complete. When the French Foreign Minister M. Pineau visited India, when he came to New Delhi, he introduced a strange argument in favour of France's holding on to Algeria. He has said.

"In Algeria there were over 1.2 million citizens of European extraction who had no home other than Algeria and who would, if they were asked to leave, rise up in revolt.... A bitter and terrible civil war would be the result."

This was the logic, the argument put forward by the French Foreign Minister when he came down to New Delhi. The illogical logic of this argument reminds me of the wolf's logic to the lamb. What about us? We, who sympathise with the aspirations of the submerged people of the world? We let down Algeria very badly. We discouraged the Arab League from putting the Algerian question before the Security Council. Instead of organising public opinion, or creating a climate of public opinion in favour of the Algerian people, we simply dissuaded them.

Maybe our Prime Minister has great admiration for French culture and the French people than I can claim to have, but that must not stand in the way of a just cause. But, that is what our Prime Minister did. Our Prime Minister suggested 'direct talks' in the light of the five-fold course for the peaceful solution of the problem in Algeria on the floor of the House on the 20th May, 1956. But what about

these proposals? These proposals were enunciated on the floor of the House, but when these proposals crossed our shores, crossed the seas, and went to Paris, then the French Prime Minister Guy Mollet refused to touch these proposals even with a pair of tongs. That was what we got for these proposals. Yet we pinned our faith to these proposals and suggested direct talks, direct talks between the lion and the lamb. Direct talks between the wolf and the lamb would be better, I suppose, than what we have been suggesting.

Take the question of American military aid to France. It is a fact that American military aid to France had greatly added to Algerian casualties. There is some interest in the Middle-East and in the African countries, in their economic exploitation, so far as the United States is concerned. In spite of this fact, there is public opinion created in the United States as a whole against French tyranny and oppression in Algeria. I may be permitted to quote Senator Kennedy:

"The record of the United States in this case is, as elsewhere, a retreat from the principles of independence and anti-colonialism, regardless of what diplomatic niceties are offered in its defence."

We can substitute the word "India" for "United States" and we can bring the same charge against our Government and our Prime Minister for neglecting the cause of the Algerian people and for supporting directly this colonial policy of the French Government. This has exposed us in respect of our foreign policy. This has exposed our "retreat" most crudely to the world, at least to the world of the submerged people. What about us? We can only mumble words of sympathy for these African and Algerian people; but, when our sympathy is put on the test, it always fails. This is about Algeria.

What about Oman? The British are there with a slaughtering mission

today. The British have brought down their venom jets, fragmentation bombs and heavy artillery into Muscat and Oman, and that too for the purpose of supporting the Sultan of Muscat. The hot deserts of Muscat and Oman are believed to contain large reservoirs of oil. These powers haunt these places for the reason of oil. The British military forces are there. They are using Cyprus as base. At the same time, they are importing soldiers from Kenya. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd gives the following argument to justify this invasion or military intervention in Oman. I am quoting Mr. Selwyn Lloyd:

"We have had friendly treaty relations with the Sultan and his predecessors for the past 150 years. We are giving full support which we think a staunch friend requires."

This is what Mr. Selwyn Lloyd has observed. What about our Prime Minister? Our Prime Minister tried to just glide over it by saying in the Rajya Sabha that the legal and constitutional position in Muscat and Oman is "somewhat complicated". An accomplished skater as he is on ice, he has very successfully glided over the entire issue.

What about the legal and constitutional position in Muscat and Oman? There are some treaty obligations, very antiquated treaty obligations. There is one treaty known as the secret treaty of Sib, on the strength of which, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd has sent the British forces to Muscat and Oman. But what about this secret treaty of Sib? The secret treaty of Sib is so secret that even the British Foreign Office does not know anything about it.

14 hrs.

This treaty was drawn up in 1918 and signed in 1920 by the Sultan of Muscat and eighteen Omani chieftains. Happily or unhappily enough to this treaty on which Mr. Selwyn Lloyd depends entirely for his military

{Shri Hem Barua}

intervention, Britain is not a signatory and that is why public opinion is growing in Britain for the publication of the text of it. The British Foreign Office has refused to publish it; at the same time the Sultan of Muscat has also refused to publish the text of it on the plea that it is a secret document. It was invalidated by the Imam of Oman himself in 1955. This is the treaty and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd takes shelter under this treaty and our Prime Minister also takes shelter under this treaty, and glosses over the entire issue.

Now what is the trouble in Muscat and Oman? It is the concession of mineral possessions. The Iraq Petroleum Company to which a concession has been given is a great producer of sterling oil. It is the oil which is responsible for the situation there and we forget about it. Now there is military intervention in Muscat and Oman. I remember to have read an article written by Sir Hartley Shawcross on Hungary in the *Times*. May I quote from that article, Sir? He says:

"It is well-established in international law that intervention by a foreign power is inadmissible even if it takes place at the request of a Government engaged in suppressing an armed insurrection or in pursuance of a treaty which is alleged to provide some justification."

My contention is this. If this is true about Hungary why should it not be true about Britain, Britain attacking Muscat and Oman? You cannot have two sets of rule for the same game of cricket. Let us play cricket in politics. Let us not believe in underhand bowling, or bodyline bowling. Here in Muscat and Oman Britain instead of playing cricket is playing, or is taking recourse to all kinds of underhand means and I am sorry to say that our Prime Minister has fallen a victim to it.

Now Mr. Harty who is the representative of the Imam of Oman proposes to place this matter of Muscat

and Oman issue before the United Nations General Assembly on the 17th of September, since it failed in the Security Council. We want to see what would be the attitude of our Government towards this problem, towards this issue that Mr. Harty proposes to place before the United Nations General Assembly. We have once failed the people; let us not fail the people of Oman this time.

Now we have been hearing that the Imam of Oman has appealed to the African and Asian nations for intervention against British operations in Muscat and Oman. I do not know whether an appeal has been received by the Ministry of External Affairs. At the same time we have to see what the attitude of our Government is going to be and how they are going to respond to the appeal issued by the Imam for help. I read Mr. Pierson's article about it. He says that it was an interesting sight to see these people fleeing on the backs of donkeys pursued by Venom jets. That is what is happening in Oman.

There are some people, as the Prime Minister would say, with a diseased mind, who say that it is because of our Prime Minister's association with Britain and his affection for British culture that blurs his sympathy for all these anti-British agitations in areas where Britain has her interests. I will be happy to know that this is a wrong statement. But statement is made by some responsible people.

What about this Middle-east? The Middle-East is a veritable storm centre today. It is because of its oil. What about this oil, Sir? Oil moves the wheels of war as much as it does the wheels of civilisation. The major powers of the world know it. It is said that the Middle-East oils fields, stretching in a great arc from Iran and Iraq around the Persian gulf, comprise collectively the richest and largest deposits of oil in the world. particular area contains two-thirds of

the oil possessions of, what they say the, free world and that is why everybody has his eye on it.

The Middle-East represents a psychological problem, a political problem and also an emotional problem; at the same time it has great strategic importance. Through this route our trade and commerce flows. I say the Middle-East presents an emotional problem because of the fact that it is in this area that the shrines of three great religions of the world meet,—Judaism, Christianity and Islam. That is why our foreign policy has to be geared up to these objective conditions.

During recent years, somehow or other, we find that our foreign policy has been a little bit halting. It has become a little static; it is losing its dynamism. That is what we feel. There are two major factors in the Middle East. One is the rising tide of Arab nationalism and the other is Arab-Israeli hostility. These are the two factors which should be taken into consideration. The past may be allowed to bury its dead, but we must see that the present or future does not have any dead to bury.

What about this Israel? Israel is surrounded on all sides by six sovereign independent Arab States, which collectively have a population of 40 million. These Arab States have never made a secret of their intentions. Their ultimate intention is to destroy the State of Israel and convert Israel into a homeland of Arab refugees. Israel might be a spring-board of war and if a horrible war is to be stopped and if peace is to be permanently ensured, we must see that that can only be done through international action. I feel that India must play a distinctive role in ensuring permanent peace in this area in avoiding a third world war.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Hem Barua: I have a lot to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may have a lot to say.

Shri Hem Barua: I am the first speaker from my party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: For the first speaker also there is a time limit.

Shri Hem Barua: I think I have not crossed it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is the first notice.

Shri Hem Barua: I shall then try to hurry up.

What about India's attitude to Israel? About Israel we have been very unfair, I would say. Israel was born; but we did not approve of the way Israel was born. Gandhiji issued in 1946 a statement about American manipulation and the manipulation of England. Whatever that might be we should see that Israel, since it is an established fact, gets its recognition, but it was an unhappy fact that for three years we did not recognise Israel. Now, in spite of the fact that there has been repeated requests from Israel to establish diplomatic relations between Israel and India we have not paid any attention to this matter. At the same time Col. Nasser, who happens to be our friend, is fanning the flame of Arab-Israel hostility. If Egypt and India are friends, I would like to know why we are not in a position to persuade Egypt, to persuade Col. Nasser, to give up his hostility to Israel; because, Israel holds the key, the key to peace or disaster. And if there is a disaster, the disaster would not be confined to the Middle East alone, but the disaster will spread all over the world, because of the oil in the Middle Eastern area. The oil in the Middle Eastern countries is in possession of those foreign companies who have their interests in that area. At the same time, these foreign companies are having a monopoly of exploring oil and storing oil in our country. I say if the oil in the Persian Gulf or the Middle East catches fire—because oil is inflammable—, I am very much confident that the fire would spread across the Persian Gulf to us as well

[Shri Hem Barua]

and we will also be consigned into the flames of that conflagration. Therefore, my appeal is that we should see that peace is restored in the Middle East and that it is done in co-operation with the United Nations organisation; because we want our foreign policy not to be negative, we want it to be positive.

Coming to nearer home, we think that our foreign policy has failed miserably so far as Goa is concerned, so far as Kashmir is concerned and so far as Pakistan is concerned. In regard to Pakistan, the Pakistan Prime Minister is issuing all sorts of statements against us. He is carrying on all kind of propaganda against us. And I feel inclined to agree with Mrs. Vera Dean, Professor of History, School of International Studies when she says that Pakistan's public relations work is much better than ours. This is also my feeling and my own experience as well when I was touring in the United States and Europe. In the States I came across a portrait of General Thimayya in a journal called *Atlantic*. And that portrait was taken against the background of a railway poster on which was written, "Visit India and Kashmir". They did not do this to create a world opinion that Kashmir belongs to India but because of the good work done by General Thimayya in Korea. But when the journal came, there was a storm of protest from Pakistan. I knew it and I also faced the storm in the States. That shows how active they are. But about us, our cause so far as Pakistan is concerned, suffers from lack of proper publicity and, secondly, lack of proper advocacy. It was badly advocated in the Security Council, I would say. And I rather feel suspicious about it. I do not think that the draft that was prepared was the draft of our Prime Minister or the draft of Mr. Krishna Menon but possibly that of some junior in the External Affairs Department accustomed to litigation. Because, it was improperly drafted. Instead of laying emphasis on certain simple, signifi-

cant and relevant points, some debating points were there and that created confusion. I remember Winston Churchill's inimitable phrase "Jaw is better than war". Our Mr. Krishna Menon almost broke his jaw by spinning words for hours which rather damaged an otherwise good case.

I think our Defence Minister should devote more of his time here in re-organising the defence and strategy of our country rather than romp about across the seas and the continents in search of the doves of peace, because the blue birds of peace are as elusive as ever.

In this connection I want to thank our Minister of Irrigation and Power, Shri Patil, for giving a five year time limit to Pakistan about the canal water dispute. Mr. Patil looks to me a man of granite—I only wish he has a heart of steel. In that case 1962 is bound to be a turning point in the history of Indo-Pak relationship.

In regard to Kashmir Mr. Suhrawardy says that India is losing friends and the U.N. has pronounced in favour of Pakistan, and most countries including the United States are in favour of Pakistan. Are we really losing friends? I posed that question before me in my own mind. The argument that would be adduced by our Prime Minister will be that we are not losing friends, for if that were so how is it that so many State dignitaries come and pay regular visits to New Delhi or India?—that is the pet argument that he would offer. But I think our Prime Minister admitted that when Mr. Noon said that India has become a Russian base it found headlines in the foreign Press, where as his contradictions did not find any headlines in the foreign Press. This shows that we are losing friends in spite of the fact that foreign dignitaries pay regular visits and we offer them dinners and parties. Because, dinners and parties are given by way of international diplomacy. And possibly it is true to say that the

easiest way to the heart is through the stomach. So many foreign dignitaries come. And Mr. Mahomed Ali when he was the Prime Minister of Pakistan also came here with his pretty Middle Eastern wife, probably Syrian. They came here, did a lot of 'Connaughting', made purchases for personal use, flashed a few "Did-you-Maclean-your-teeth" smiles and provided an opportunity to our photographers to shoot them into their lenses. But what happened after that? The drama ended there. And the trail of bitterness—the bitterness that was born on the day Pakistan was born—still continues between Pakistan and India.

In conclusion I would say, Sir, that the thunder clouds are looming large on the Middle Eastern horizon and across our borders in Goa, Kashmir and Pakistan. I would say, in the words of T. S. Eliot, "Listen, what the thunder says". We want our Prime Minister to provide a silver lining to these dark clouds collecting in the Middle East frontier that threaten us with the next World War.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र (बेगू सराय) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह खुशी की बात है कि अब यह सदन विदेश नीति पर दो न लगा कर केवल एक दिन लगाने जा रहा है। मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जिनका कि यह खयाल रहा है कि हमारी सरकार और हमारा देश विदेशों के पचड़े में ज्यादा न पड़ कर अपने ही सवालियों पर ज्यादा ध्यान दे तो अपना भी भला ज्यादा करेगा और दुनिया का भी भला ज्यादा करेगा।

सबसे बड़ा सवाल विदेश के मामले में जो हमारे देश के सामने है और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने भाषण के शुरू में ही वह वह पाश्चात्तरिक सवाल है वह पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध का सवाल है और यह सवाल कुछ ऐसी शकल लेता जा रहा है, यह समस्या कुछ ऐसी दुर्बुद्ध होती जा रही है कि लोगों का खयाल

है और मैं भी इस खयाल के साथ हूँ कि यदि इसका फंसला बहुत जल्द नहीं किया गया, यदि इस सवाल को किसी न किसी किनारे न लगाया गया तो इस देश के लिये और दुनिया के लिये भी कुछ बुरा होने वाला है।

इस देश में ऐसे लोग भी हैं जो कभी कभी ग्राह के साथ यह कहते हैं कि काश, सरदार पटेल जीवित होते तो यह काश्मीर का मामला इस क्रूर बुरी तरह फंसा हुआ नहीं रहता। जो भी हो, एक बात है जो आज प्रधान मंत्री ने कही और किसी भी हिन्दुस्तानी को वह बात चिन्ता में डाल सकती है कि पाकिस्तान के पास हथियार दूसरे देशों से बड़ी मात्रा में और बहुत अधिक आ गये हैं। यह ठीक है कि अमरीका कहता है कि हमने जो हथियार पाकिस्तान को दिये हैं वह हिन्दुस्तान से लड़ने के लिये नहीं दिये हैं। हमने वह हथियार पाकिस्तान को इसलिये दिये हैं ताकि जब अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्युनिज्म हमला करे तो उसका मुकाबला करने में पाकिस्तान उनका इस्तेमाल करे। लेकिन पाकिस्तान के हाथ में जब वह हथियार आ गये हैं और पाकिस्तान के नेता आज कैसे हैं, कैसे लोगों के हाथ में वहाँ की सरकारें हैं, तो इन बातों को सोच कर अगर हर हिन्दुस्तानी का जी धराराये और दहशत में पड़े तो इसमें कोई आश्चर्य की बात नहीं। उन्हीं हथियारों से पाकिस्तान कल को कुछ कर बैठे, हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जंग कर बैठे, हमारे उसके बीच लोहा बज जाय तो अमरीका क्या करेगा और अन्य कोई क्या करेगा? इसलिये पाकिस्तान को फौजी शस्त्रास्त्रों की सहायता मिलना हमारे लिये बड़ी चिन्ता की बात है और जिस तरीके से यह सवाल पिछले दस वर्षों से टंगा हुआ है, समय आ गया है कि अब इस सवाल को और ज्यादा देर तक टंगा हुआ नहीं रहने देना चाहिये और इसका फंसला जितनी जल्दी हो सके, हो

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

जाना चाहिये । और यह पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों के लिये अच्छा होगा और दुनिया के लिये भी अच्छा होगा ।

एक सामग्री सवाल : कैसे ?

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : सबसे बड़ी बात कि काश्मीर की जो जनता है उसके लिये यह जरूरी है कि यह सवाल एक किनारे लग जाय और यह तय हो जाय सदा के लिये कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहने वा रहा है । एक सीमा पर का प्रदेश, उसके लोगों को दस वर्षों से यह मासूम नहीं कि वे कहां हैं । अभी थोड़ा समय हुआ वहां की कांस्टीचुएंट असेम्बली ने यह तय कर दिया कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहेंगे लेकिन संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने एक दूसरा प्रस्ताव पास किया कि वहां की कांस्टीचुएंट असेम्बली का फैसला काश्मीर के भविष्य का फैसला नहीं कर सकता । हमने यह जरूर कहा कि हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के इस फैसले को नहीं मानते लेकिन इतना कह देने से वह बात हल नहीं हो जाती है । इसके लिये जरूरी है कि हमारे देश ने काश्मीर का सवाल जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सामने रक्खा था, उसको हमारा देश वहां से वापिस ले ले और साफ साफ कह दें कि जहां तक हमारा सवाल है, काश्मीर हमारा है । लेकिन अगर कहीं हमारे मन में भी कुछ बातें हों, प्रेम के साथ समझौता करने के लिये कुछ गुंजाइश हो तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि तब उसमें कोई प्रतिष्ठा व इज्जत की बात नहीं रहनी चाहिये और पाकिस्तान की सरकार के साथ समझौता करने के लिये सीधे तौर पर या किसी मध्यस्थता के जरिये प्रथवा किसी पंचायत के जरिये सुझाव समझौता करने के लिये तैयार हो जाय और प्रतिष्ठा और इज्जत की बात छोड़ कर पाकिस्तान से सीधे न सही वो किसी के जरिये बातचीत करके इस

मसले को तय कर लें । इस मामले को यूं ही सटकाये रखने से एक और हिन्दुस्तान का फौजी खर्च बढ़ता चला जाय जब कि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना भाग में पड़ी हुई है, मुसीबत और संकट में पड़ी हुई है, इतना तनाव दो पड़ोसी देशों के बीच हो और उसका असर दुनिया पर हो, तो यह कोई अच्छी चीज नहीं है । कभी कभी लोग कहते हैं और यह बात ठीक से जानते हैं कि दुनिया की जो कमजोर जगह हैं जहां से लड़ाई भड़क सकती है, उसमें हमारा काश्मीर भी आ गया है । इसलिये मैं अपनी सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि बजाय इसके कि दो वर्ष बाद आपको इसका मुकाबला करना पड़े, जब पाकिस्तान के पास और अधिक हथियार और सैनिक सामग्री हो जाय और पाकिस्तान में कोई और खतरनाक नेता आ जाय । अभी भी पाकिस्तान की जिनके कि हाथ में बागडोर है, श्री सुहरावर्दी, उनको हर हिन्दुस्तानी बखूबी जानता है कि वे कौन हैं । यह वही सुहरावर्दी साहिब हैं जो कि कलकत्ते के क्रांतिल भे जिन्होंने कि हिन्दुस्तान में पहले पहल हिन्दू मुसलमानों के बीच कतलेघाम कराया था, वही सुहरावर्दी साहब आज पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री हैं । हर हिन्दुस्तानी उनको खूब अच्छी तरह से पहचानता है और वह अपनी नेतागिरी को बनाये रखने के लिये कुछ भी कर गुजर सकते हैं । इसके लिये वह पाकिस्तान को भी भाग में डाल सकते हैं । इसलिये इस मामले को अब अधिक देर लटका रहने नहीं देना चाहिये और इसका फैसला करना चाहिये चाहे उसका जो भी नतीजा हो । अगर पंचायत के जरिये इसका निबटारा हो, तो हम पंचायत के सामने भी जाय प्रथवा और जैसे भी सम्भव हो करे । इतना तो दुनिया को और कम से कम काश्मीर की जनता को कह देना होगा कि अब आपका मामला किसी दूसरी संस्था के हाथ में नहीं रहेगा, आप अपना

मामला खुद तय कर सकते हैं और जब वहाँ के लोगों ने इस बारे में फस्तला कर दिया है और अपना भाग्य सदा के लिये हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जोड़ दिया है तो फिर कोई सवाल नहीं है कि काश्मीर का मामला इस तरीके से घटका रहने दिया जाय ।

गोवा के बारे में मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ कि प्रवक्ता ही कुछ पेशीदगियाँ हैं और उन पेशीदगियों को समझते हुये गोवा के मामले में कोई भी हिन्दुस्तानी यह नहीं कहेगा कि उसको लेकर के हिन्दुस्तान कोई बड़ी मुसीबत या संकट दुनिया के लिये पैदा करे । लेकिन एक बात जो आज प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने कही, यह मुझे कुछ अच्छी नहीं लगी । प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि हंगरी का सवाल फिर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सामने आने वाला है और अगर वहाँ पर रूस द्वारा हंगरी पर आक्रमण करने की निन्दा की गई तो हम उस निन्दा के साथ नहीं रहेंगे । मुझे अपने प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के मुँह से यह शब्द सुन कर बड़ा अफसोस हुआ । मिस्र पर जब इंग्लैण्ड और फ्रांस ने आक्रमण किया तब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने यह फिलासफी नहीं रखी कि हम को किसी चीज की निन्दा नहीं करनी चाहिये लेकिन जब रूस ने हंगरी पर ठीक उसी सप्ताह में हमला किया तो हमारा रूस कुछ और था और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बात तो अब इतिहास की है कि एक ही सप्ताह के अन्दर पिछले साल ऐसे आक्रामक हुये कि जिनके बाद से दुनिया में सब का परदा फास हो गया । कॅन्जर-वेटिव इंग्लैण्ड और समाजवादी फ्रांस ने मिस्र पर आक्रमण किया और कम्युनिस्ट रूस ने हंगरी पर हमला किया, तीनों ने हमला किया और तीनों ने खुले तौर पर अपने साम्राज्यवादी इरादे दुनिया पर जाहिर कर दिये । उस ऐतिहासिक सप्ताह में दुनिया ने तीनों के शंभे मासूम खून से रंगे हुये देखे । हमारी आँखें इंग्लैण्ड और फ्रांस पर साज हो गई, लेकिन यह कहना

पड़ता है कि रूस पर हमारी आँखें साज नहीं हुई । मेहनत साहब के उस समय के भाव्य लोगों को याद हैं . . . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वहाँ साज पहले ही माली काफ़ी थी ।

श्री ज० प्र० जिध : उसके बाद जब दुनिया में हंगरी के आक्रमण को लेकर आवाज उठी और जब यह कहा जाने लगा कि हिन्दुस्तान के लिये यह योग्य नहीं हुआ कि वह एक आक्रमणकारी की तो निन्दा करे और दूसरे के बारे में चुप हो जाय तब हिन्दुस्तान की नीति कुछ बदली और आज प्रधान मंत्री बहुत बड़ी बात कहते हैं जब वे कहते हैं कि हंगरी के लोगों की जनता की जो लड़ाई थी वह राष्ट्रीयता की लड़ाई थी, आजादी की लड़ाई थी । और जांच आयोग ने वहाँ जा कर पूरी स्थिति देखी थी और उसके बाद संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को अपनी रिपोर्ट दी थी । अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे ही पूछता हूँ कि एक मुकद्दमा हो और वह जब जज के सामने फ़ैसला के लिये जाय, अगर एक पक्ष कहे कि मैं उस जज के सामने नहीं आऊंगा तो उस हालत में क्या उस जज को फ़ैसला नहीं देना चाहिये ? वह जज फ़ैसला देगा । अब जज के फ़ैसले को माना जाना चाहिये और अगर एक पक्ष उसको नहीं मानेगा तो यकीनन वह चलती कर रहा है । पंडित जी कहते हैं कि वह फ़ैसला भी बड़ा अच्छा है और मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान को हंगरी के विषय में अपनी नीति के औचित्य को सिद्ध करने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि वह इस मामले में संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की आवाज का साथ दे, जो आवाज यह कहने जा रही है कि रूस ने हंगरी की जनता पर आक्रमण किया, वहाँ की आजादी को दबाया गया है ।

फ्रांस ने भी आक्रमण किया, कॅन्जर-वेटिव इंग्लैण्ड ने भी आक्रमण किया और

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

इसके खिलाफ दुनिया की आवाज संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठी। उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह आक्रमण खत्म हो गया, फ्रांस और इंग्लैंड हार गये और मित्र बच गया और स्वेज नहर बच गई। लेकिन जब हंगरी के बारे में वहाँ पर आवाज उठी तो माफ कीजियेगा हिन्दुस्तान की आवाज उस समय नहीं उठी थी। दुनिया की आवाज के आगे हमने देखा कि पश्चिमी साम्राज्यवाद तो झुक गया लेकिन सोवियत साम्राज्यवाद कहिये या कम्युनिस्ट लाल साम्राज्यवाद कहिये और जो नया ताकतवर साम्राज्यवाद है, वह उस आवाज को सुनने के लिये तैयार नहीं था। और आज भी हंगरी में विदेशी फौज रूस की फौज पड़ी हुई है और आज भी हंगरी में वही जुल्म हो रहे हैं, उससे बढ़ कर जुल्म हो रहे हैं जो कि पिछले साल हुये थे। यही फर्क है, प्रजातंत्र और तानाशाही में।

मेरे मित्र श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी बहुत फरमाते हैं कि ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद की शकल नहीं बदली, वह आज से दस, बीस वर्ष पहले जैसा था वैसे ही आज भी है और वीसा ही आज भी खूबवार है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बात इतिहास की है, ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद की शकल बदल गई है, पुराना साम्राज्यवाद मिट रहा है, खत्म हो रहा है लेकिन यह जो कम्युनिस्ट साम्राज्यवाद उठ रहा है हालांकि यह नया साम्राज्यवाद है लेकिन यह ज्यादा ताकतवर और खूबवार है। आज सोचना होगा कि दुनिया में कौन सी चीजें हैं जो आज दुनिया की शांति को ज्यादा खतरा पहुंचाती हैं। पश्चिम का डूबता हुआ साम्राज्यवाद या पूर्व का उगता हुआ साम्राज्यवाद ?

मैं कभी कभी सोचता हूँ कि पहली लड़ाई के बाद और दूसरी लड़ाई के पहले

जो हालत फासिस्ट ताकतों की थी, दुनिया की शांति के मुकाबले, वही हालत दूसरी लड़ाई के बाद और तीसरी लड़ाई के पहले—भगवान न करे वह स्थिति आये—दुनिया की शांति के मुकाबले कम-बेश कम्युनिस्ट ताकतों की हैं। और इसलिये जो लोग बहुत चिल्लाते हैं साम्राज्यवाद, 'साम्राज्यवाद' वह जरा बतायें कि यह जो नया साम्राज्यवाद उठा है, जिस को लाल साम्राज्यवाद कहते हैं, जिस ने संगीनों के बल से हंगरी की जनता की आजादी की लड़ाई को कुचल दिया, जो पोलैंड के सामने झुका तो जरूर, लेकिन जिस की कोशिश चल रही है कि गोमुल्का का राज्य खत्म हो जाये, जिस ने पूर्वी जर्मनी की आजादी छीन ली है, उस के बारे में उन का क्या विचार है। बहुत लोग आवाज उठाते हैं कि जो लोग गुलाम हैं उन की आजादी वापस मिल जाये। बहुत अच्छी बात है, हम सब को इस आवाज में आवाज मिलानी चाहिये। लेकिन, जो पूर्वी योरप के लोग गुलाम हैं, उनकी आजादी के लिये कोई नहीं चिल्लाता। उनकी आजादी उन को उतनी ही प्यारी है, जितनी हमारी आजादी हमें प्यारी है। इस देश को, इस देश की सरकार को और सब से बढ़ कर इस लोक-सभा को पूर्वी योरप के देशों के लोगों की आजादी के साथ अपनी सहानुभूति, अपनी हमदर्दी उसी दिलचस्पी के साथ देनी चाहिये, जिस दिलचस्पी के साथ हम ट्यूनिशिया और दूसरे देशों की आजादी के साथ अपनी सहानुभूति पेश करते हैं।

एक सवाल और है निःशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में। मैं बहुत अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह ठीक है कि लड़ाई होगी या नहीं, यह कोई ज्योतिषी नहीं है जो कह सकता हो, मगर इसे मानना होगा कि आज दुनिया की जो हालत है, उस में

किसी समय लड़ाई छिड़ सकती है। आज बड़े बड़े मुल्क लड़ाई की तैयारी करें, नये नये हथियार रोज गढ़ते जायें और आपस में तनाव बना रहे, तो लड़ाई के बारे में कोई नहीं कह सकता कि कब हो जाये। लड़ाई न बुद्धि के साथ लड़ी जाती है और न विवेक के साथ लड़ी जाती है, लड़ाई तभी होती है जब इन्सान अपने हाथ से छूट जाता है, अपने विवेक के हाथों से छूट कर बर्बर विचारों के हाथों में चला जाता है। इसलिये हमें लड़ाई के खिलाफ दुनिया में एक वातावरण पैदा करना चाहिये, शांति का वातावरण पैदा करना चाहिये, और जो लोग ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करते हैं वह संसार के मित्र हैं और उसका भना चाहने वाले हैं। लेकिन आज की आब-हवा में यह बात अच्छी नहीं लगती है कि जब अमरीका और इंग्लैंड तथा दूसरे स्वतंत्र प्रजातांत्रिक देश एक एंटम वम का प्रयोग करें, तब तो हम चिन्ताये कि बहुत बुरा हो रहा है, लेकिन चुपके चुपके रूस हर तीसरे राज ऐसे वम फोड़ा करे तो हम कुछ न बोलें। यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। यह बहुत जरूरी है कि इन अणु बमों पर रोक लगाई जाये, लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ सिर्फ हथियारों पर रोक लगाने से ही दुनिया में शांति नहीं होगी। मैं कहता हूँ कि हथियारों पर रोक लगाने से, या फौज में बहुत कमी करने से भी दुनिया में शांति नहीं होगी। दुनिया में शांति पैदा करने के लिये एक नये वातावरण की जरूरत है। आज जो मुल्क चाहता है दुनिया में अपने आप को फैलाना, दुनिया के और और हिस्सों को अपने कब्जे में लेना, अपना प्रभाव बढ़ाना, यह ठीक नहीं है। बड़े मुल्कों की यह प्रवृत्ति खत्म होनी चाहिये। दुनिया के वे लोग जो शांति चाहते हैं, इन बड़े देशों से कह दें कि आप दुनिया में अपने को फैलाने की कोशिश न करें। और वह दुनिया का सचमुच दुश्मन है जो दुनिया में अपने को फैलाने की कोशिश

करता है। उन्होंने सदा इतिहास में शांति भंग की है और वही आज के इतिहास की शांति को भी भंग करने वाले हैं। इस लिये जरूरी है कि अहिंसा आणविक हथियारों पर रोक लगे, उसके साथ ही देशों की परम्परागत फौजी शक्ति में भी कमी की जाय।

जिन देशों ने राक्षसी सेनाये बना रखी हैं, और खास कर कम्युनिस्ट देशों ने जो अपनी अपनी सेनाये ऐसी बना ली हैं, जो अगर इन आणविक हथियारों को हटा दिया जाये, तो सारे योरप पर कब्जा कर सकती हैं। रूस को योरप पर कब्जा करने में सिर्फ ७ दिन लगेंगे, और चीन को सारे एशिया पर कब्जा करने में कितने दिन लगेंगे, कहा नहीं जा सकता, उन को खत्म करना बहुत जरूरी है। आज वह बहुत जरूरी है कि अगर कम्युनिस्ट देश शांति चाहते हैं, तो अपनी राक्षसी फौजी को खत्म करें। और वैसे ही पश्चिमी राष्ट्र, इंग्लैंड, अमरीका आदि भी अपनी फौजे हटा दें। हमारे देश के लिये भी यह बहुत जरूरी है कि हम अपनी फौज के खर्च से छुट्टी पा जायें। इस से हमारा बहुत बड़ा कल्याण होगा। आज हिन्दुस्तान अपने कुल खर्च का आधे से ज्यादा खर्च फौजों पर करता है। आज हमारा देश बहुत गरीब है, हमारे यहाँ कारखाने नहीं हैं, उनका और नहरों का बनाना हमारे लिये ज्यादा जरूरी है। इसलिये दुनिया में निःस्त्रीकरण हो, इस से बड़े राज्यों का जो फायदा होगा वह तो होगा ही, उस से हम लोगों का बड़ा फायदा होगा। हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना का जो पूरा खर्च है वह सयुक्त राष्ट्र अमरीका १८ दिनों में अपनी फौजों पर करता है। इसलिये आज दुनिया में जो इतना धन पागलपन पर, वहशियाना बातों पर लगाने के लिये खर्च किया जाता है अपने को फैलाने के लिये, वह बेकार है। बड़े राष्ट्र इस को समझे और इस चीज को रोकें तो संसार का बड़ा कल्याण होगा।

[श्री म०प्र० मिश्र ]

मैं सिर्फ एक बात और निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी जो वैदेशिक नीति है, मौलिक रूप से, बुनियादी तौर पर, वह सही है। नये उगते हुये राष्ट्रों के लिये, छोटे राष्ट्रों के लिये यह जरूरी नहीं है कि वे बड़ों के झगड़ों में पड़े। वे राष्ट्र अपना घर बनाये, अपने पैरों पर अपने को खड़ा करें, इसी में उनका कल्याण है। लेकिन मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर पिछले दस वर्षों में नहीं तो कम से कम पिछले पाच वर्षों में जिस को हम नानइन्वाल्वमेंट या तटस्थता की नीति कहते हैं, वह हमने अमल में बरती नहीं है। हम आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में इन्वाल्व हो जाते हैं। हमारे लिये हर छोटे बड़े मवाल पर राय देना जरूरी नहीं है। हमारे अपने बड़े मवाल हैं। देश के बनाने, समाज के बनाने, गरीबी दूर करने, इन बातों पर हम ज्यादा ध्यान दें। सब बातों पर अपनी राय जाहिर करना, बोलना यह हमारी नानइन्वाल्वमेंट पालिसी के अनुकूल भी नहीं है। मुझे खुश है कि यह चीज धीरे धीरे हमारे सरकार और हमारे नेता समझने लगे हैं। मुझे इस की भी बड़ी खुश है कि जो भाग्य का बड़ा इजलास हुआ, उसमें वैदेशिक नीति की बात ज्यादा नहीं उठी। मैं यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर नानइन्वाल्वमेंट की नीति ठीक से बरती जाये तो इस देश का अधिक कल्याण होगा और मसार का भी कुछ कल्याण होगा।

**Shri Osman Ali Khan (Kurnool):**  
**Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,** I consider it an unique privilege that I should speak on this important subject of foreign affairs, in this my maiden effort before the House.

I have ventured to speak on this subject for two reasons, Firstly because I feel rather strongly on certain aspects of our external affairs, and secondly because I consider this subject to be so very important that I feel even the internal progress of our

country does to a considerable extent depend upon our relations with other countries, and the prevailing conditions of the world.

We are now passing through a critical period in the history of mankind. Invention, the Prime evidence of man's superior power, is being prostituted to the service of competitive destruction. Our technological advancement has resulted in the production of the nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of mass destruction. Even the present stocks of these deadly weapons are enough to completely annihilate and destroy the entire mass of humanity with all its culture, its civilisation and all the good that it has so far produced.

The pulsating wave of cold war is already on, alternating between hope and despair; and is not showing, any real signs of abatement. The situation is pregnant with danger and is likely to bring forth shamefully in its wake disease, death and destruction for this family of mankind

Grim and grave as is the situation, it is for us to put all our efforts doggedly and determinedly to avert the catastrophe that threatens to overtake mankind. Man is a unique being. Great are his powers; great are his capacities and capabilities, in whatever direction he may employ them. He has achieved great success in the building up of the mighty machinery of war. He can achieve greater success in the building up of a mighty machinery for peace. But man has to strive in whatever direction he desires success. So far his attempts have mainly been to develop the method of force as compared to the method of reason for purposes of defence. As has been pointed out by an eminent statesman of our times:

"Traditionally, protection from attack has always been associated in the minds of the people with arms and armaments. Our language and literature are full of analogies drawn from war and warlike preparations. A thousand and one instances

could be cited to prove how the idea of fighting and war has become part of the everyday outlook of the normal person. The immediate reaction to the danger of aggression is the desire to build up so-called defence forces".

While our efforts in the direction of force have culminated in nuclear weapons, our efforts in the direction of peace have crystallised in the form of the United Nations Organisation. But if we compare these two opposing forces, we are sorry to find that the machinery for peace is not able to counteract the forces of destruction. It is because the magnitude of our effort in the direction of force has been times out of number far greater than what has been our effort in the direction of peace. We will have to so intensify our efforts in the direction of peace as to build up a mighty machinery that can successfully counteract the forces of destruction and always maintain an upper hand to be able to solve all the problems of the world in a peaceful manner without resort to force.

Our country has demonstrated by her own example in our struggle for freedom against the imperialist rulers that force need not and should not be conquered by the method of force, if it is to result in any real good. Our unarmed people have achieved their freedom against the then mighty British under the leadership and guidance of Mahatma Gandhi without the use of force, without resort to arms and without violence—unique in the history of the nations of the world. Even after the attainment of our freedom, our progress has been a peaceful progress in our efforts to evolve an ordered socialist society under the leadership of the political heir to the Mahatma, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

In our disputes with other countries, we have always indicated our firm resolve not to resort to force in the settlement of our disputes. The case of Goa is an instance on hand. For a foreign country to hold a small bit of this vast sub-continent under subjugation against the will of its people in the present-day world of the 20th

century, and for us to have tolerated this ugly spot on the map of our motherland these ten years of our freedom against the popular demand of our people to liberate our people there by military action, is an indication of our firm resolve not to resort to force in our disputes with other nations.

The case of Kashmir is yet another instance. Even in the face of grave provocation, we did not resort to war. Communal passions were raised. In fact, Pakistan based her case on the medieval theory that since the State is predominantly Muslim, it should be given away to Pakistan. But the 3½ crores of Muslims in this country along with their fellow countrymen are solidly behind the Government of this country. And I have the least hesitation to say that they are undoubtedly in support of the policy of our Government in its stand on Kashmir. The State of Kashmir having lawfully acceded to India and in the face of naked aggression by Pakistan, when we with our superior might could have thrown out the aggressor from our soil, we did not resort to war and we appealed to the United Nations. In fact, we accepted the cease-fire line with the aggressor on our soil. We did not want to wage war. Our Prime Minister went to the extent even to offer mutual no war declaration with the Government of Pakistan in an effort to rule out war as a means of settlement of this dispute. He did not stop at that. Our Prime Minister went to the farthest extent possible. He could have gone no further with dignity and self-respect than to have offered to discuss with the Government of Pakistan the solution of this dispute on the basis of the present cease-fire line, not because they were in the least entitled even to a bit of this land of Kashmir but because of our keen desire to settle this dispute in a peaceful manner with our neighbouring country of Pakistan. Thus we have demonstrated our faith in the United Nations Organisation which is the only hope for future of mankind.

[Shri Osman Ali Khan]

Our policy of non-alignment together with our efforts to enlarge the area of peace by adopting the principles of Panch Shila has gone a long way in checking the rising tide of tension in the world. It is most regrettable that our neighbouring country of Pakistan instead of helping to enlarge the area of peace has brought the cold war to our very doors. It may be no imagination to hope that the people of Pakistan will realise and will elect such a government in the ensuing elections that will not keep war off its shores but will help the cause of world peace.

Our foreign policy, I have the least hesitation to say, is the most correct and best suited to the present day needs of mankind. However, I have a few suggestions to make which the Ministry of External Affairs may devote its thought to while reviewing its policy from time to time.

Firstly, I would like to say that in keeping with our policy of promoting world peace, it is essential that the people in this country and elsewhere should realise the importance of working for peace. Of course, no reasonable human being believes in the desirability of war, but millions there are who believe in its inevitability. If once you can make the world mind appreciate that evolution may be gained without resort to war, we have accomplished the first great step in the direction of world peace. However noble our goal or correct the policy of our leadership, since the real strength lies in the people, it is very necessary that the Ministry of External Affairs should educate our people in this direction.

Secondly, I would like to point out the great magnitude of effort that is employed for the purposes of Defence. The three commands, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force are equipped with the most modern of weapons. The best human material is employed; persons devote the best part of their lives for this task and the best of training is given to these men for

a number of years. Thus an enormous effort is put in terms of men, money and research. Comparatively what is the effort of any country to develop the alternate method of reason? Practically negligible. So, how can we expect to replace this highly developed method of war with the hardly developed method of peace or reason. It is not possible. We will have to intensify our efforts and develop this science of reason... Apart from the efforts of the countries individually, the United Nations Organisation should undertake this task. The causes for dispute between nations have to be investigated and solutions found. Methods to eliminate suspicion and fear between nations have to be devised. Ways and means of promoting harmony between nations have to be determined. Better methods of conciliation, negotiation and arbitration and world judiciary have to be developed. Several such steps have to be taken. The best of our men have to be trained in the techniques of peace. The more we dig into it, the more we gain and success is certain. So, we have to develop our science of reasons as an alternative to war.

Lastly, I would like to point out that it is very necessary to view things from the world angle. Even the internal progress of our country does to a considerable extent depend upon our relations with other countries and the prevailing conditions in the world. The world has shrunk small. Our Prime Minister says: "We talk of the East and the West, the Orient and the Occident. Yet these divisions have no reality. The world has become too small for such divisions." So, it is but proper to view all our problems from the world angle. The world, today, has enough generals and men of the militia but it is in dire need of the architects for peace. Great as is the need, few are these architects. Our country can legitimately be proud that we have in our Prime Minister the great architect of peace, acknowledged all over the world as such. The world, humanity looks to our Prime Minister for service in its cause. But, I am

sorry to find that so much of his time and attention is being utilized by problems at home. It is a great injustice to him and to humanity. In the interests of humanity he should be spared and his worthy colleagues should undertake the task.

Our country has produced yet another genius, popular all over the world as the right hand man of our Prime Minister. He is Shri Menon. A great diplomat, a born negotiator and man of peace as he is, his services are indispensable for the good of mankind, now more than ever before.

May the vision of man enlarge to comprehend the picture of the world. May the reason of man reign supreme. May the cause for peace triumph ever and ever over the forces of destruction.

**Shri V. Raju** (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it was with attention that I listened to the Prime Minister's exposition of the foreign policy of our country and also the various proposals and policies which the Government of India is pursuing. I feel that the Prime Minister has not been very definite or firm regarding national policy on the Kashmir issue. I know the delicacy and the difficulty that we are going through in this context and I would like to have had a firm formulation of policy by our present Government

The Jarring Report has merely stated that conditions have changed because of the cold war. I therefore take it that if conditions revert back to normal, the plebiscite may be held. This view, we are given to understand, is basically acceptable to the Government of India. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what he understands by 'normal'. Is it the dropping of the foreign military aid to Pakistan? I agree, we must normalise relations with Pakistan, if necessary by a fresh approach, a direct approach. We must, however, make it clear that in the matter of Kashmir the question of its special status shall not be questioned. But, before you

can do this the internal stability of Kashmir must be ensured and you must categorically withdraw the commitment for a plebiscite, which causes to maintain communal tension in Jammu and Kashmir. Further, civil liberty and normalcy must be ushered into Kashmir.

I would like to ask what the Government proposes to do regarding the formulation that I have now placed before this House. In our relationship on the Kashmir issue, and in so far as much water has flowed under the bridge since the last ten years both in international conferences and also in the statements in our own Lok Sabha by the Prime Minister and in speeches made by the Prime Minister outside this House, an impression has been created that in all matters the handling of Kashmir has been to the best advantage of our country. When I use the expression "best advantage" I do not merely want it to be understood that we have been able to stop aggression by the tribesmen in Kashmir. A private army, or an army of hill-men or a sort of a rebel army entered Kashmir and tried to disrupt the peace of that area. We did right in entering Kashmir and stopping the advance of this disorganised force, and reintroducing peace in Kashmir. But, subsequent on that event a certain definite policy has been developed in Kashmir, which today must be clarified before the people of India.

What exactly is that policy? Is Kashmir a part of India, or is it not? That would be one of the questions that needs answering. If it is part of India, then the separate status and position of Kashmir in terms of administration must be clarified here and now, I feel, because we know that foreign affairs, defence and communications are subjects which Kashmir has surrendered to this Parliament. But, what about other questions? What about the question of civil liberties in Kashmir? What about the question of internal administration in Kashmir? Is it the right of this Parliament to go into such issues or not?

[Shri V. Raju]

These must needs to be answered, because, when we state that Kashmir is part of us, I for one would like it to be understood that not merely do we defend Kashmir against any aggressor, not merely do we pay the very great price of arming our country to defend Kashmir in a war of aggression, but we must have the right of feeling that the internal administration of Kashmir is democratic, is being run with the same ideals, with the same motivations that run the Indian democracy. And, here, I am afraid that conditions in Kashmir internally are not as happy as I would like them to be.

Apart from the fact that we have our own problem with Pakistan, I cannot understand why normalcy has not been introduced into Kashmir territory. Why is an individual still—he, Mr. Sheikh Abdullah may have been the Prime Minister of Kashmir, whatever his antecedents may be—kept in detention without trial? Adequate reason must be given why he is kept in prison without trial. Is this civil liberty? If it is embarrassing to the Government of Kashmir to finalise the affairs I would ask, in view of the fact that we are one people, one nation and Kashmir is part of us, let Mr. Sheikh Abdullah be brought, if necessary, to any part in India and given a fair public trial. What constitutes the essential disagreement between him and the present Government of Kashmir? Such an act by this Government would not in any way endanger the position of Kashmir, would not in any way create a situation wherein our enemies may take advantage of such an act.

**Shri B. S. Murthy** (Kakinada-Reserved—Sch. Castes): Who is the enemy?

**Shri V. Raju**: Whoever it happens to be. When I say 'our enemies' as far as Kashmir is concerned, the hon. Member knows that we have in the Kashmir issue our differences with our neighbouring country. If he does not like my using the word 'enemies' as far as Kashmir itself is concerned,

I would say 'our neighbouring country', with which we have at the moment a live disagreement, would not in any way be able to take advantage of this.

The first essence is that the people of Kashmir must feel that not merely do they feel happier to live with us, but that in all matters they obtain the freedom that we give to our own people. Once normalcy is brought into Kashmir, I feel that certain tensions will no longer be there. I have understood that it is the policy of the Government still to think in terms of plebiscite. I do not support this view. So long as we continue to accept plebiscite, we have to accept the fact that there are in this sub-continent two separate racial entities, two separate people belonging to not merely separate religions but of ethnic origin, and as such neither one can live with the other in permanent peace. Therefore, the first thing to remove this illusion is to completely State categorically that the people of the sub-continent are one. We have to accept that all doctrines or all concepts which would allow for the two nation theory to remain in operation must be forthwith given up by us and, to that extent, if the Government of India categorically states that we do not accept the commitment of plebiscite, I do not think we would be making a mistake. On the other hand, we would be consolidating the position of a very large and essential minority which continues within our own country and who are part of our own countrymen, and there is still—

15 hrs.

**Shri B. S. Murthy**: How can acceptance of plebiscite be construed as giving a fillip to ethnic and racial considerations?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker**: The hon. Member will tell us.

**Shri B. S. Murthy**: I am asking for clarification.

Shri V. Raju: Therefore, I have made the following formulation, namely, before you can do this, that is, withdraw from plebiscite, the internal stability of Kashmir must be ensured and you must categorically withdraw the commitment of plebiscite which causes to maintain communal tension in Jammu and Kashmir, and agree to a new approach to Pakistan, so long as the question of Kashmir and the question of its special status is not questioned. If the position of Kashmir is not questioned alone, should I expect that we could make a new approach to Pakistan? This is the formulation I have made. I feel that that normal approach can be made only if we withdraw our terms of agreement on the plebiscite.

So far as the problems in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world are concerned, I find that the Government of India has been expressing policies which, on the face of them, are valid and ideologically sound. But if *Panchsheel* is to be effective, what I suggest is this. If the Government of India uses the basis of *Panchsheel*, it should be more effective. It has been using the basis of *Panchsheel* with our neighbour China, and in a mutual agreement on the 22nd June, I think, last year, when the Russian leaders were here, a re-statement of *Panchsheel* was made. And these neighbours have accepted the concomitance of the five points in the programme and policy, namely, mutual respect for each other's integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence. A further clarification was made to point 3—non-interference in each other's internal affairs—when interference was defined as “no country should interfere in the economic political or ideological character of the Governments concerned”. We have had this *Panchsheel* agreement signed with our neighbour China and also with the Russian leaders. However, it is a matter of regret that the western powers with special reference

to—I do not like to use the word middle east; it is western Asia or only western neighbours—the western neighbours do not seem to accept the commitment of non-interference in the internal, economic and political structure of the countries of western Asia. I believe that our protest has not been strong enough or adequate on this score.

Here, some agreements which the Prime Minister has arrived at, seem to have negated the position. On the 19th July last year, at Brioni, when the leaders of Egypt, Yugoslavia and our Prime Minister met, this is what article 11 of that agreement said:

“In the middle east, conflicting interests of the big powers have added to the difficulty of the situation. The problems should be considered on their merits, safeguarding the legitimate economic interests, but basing solutions on the freedoms of the people concerned”.

I do not know how we are able to reconcile these two positions, safeguarding the legitimate economic interests of the big powers and, at the same time, guaranteeing the solution the people concerned. Because, so far as the countries of Egypt, Lebanon, Transjordan, Saudi Arabia, Syria and the two little countries which have come in the news of late—Muscat and Oman—and all these Sheikdoms are concerned, and as far as guaranteeing their prosperity and the future of those people are concerned, we have to be clear in our mind as to what their historical origin is and who represent the people in those areas. I am sure hon. Members are aware that most of these kingdoms have been carved out after 1920 or thereabouts, when, after the first World War, Turkey's suzerainty in this area came to an end. At that time, it was expected that this whole area, the Arab peninsula, would constitute one nation, but, unfortunately, the great imperialist of this age, the United Kingdom, carved out a number

[Shri V. Raju]

of smaller territories in that area, placed emperors and kings on the thrones of those little kingdoms whether they happened to be Trans-jordan or Iraq or even Iran—I think the present Shah's father was placed on the throne of Iran then. The subsequent history of these areas during the last 25 to 30 years has been one of conflict between these autocratic regimes, one against another, especially in so far as the bartering of legitimate mineral interests are concerned—the oil interests—with the foreign American and British companies. Therefore, when we use the word 'people' in respect of these territories, I do not know if we mean individual kings or sheikhs in those areas or we mean genuinely, the people there who should have democratic representation and expression. In this direction, I would say that India's role in that area, if it is to have historical validity, must support not merely national demands but also people's demands. I want it to be clearly understood that there is difference between a national demand and people's demand, because a Shiekh or King also represents national interests. It is not my interpretation of genuine interests. The distinction has to be made between national demands and people's demands. India's role as peace-maker in the Near West—I use the term Near West—must be positive and not negative. It must not merely maintain good relations with Egypt. I repeat, it must not merely maintain good relations with Egypt, but it must help in the creation of democracy in the near western region and freedom from foreign exploitation.

We must sympathetically view the Syrian experiment. In the Near West, the power vacuum must not be filled either by America or by Russia, either by capitalism or by socialism, but by democratic and socialist forms of Government evolving out of the revolutionary potential that has been created. Here I am very serious. I think the House is aware that after

the overthrow of the feudal regime in Egypt, after that event, the people of the Near West are rising up. Under Col. Nasser's leadership, Egypt is now for the first time, after a few hundreds of years, expressing the viewpoint of the common man. I know it is difficult to estimate the repercussions of the Suez Canal crisis. We are closely involved in that crisis in so far as the Suez Canal happens to be our life-line. Our Five Year Plan is dependent upon the free access of ships, so that vital goods may be brought to our shores.

It must not be forgotten that the imperialist powers attacked Egypt and the effect of that action on the whole of the Middle-East or Near West has been in ferment. The people there are aware of what is happening. Here it is unfortunate that reactionary forces to some extent and also America and Great Britain have not accepted the concomitant of non-interference in the internal affairs of nations. The whole Eisenhower doctrine to some extent is suspected. Why should the power vacuum of that area be filled by American dollars? As I have pointed out, the choice for the people there is not communism or capitalism. The choice of the people must be democracy and socialism. It must be the expression of the common man. Here I believe that our policy should be categorical. We should state our displeasure in no uncertain terms that any doctrine which believes that it should enter into an area and dominate that area politically, ideologically and economically, merely because a rival theoretic concept today exists in the world and tries to catch the imagination of the masses. This would be very necessary, if we are to be effective in this area.

The Prime Minister has raised many other issues in this House. I would like here to state that as far as disarmament is concerned, this House, speaking for myself, would appreciate any move or all moves that go

towards lessening the arms race. It is meaningless for us to try to place the guilt either on America or on Russia or more so, at the foot of science. All the same, I should like the policy of the Government of India to be categorical and should condemn all pacts which allow for the stationing of foreign troops in another country. That condemnation should be there both in reference to the NATO pact and the Warsaw pact. It is only when we are prepared to make such a condemnation actively that I believe that the tensions that are being built up on our own borders would lessen.

**Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput):** Mr. Mukerjee, while expressing his general agreement with the foreign policy followed by the Government, was rather critical in respect of two matters, namely, our continuance in the Commonwealth and our relations with Goa. Our continuance in the Commonwealth is to our advantage. According to him, India should have cut off its ties in the Commonwealth because Britain invaded Egypt without previous intimation to India. India did not keep quiet. India raised it in the United Nations and we uphold the sovereignty of Egypt, and ultimately, we were responsible for the cessation of hostilities in the Suez area. Ultimately Britain lost her stand. The prestige of Britain went down and the prestige of India shot up. So, I see no reason why our continuance in the Commonwealth is to the detriment of the country. I think the Government of India policy, the policy followed by the Prime Minister, in this regard is certainly the right one.

In respect of Goa, he means to say that our Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, should not have appealed to the several powers—America, Britain and France—to ask Portugal to leave Goa. He means to say that we should have occupied Goa by militarism. How can we follow a policy of aggression? Our policy has been one of non-aggression. Our policy has been embodied in article 51 of our Constitution. It is one of

maintaining "just and honourable relations between nations" and maintaining international peace and security. We cannot view the Goa problem as an isolated problem. Using force and taking Goa does not take a long time. But what about the repercussions? It will involve us in a world war. The policy followed by the Government is certainly a right policy and it is not correct for Mr. Mukerjee to say that the Goa problem could have been resolved in another way.

Our foreign policy is one of non-alignment with power blocs and one of non-aggression. It has gained the appreciation of the whole world. India today occupies a pride of place in the comity of nations. We are a member of the United Nations and we are wedded to the principle of international law and peace. We have been responsible for resolving world conflicts in the last ten years. All these we could achieve by sheer reason and persuasion. Our voice is heard all over the world and our voice is one of reason, justice, human freedom and human rights.

Regarding military pacts, the hon. Prime Minister has been condemning them in unequivocal terms. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter is being availed of by these States. NATO came into existence by virtue of article 51. As an answer to that came the Warsaw Pact; then came the SEATO and Baghdad Pacts, so much so there is mutual distrust and suspicion. The cold war has spread. What is the remedy? As suggested by our Prime Minister more often, it is a policy of peaceful co-existence. That is the only alternative remedy. It is only when the States realise that international security is a universal problem that the United Nations will succeed. Unless this realisation penetrates most of the foreign offices of the world, I am afraid the United Nations will go the way of its predecessor, the League of Nations.

Sir, I find now the need for a revision of the United Nations Charter. Article 51 is the source of all the

[Shri Jaganatha Rao]

mischief. Unless this Charter is revised in a proper form, I am afraid this state of affairs will continue.

Sir, our Prime Minister has been criticising the Eisenhower Doctrine of a "vacuum". What right has America to fill in this vacuum, as he calls it, in the Middle-East? This vacuum is occupied by millions of people. They have their own Government; they are fighting for their own freedom from foreign aggression. What right has America or for the matter of that any other country, to fill in this so-called vacuum in another country? The solution would be to follow the policy of India, one of non-interference and also of peaceful co-existence

Our Prime Minister was the first person to condemn the nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and explosions. Today America and Russia are playing the game of chess with these missiles as pawns. America has produced a long-range missile; Russia has produced inter-continental ballistic missile. Where is the end to this race? If the two countries go on in this way I am afraid the world will come to an end.

Sir, on the whole, the policy that has been followed by our Government right from the day of independence in 1947 to this day has been the correct policy, which has been acclaimed as such by several countries of the world. It is no good for our hon friends in the Opposition saying that our Government should follow a different policy. One hon Member, Mr Hem Barua, has criticised the part played by our Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon in the United Nations. I would only request him to go through the records of the last ten years and see what part he has played. He is a brilliant statesman, with wisdom and farsight and I am surprised the hon. Member has got the temerity to question the correctness and appropriateness of his policy.

I support the policy followed by Government, to which effect I have moved an amendment. I commend my amendment to the House.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have got two or three suggestions to make.

The Prime Ministers of India, China and Russia should meet....

**An Hon. Member:** And sign a military pact!

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** Nobody knows more than the Prime Minister the gravity of the international situation, and especially the danger which confronts this country. He has said this morning about the enormous quantities of arms that America, our friend, has given to Pakistan, which is plotting day and night to loot and devastate us. I do not know how the freedom, independence and territorial integrity of this country can be secured without our entering into an alliance with China and Russia. We seem to have become allergic to military pacts in an age—in a world of nation States. We do not seem to realise the concomitants of the age. I suggest to the Prime Minister that a strict watch should be kept on the activities of all foreigners in this country.

In view of what has successfully been done in Jordan and what was attempted to be done in Syria, I have to make these humble suggestions. Our political thinking regarding Pakistan is based on three assumptions: No. 1. Pakistan is a satellite State of America; No. 2. America does not want Pakistan to invade this country; and No. 3: there is an imminent danger of invasion of India by Pakistan. These three assumptions do not go together. If Pakistan is a satellite State of America, then it cannot wage war against her wishes. If there is an imminent danger of invasion, then something is wrong with our political calculations.

If America does not want war and still Pakistan wants to invade India,

then Pakistan is not a satellite State of America. I maintain, Sir, that I draw this conclusion—Military alliance does not lead to subservience. We will have to revise our notions about the Baghdad Pact.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There will be greater force in his argument, if the hon. Member were to stand erect.

**An Hon. Member:** The hon. Member's notes are flying; let him pick them.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not dignified that the hon. Member should be speaking while he is walking.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** ...But if we maintain that Pakistan is a satellite State and Pakistan wants to invade India the logic of the argument drives one to the conclusion that America wants Pakistan to invade India. Thirdly, there is no need for wasting money over defence if both the first and the second assumptions are correct, for then there can never be any war. Let us then sleep eternally in peace

I suggest that the Government of India should make an offer of a federal union to both China and Russia, and also an offer of a military alliance to China and Russia, and Egypt and Syria as well. When I speak for a federal union or a military alliance with China, my eye is on South East Asia. When I plead for a federal union or a military alliance with Russia, my eye is on the Middle East. A foreign policy of non-alignment does not take into account South East Asia and the Middle East. India cannot survive as an independent unit if South East Asia goes down under Chinese or American rule, and if the Middle East goes down under Russia or America. We are not outside the range of firing.

I suggest that the Government of India should purchase arms from the Soviet Union. But I have always added a rider that before doing so we should enter into a military alliance with China and Russia. No danger

will accrue to this country if we purchase arms from the Soviet Union after we have entered into a military alliance. I venture to maintain, Sir, that alliance or no alliance with Russia, America cannot win in a limited war in Western Asia. When I suggest that we should enter into a military alliance with China and Russia, it is with a view to preventing Pakistan from invading this country. I want Pakistan to exist as a sovereign State. But I am certain, whether there is any alliance or not, if Pakistan invades this country, Russia will attack and liquidate Pakistan in her own interest. Because, the Baghdad Pact constitutes a threat to the Soviet Union, and a conflict between India and Pakistan will provide a golden opportunity to the Soviet Union to finish this menace.

I want Pakistan to exist as a sovereign independent State, because I am afraid that with the liquidation of Pakistan the whole of the Middle East from Rawalpindi to Constantinople will pass under the Russian orbit of influence. Therefore I want Pakistan to exist as a sovereign independent unit. I do not want the vacuum in the Middle East to be filled by Russia or America. It cannot be filled by the countries of the Middle East themselves. It can only be filled on the basis of a federal union, because Russia will never permit the countries of the Middle East to be integrated. The power position of Russia is such that it can prevent any development from happening in the Middle East which runs counter to her interests. We are also interested likewise in the Middle East, and our interest lies in the maintenance of the freedom and territorial integrity of the countries of South East Asia and the Middle East. Without collaboration with Russia the vacuum in the Middle East cannot be filled. We cannot fight against Russia; and no nation in Western Asia or Middle East or Africa or Europe is in a position to fight and wage a successful war against the Soviet Union. We must be realistic. I am not enamoured

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

of the Soviet Union or China, but I am enamoured of freedom and peace.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is that all?

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** No.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There should not be such long intervals.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I am opposed to the Baghdad Pact. I am not opposed to the Baghdad Pact just because it is a military alliance—for I myself plead for a military alliance with China and Russia. I am against the Baghdad Pact because it constitutes a threat to this country. I am against it because of the presence of an interloper, that is America. The presence of America prevents the political integration of Asia, both in South East Asia and the Middle East. I am also opposed to the Baghdad Pact on the ground that the presence of America will lead to war. Firstly I am opposed to it because the presence of America prevents the political integration of Asia, and secondly because there will be a war if the Baghdad Pact is allowed to continue for some time more.

There is one thing which strikes me, and I think that Members of this House must have also thought over this aspect, namely, why is it that there is always trouble in the Old World, why the danger of war always arises in the Old World and not in the New World? Why is the New World singularly free from all political unrest and turmoil of a nature which may threaten the peace of that Continent? Of course, minor palace revolutions and *coups de etat* always happen there, but there is no danger of war. There are two reasons why this is so. America succeeded in establishing her hegemony over the New World. That was called the Monroe Doctrine. The success of this venture was mainly due to two factors. There was no power strong enough in the New World to challenge the position of the United States of America. And secondly the powers of the Old World were quarrelling among

themselves and did not pay sufficient attention to what was happening in the New World. The position in the Old World is different. Since the last fifty years America has been intervening in the affairs of the Old World. Whenever any nation of Western Europe tried to integrate Europe, they have intervened and prevented the political integration of the Old World. Both during the time of the First World War and the Second World War the Americans came and prevented Germany from integrating Europe. Unless the Old World is integrated there will never be any peace. It is not by resorting to any stock-exchange diplomacy that peace can be maintained in the Old World. The condition precedent to the political integration of the world is the political integration of the old world, and the condition precedent to the integration of the Old World is the political integration of Europe, and the condition precedent to the integration of Europe is the integration of the Middle East, and the condition precedent to the integration of the Middle East is the integration of South East Asia.

I have said many a time on the floor of the House that the depth of the political vacuum in South East Asia is greater than the depth of the political vacuum in the Middle East. America and Russia face each other in Europe. In Europe the power position of Russia is strong, but not strong enough to liquidate America. I now come to the Middle East. Here again, America and Russia face each other, and here again the power position of Russia is superior and stronger, but not strong enough to liquidate America. Therefore, there is a deadlock both in Europe and in the Middle East. Now I come to South East Asia. Here, China confronts America—China which is no match to America. Here the danger of American hegemony is greater. This is the first sense in which I say that the vacuum in South East Asia is deeper.

Now I come to the second reason why I say that the vacuum in South

East Asia is greater than in the Middle East or Europe. There is a danger of a political settlement between Russia and America. If a political settlement is arrived at over our heads, over China and India, ignoring our interests, jeopardising our interests, the Russians will allow the Americans to establish their hegemony over South East Asia. The price that America will pay will be to facilitate the establishment of Russian hegemony in the Middle East. If India and China come together on the basis of a federal union or a military alliance, no power on earth can fill the vacuum in South East Asia. If India and China fill the vacuum, no doors will be left open to Russia to impose itself on India.

There are two alternatives left to the Russians, either to join hands with the Americans or with the Asian people. We must liquidate the first alternative, so that Russia can be compelled to live in peace with the peoples of Asia. The solution to all the problems of International politics lies in the hands of India and China. If India and China come together, India and Russia will have to come together.

Russia is not in a position to integrate Europe because of the danger of attack from two sides, Asia as well as Europe. The Americans are in a position to attack Russia from two sides, but if India, China and Russia join together, they would not attack. The Americans cannot invade Russia. We must stand solidly behind Russia and help Russia to integrate Europe. Unless Europe is integrated, there will never be peace. The road to Rome, Berlin, Paris and London lies via Moscow, Peking and New Delhi.

**Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad):** As I listened to our Prime Minister I felt, as most Members in the House felt, that the direction of the foreign policy that he has been enunciating and following is fundamentally sound, but great differences crop up as to the

tempo and the method by which the policy is to be implemented.

I want first to take the question of our nearest neighbours, Pakistan and Goa. In the matter of Goa there is very serious discontent all over the country, and particularly in Bombay State, because Diu, Daman and Goa, the so-called Portuguese possessions, are on our borders. We have skirmishes, we have firings, and there are casualties sometimes, and people feel that after a lot of tempo was generated by speeches from the High Command, nothing more is being done in the matter, and we are still being solaced and comforted with high-sounding phrases and sentences while we see no end to our troubles, no end to the troubles of our brothers and sisters in Goa, Diu and Daman.

In the matter of Kashmir I am sorry to find a sort of hush-hush policy being followed even in this House. As a new comer I am rather surprised to see that hardly any questions or hardly any resolutions, private or governmental, are being brought before the House in the matter of Kashmir when today we have to discuss Kashmir in relation to the questions and conflicts with Pakistan.

We are four square with Government in feeling and asserting that Kashmir is and shall remain a part of India. But at the same time, here again, we have not only to look to the international aspect, but also to the internal aspect. I was thankful to see my friend Shri Raju opening the lid a little bit and referring, however lightly, to the internal administration of Kashmir, because everything that happens in Kashmir is related to our conflict with Pakistan, and the murmurs, the worries, the troubles, the complaints, the oppression or suppression of persons of individuals, incarcerations and detentions not only come here but go across the oceans to the United Nations and they are the object of great propaganda against us.

[Shri Yajnik]

We want normalcy all over. We want that our relations with Pakistan should be brought to normalcy let us bring the conditions in Kashmir also to normalcy. Let alone old past events. Let us concentrate on the present moment. We were all glad that, though we were told that the rumblings of the international storm may affect the time-table for our elections, our elections did go through. At the same time, the Constituent Assembly in Kashmir also sealed its union with India. It was a matter of rejoicing. But having done that, shall we not proceed further? What is the position constitutionally today? Article 370 of our Constitution says that only article 1 and article 370 shall apply to Kashmir

What did Kashmir accede to? What is the meaning of the accession of Kashmir to India? Certainly it is accession of a government to another government; but it is also the accession of the people of Kashmir to the Constitution of India. And what does the Constitution mean? The Constitution means so many hundreds of articles, out of which only two are applied today. The Constitution envisages the Government of India in three agencies, the executive, the Central Government, this Parliament and the Supreme Court. What are their privileges and powers with regard to Kashmir? We have been told in article 370 that India shall concern itself only with the subjects mentioned in the Instrument of Accession, Communications, Defence and Foreign Policy, and the rest may be laid down by the President in his Orders. The President has issued his Order of 1954, and that Order while applying article 19 and conferring all the seven freedoms that are conferred on the citizens of India also on the citizens of Kashmir, has by adding subsection (7) to article 19 dealing with the freedoms, drastically curtailed the right of the Supreme Court in dealing with complaints regarding infringement of civil liberties in the matter of

the citizens of Kashmir. That provision says:

"The words 'reasonable restrictions' occurring in clauses (2), (3), (4) and (5) shall be construed as meaning such restrictions as the appropriate Legislature deems reasonable".

The word 'reasonable' is justiciable in the context of the citizens of India, but this word 'reasonable' has only to be construed in Kashmir exactly as the Legislature has laid it down, with the result that our Supreme Court, which is the sentinel and the custodian of our liberties, can do nothing in the matter of the citizens of Kashmir.

My submission, therefore, is that if these civil liberties of the people of Kashmir are to be guaranteed, and conditions in that State brought to normal, it is necessary that the whole Constitution, subject to such provisos or exceptions that might be necessary, the whole Constitution, especially the articles dealing with civil liberties, should be applied to Kashmir so that afterwards there may be no complaint about the arrest of a person or suppression of a newspaper, because whether it happens in India, in any other State of India or in Kashmir, everything can go up to the Supreme Court and everybody has confidence in the integrity of the Supreme Court, and when the Supreme Court is seized of any matter and can decide on these issues, then the reasonable grounds in respect of civil liberties in Kashmir, as in the whole of the rest of India, will remain inviolate.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga):** On a point of order. The hon. Member is discussing the question of the citizenship of the people of Kashmir. We are discussing foreign affairs. I would like to know whether the internal question of the citizens of India is relevant to this discussion.

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** That is home affairs.

**Shri Yajnik:** We are proud of the accession of Kashmir to India. What

does this accession mean? The accession of the people and Government of Kashmir to the people, Government and Constitution of India. And if it is to be made a reality and not merely ending in a phrase, it is necessary that the Supreme Court, like this Parliament, like the Government of India, should have undisputed sway over the people and Government of Kashmir and should also guarantee the same freedom, the same liberty of the citizen that is available to the people of India to the people of Kashmir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is correct, but the only doubt that has been expressed is whether this internal question has anything to do with external affairs which we are discussing.

**Shri Yajnik:** As I said before, these complaints about the curtailment of civil liberties in Kashmir do not remain merely the property of the people of India. They have wings and they go to the U.N.O. and become the subject of serious complaints and propoganda against us. Therefore, first and foremost everything that happens in Kashmir relates to foreign policy because it is taken over to U.N.O. and becomes an instrument of mud-slinging against us.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That would be far-fetched, and the hon. Member may not find time to deal with external affairs.

**Shri Yajnik:** Secondly, our Prime Minister told us that we could not, and we would not vie with Pakistan in military equipment. We will not run a military race with them. Then we must depend on the unswerving loyalty, regard, friendship and contentment of the people of Kashmir. We should have real moral, political and psychological rearmament of the people of Kashmir if it is to serve as a buttress of their own freedom and also of the freedom of India. That is with regard to this point, and I hope that our Prime Minister, who is going to Kashmir in the next few days, will make thorough inquiries into the mat-

ter and see for himself how he can bring back normalcy to that distressed area.

There are two other problems which have also been discussed from a wide international angle. While agreeing with most of our friends about banning or suspending the tests of A and H bombs and while desiring to destroy them altogether, my feeling is that we would do best at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the U.N.O. to be held this month to follow the broad lead that we have ourselves given and that has recently been reinforced by the conference that met at Tokyo against A and H bombs. That conference cannot be said to have been the instrument of any particular bloc. We all know that that conference in Tokyo had the backing of its own Government and nobody out of bedlam will dream of Japan being a satellite of the Soviet or Chinese Government. There were American delegations there; there were delegations from Asiatic, European and African countries. That conference was greeted and blessed by messages from many Parliaments and Governments. Our Vice-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, also sent a message of greetings. That conference has restated in the clearest terms the demand of the millions and millions of the world for an immediate and absolute cessation of all tests of all nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. I think that would also include all tests of the bellicose ballistic weapons which are called the ultimate weapons.

Now, we will be perfectly on safe-ground. The matter is coming up and I have no doubt that our Government, with the Resolution that we have already adopted in this very House, will do its very best to see that this Resolution is implemented in the General Assembly of the U.N.O. What I am most concerned with is that these A and H bombs do not necessarily spell danger, disaster and death merely for those who are direct objects of these A and H bombs. Today the world is getting smaller every-

[Shri Yajnik]

day and if there is an experiment at one end of the world, we are affected at the other end. Our Prime Minister told us this morning that the proportion of radio-active material has risen, however slightly, but it has risen, even on our shores, though it has not reached the proportion of the danger point. But who knows when it will rise to that level and before it rises to that danger level, it is quite possible that some bad effects might be experienced. Therefore, I say, it is not merely for purposes of the world, but also for our own health, for our own happiness, for our own salvation, we want a complete nuclear ban, not only to place a ban on the tests but ultimately on the production of all these A and H bombs and I hope our Government and its delegation will follow a vigorous policy in the matter.

16 hrs.

In the matter of the Middle East, and West Asia and Eastern Asia, the Far East as it is called, there is only one big point that I want to make. We do not want to dabble into other people's affairs. But, what is the reality of the situation? The fact is that for many years past, especially after the last peace or the last War, Russia and China have been sought to be encircled by the Western Powers. It is not for me to speak about it. You see lots of American magazines and you see the whole chain of bases with which they want to ring round China and Russia. If the British and American Governments and their propaganda machines are attacking the foreign policy of India, it is largely because we have not become their yes-men. We have chosen and we have dared to follow an independent policy. We are not a link in their chain anyhow and that is why they are up in arms against us and want to embarrass us in many ways. They oppose us in the U.N.O; they oppose us sometimes on the Kashmir issue. They do not want to make it easy for us and they want to make it as difficult as possible in many respects.

There was this old idea of ringing the Soviet Union and Russia with their bases. Now, this is being taken further. And whatever happens to Russia and China today, we are being encircled and who will say no to it? Look at the map of the world; look at what passes all round us from one end to the other, from Japan to Africa; almost everywhere, you see these bases. Japan remains a base in spite of the Conference resolution protesting against the American bases in that country. So also Formosa, I think, South Indo-China, South Korea, Philippines. Indonesia is not, but then a part of Indonesia today is being sought to be made a base and where it is a base it is also a base for atomic and strategic weapons. Then, you see Honkong, and Singapore. Ceylon has, probably, escaped from its nets for the moment. That is very good.

Remember that Diu, Daman and Goa are not merely Diu, Daman and Goa. They are not merely Portuguese. They represent the bases of these western powers who want to create a ring of bases round the other countries and round Asia now and our own country, and then take it up with other bases that are sought to be created now in Iran, Oman and Muscat.

Last year there was trouble with Jordan; last year Amman, now Oman. There was trouble in Egypt and Egypt has come out unscathed from this trouble, not altogether unscathed. Then Turkey. Turkey is a big base. You never know when they have strategic or atomic weapons. Remember, therefore, that it is no question of big theories. It is no question of fighting imperialism in the abstract. We have to fight a concrete situation in which we are being encircled from all sides.

What are we today? Do we want to give in? Do we want to adopt our foreign policy in obedience to the dictates of the big powers or do we want

to raise our head as high as we have done and remain independent in our foreign policy? If we want to maintain our high stand, spiritually, morally and culturally in this world, as we have done up till now, it is necessary to be exceedingly cautious about these latest developments, in Oman and Singapore. If we have to speak about Oman, if we have to make a very emphatic protest, it is not because morally we want to be shouting aloud, but we must have a long range view. There is Aden; there are the old bases in Iran, Persia. Iran is also having a base and we draw our oil from that place. In all this context, it must be understood that if we have to fight against the British seizure of Oman or their aggression in Yemen, it is not with a view to fight our old imperialistic enemy, Britain. But it is largely with a view to save ourselves and to save the integrity and freedom of the Asiatic and the African people.

In that sense, I think, it is very necessary that our policy in this matter of Oman or Syria should be positive. I do not say it should be loud all the time but it should be positive and must be firmly and perseveringly followed and here is an opportunity at the U.N.O. At the U.N.O. meeting our Delegation will go. The Imam of Oman has sent out an SOS to all the Bandung Powers and we were in the Bandung Conference. We are associated with the Bandung Resolution and decisions and it is up to us, therefore, to respond to that appeal, to join with our friends of Asia and Africa, join them in a very vigorous protests against the further incursion of Britain into this Arab land and against the massacre of innocent people whose townships have been demolished.

Syria may be a small dot on the map but Syria is a link in their chain. It can also be a link in the chain of freedom as it can be in the chain of slavery. And, therefore, I say that even Oman today or Syria tomorrow, are symbolic of the freedom of our Asiatic people. Though small coun-

tries, they are symbols today of the freedom of the whole of Asia and the whole of Africa, in fact, of all the peoples of the world. I desire and I submit that our Delegation should immediately confer if we have not already conferred with all the Asiatic and African friends in the U.N.O. and carry out a vigorous policy which would compel these western powers to halt, to look and to retrace their steps so that aggression may not be attempted again and normalcy would return with peace in Asia and Africa.

**Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amended resolution, as accepted by the Prime Minister, and in doing so.....

**An Hon. Member:** Who has accepted?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Not accepted so far. The motion and the amendments both are there for discussion; probably, the hon. Member was not here then.

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** I mentioned about it from what I heard in the lobby, I would like to withdraw it. I rise to support the motion made by the Prime Minister asking this House to take into consideration.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But he can support the amendment.

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** I do not make much difference between the motion and the amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Prime Minister has not so far accepted it.

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** Sir, I am supporting the Prime Minister's proposition.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There is no proposition by me.

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** I know there is no positive resolution before the House except that we are taking a particular situation into consideration allowing the House to air its views on the matter.

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

Sir, I now stand before you to say a few words about the foreign policy of our country. After the advent of independence our policy is being directed with a blend of realism and idealism. That has produced substantial results not only to our country but to the Asiatic continent. Sir, my mind goes back to the year 1948 when the Prime Minister addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris, when he had to expound the basic principles of the foreign policy of India before the great assembly of the world nations. Therein he has in so many words expressly stated that our foreign policy is based mainly on rooting out colonialism in the world, establishment of freedom in all freedom lacking countries and extermination of racial superiority in this world.

Now, after ten years of our existence as a free nation, if you look back we can very well assess how far we are justified in our attitude of, what is called, non-alignment in our foreign relations.

With regard to the first item, rooting out colonialism, India, with a sizeable population that accounts for something in international matters, has stood firmly against colonialism of the western nations. Though not entirely due to the efforts that India has made, but on account of the moral stand which this country has taken the colonialism in the east has been largely liquidated. For instance, whatever the reason may be, colonialism of the western type is going to disappear and will likely disappear from the eastern waters.

Another thing is, there is too much of interference by western nations. The habitual traditional interference of the western nations in the affairs of the Asiatic nations has become a chronic habit with those nations. It is very difficult to make them get rid of this habit. Whatever happens in Asia in China, in South-East-Asia, it has been a matter of keen interest and always permanent intrigue for

the western nations. By our attitude in these matters we have been able to rectify circumstances to a certain extent. For instance, Indonesia getting out of the clutches of the Dutch and Indo-China getting out of the clutches of the French have helped in this process and in that India had its own part to play.

Coming nearer home, we have been able to evolve a new pattern of the membership of the British Commonwealth. Our friends have been objecting strongly that we should sever our connections with the British Commonwealth. Of course, there is an amount of feeling in the country too, of which our Prime Minister is aware, that the recent happenings in England, and the attitude of the British public and British newspapers about India, have accelerated the feeling between India and England. But these are the times when we have to show some patience, some forbearance. In an atmosphere of opposition, carping criticism, when leading newspapers in England were criticising our country and our Prime Minister, our Prime Minister took a decision to attend the recent conference of the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth. That requires courage, that requires foresight, that enables us to stand firm when there is emotional disturbance from all sides. Our going to the conference table has created an impression, a position for India which cannot be easily or light-heartedly treated even by the United Kingdom.

There is a feeling that a time may come when we will be dominating the United Kingdom. There were prophets that were not wanting among the British public saying that hereafter the British nation has to turn out to be the tail and the main dog will be India, and the tail cannot afford to wag the dog any more. But we do not aspire to such a position. As long as there is some purpose and some ideal for which we are pursuing, which can be achieved by relieving some of these smaller nations

from the clutches of British Imperialism, there is place for us in the Commonwealth, and it cannot be lightly treated. There are other ties, commercial, military and cultural, with England which may be severed at any moment if you like, but a large amount of cultural and commercial utility can be derived by continuing for some time in the British Commonwealth without any violence to our feelings or the sense of republicanism in the country.

With regard to the attitude taken by our Prime Minister even in an atmosphere of complete hostility in America, he has made bold to travel all the way to the United States to see President Eisenhower and explained to him our real stand. President Eisenhower may be helpless for the time being, he may be outwitted or intrigued against by his own Secretary of State and his Vice President, but still the President of the United States carries a personal prestige for goodness, for honesty of purpose which, I think, must have been properly assessed by world forces. Wherever there is a necessity of clarifying our stand, wherever there is an opportunity of explaining our position and making it clear that there are certain fundamentals on which India stands, we always stand to gain. On such occasions our Prime Minister has not stood on mere personal prestige or pride, but he has gone to the farthest corners of the world to explain the stand of India.

What is our stand? We have taken a stand even before our independence that India is opposed to imperialism, to colonialism, to fascism, to communism. If we are opposed to all these 'isms', what is the ism by which we are standing? Ours is a democratic State with democratic way of life. We, the youngest democracy in this world, have shown how democracy can work smoothly and calmly. Without violence, an electorate of 17 crores—a voting strength equal to the population of Russia and slightly less than the population of the United States—

went to the polls twice within ten years. It has shown how without violence, shootings or murders elections could be carried on to fill thousands of seats in the legislatures of the country. Our Constitution is based on a democratic bed rock. Our legislation is absolutely democratic. Not only that, this strength of the Opposition Party is a standing example of the democratic spirit of our Constitution. Opposition parties in other countries where democracy does not work are completely liquidated.

Now, if there is any misunderstanding about us in the United States or United Kingdom our actions are eloquent testimony of the basic faith in democracy which this country has proclaimed. With all that the country has shown an amount of independence of conduct, independence of judgment and courage of conviction. That has not been cowed down by the atom bomb or hydrogen bomb that Russia and America are producing for mutual destruction, not only of themselves but of the whole world.

Our policy has been wedded to one thing that is peculiar and traditional to this country, and that is the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi. That teaching has fashioned the political life of this country, gave an ideology to this country, that has shown the world that a nation of 35 crores can be emancipated without shedding blood. That is the sheet anchor, the bed rock on which our policy of non-interference, non-alignment and, as far as possible, non-violence in public matters is built up. We are pursuing that policy. We are friends of all. Just now in his opening speech the Prime Minister has said that he wants complete friendship with everybody. He does not want enmity with anybody and so could we not afford to be friends with the Communist China and with Communist Russia and a democratic United Kingdom and democratic America? People in the West are not able to conceive that once you differ from a man you need go the not whole hog in differing from him in every respect. That is the

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

atmosphere in which now the rival powers in the East and in the West and in Russia and the United States are contending for world domination.

In this context, India has refused to take sides. We have told them that we are friends of all because two world wars have created such a consternation for a third world war. If you see the pictures that are now exhibited about the visit of our Prime Minister to Russia and China, if you see the longing eyes and bleeding hearts of the young men who are driven like cannon-fodder to satisfy the war lust of those leaders in those countries, you will understand that the younger generation in every country does not want war but wants peace and they look to the Prime Minister of this country, our leader, who has got the moral stature and courage to stand up and tell those people that 'you should not rake up a third world war with these destructive weapons'. It is a contribution that we have made to world peace. It is the contribution which our policy of non-alignment has made to world peace.

Now, after ten years of freedom, after the first Five Year Plan, we are now thinking of building up this nation by a series of five year plans and building economy in this country. We are greatly interested in peace. No other nation that has won its freedom recently can have greater interest in seeing that a holocaust which will envelop the country in flames should not come, and we say, give us a little respite, peace of mind and an opportunity to pursue our peaceful occupation of development in this country. That is the main interest that influences our attitude of non-alignment and prevention of war in this world and we have to devote our attention to that. In that, we have to make it clear about our friendships. There is no use of anyone misunderstanding it, namely, the geographical position in which we are situated, with two large land masses occupied by 65 crores of Chinese on one side and 17 crores of Russians on

the other side, and ourselves comprising 35 crores of people. This constitutes more than half of the world population. This poses a very big problem for us. We cannot afford to quarrel. We cannot afford to align ourselves thoughtlessly either with the Baghdad Pact or SEATO or NATO or any other military pact in this world. We are as the Prime Minister has put it nicely, walking on the edge of a sword and India is doing that with great care. You cannot afford to incur the displeasure or the enmity of one nation for the doubtful friendship of another nation.

In these circumstances, we are able to say that we are going to develop the country and we are going to stick to the fundamental tenets of our Constitution. If those policies are violated, if we are attacked, if those tenets are sought to be watered down, then the Government and the people of this nation are one in defending it. If there is any doubt about the part India plays when the real test comes, when the real critical situation comes, we will show it. When such a situation came previously, and when a situation arose when others expected that we would align ourselves with one side or the other, we have lived and shown that we stood by our Constitution and we have shown that that we are always by our democratic rights and protected our individual rights and freedom and democratic life and not the autocratic and the totalitarian way of life.

Therefore, this is the time when our diplomacy has got a great and delicate task to perform in telling those people that India will be pursuing the policy of peace and strive towards her economic betterment. There are people who are brave and play their part in shaping the world. In India today, our Prime Minister occupies a high position among the tallest men in the world, and our Shri Krishna Menon, with a mind like a razor-edge has got a

particular mission and purpose to serve in the world set-up today, and our great Vice-President, who is a philosopher-statesman, has to interpret this country to others and allay the doubts and fears about our attitude. These three gentlemen can play a great role in creating world opinion in our favour and in seeing that all the best and good-intentioned friends in the country come to the rescue of this country and make the country stand on its own legs in fulfilling its second Five Year Plan.

**Shri Dinesh Singh (Banda):** I should like, first of all, to congratulate the Prime Minister on his foreign policy, a policy of peace friendship and of non-involvement which has won the respect of all the thinking people all over the world. We might consider our foreign policy in two aspects. One aspect of it may be called the international aspect—our contribution in solving world problems, our aid and advice to other countries and our co-operation in the maintenance of peace and in the betterment of the world in general. If I may say so, we have done admirably well here. Ours is a newly freed country, weak in terms of material wealth and armed forces. As soon as we became free, we were caught up in the cold war that was going on and which continues to go on, a reference to which was made by the Prime Minister himself. We have withstood the storm and we have taken an honoured place in the councils of nations. Our policy, based on the five principles of Panchsheel, may yet offer an alternative to the hydrogen bomb. This is no mean achievement, and I would like once again to pay a personal tribute to the Prime Minister for achieving in such a short time what many nations have not done in their lifetime so far.

The other aspect of our policy is what we might call the national aspect, that is, the understanding and help that we are able to get from other countries in solving our problems. Here also, we have done well.

We have the goodwill of many countries, even of those countries which do not wholly support us. But in this respect, there is, I feel, room for improvement. We have not received much support from the democratic countries whose friendship we should naturally expect. We have also not received support from certain countries for which we have gone out wholeheartedly. What is really wrong, what we are not able to do, is a problem which the Government must consider very seriously. I can only say that in a very small measure the responsibility lies on our representatives who are our spokesmen abroad. Our heads of missions in our missions abroad, our Ministers, our ambassadors, I feel, have not been able to put in such effort as we might expect from them. It is their duty.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may speak a little more loudly. He is not audible to the reporters.

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** As I was saying, I feel that our representatives abroad should take a little more care about what they are doing. They should try to meet all classes of people, try to gather all shades of opinion and try to reach the people who in the democratic countries are the real sovereigns. Even in other forms of Government, totalitarian Governments, the awakening is growing, and we should try to study their problems. We should try to find out how best we can help them. Then only we shall be able to put through our viewpoints once we are able to understand them.

So far as the junior members of our services are concerned, they live in constant discontentment. The Prime Minister himself has mentioned their difficulties and their economic hardships. I feel that if they are made better, they will be able to contribute more for the national cause.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

Another point which I would like to make is that our foreign policy, our defence policy and our economic policy should be an integrated whole. At present our foreign policy is an independent policy based on non-alignment, while our defence policy and our economic policy are dependent on what one might call the 'western bloc'. We have got to procure our supplies from them. So long as we continue to procure our supplies from only one power bloc, we shall always be dependent on them. They are also in a position to know our weakness and our strength, because they have supplied the goods and they know what we need.

This is a very important matter. I do not mean to say that we should join one power bloc or the other, or that we should run in panic to the other power bloc, if we do not get our supplies from one. But we should try to buy them independently from all countries which can supply us. That is our weakness today. We see that our neighbour is being dangerously armed. The Prime Minister himself has mentioned that a certain power bloc is arming our neighbour dangerously. We must consider how our neighbour is being armed. They do not need the guns; all they need is food and clothing. But they are getting military supplies. Why is it that they are getting military supplies? They have no danger of being attacked by either power group. What for are they receiving these huge quantities of arms? Is it because that certain people want to destroy our independent policy? Is it because they feel jealous of us that we are following an independent policy? This situation will continue.

Therefore, it is essential that we buy what we need from all countries which can supply us. We should not be regimented to one pattern. There is the question of strategy also. We are getting our supplies from a certain power group and our personnel

are being trained there. Everything is known to them. If we bring in an element of surprise, if we are able to bring in new goods which are unknown to the other side, we will also be providing a deterrent to them and they will consider twice before they try to attack us. The country which is supplying arms to our neighbour might also think in the matter and might decide that this arms race is futile. They might also consider following, if I may say so, a more reasonable attitude.

Similarly our economic policy is also linked with certain power blocs. Our Finance Minister himself has said that we need a foreign loan for the core of the Plan. If we need foreign loan even for the core of the Plan, it is obvious that we depend upon outside help. If we limit it to one power group, we should be forced to depend on it even for our foreign policy. We cannot pursue this policy of independence unless we achieve independence from one power group. It is with this in mind that I beg to suggest to the Government that we should try to spread our dependence all over the world, so that we are not dependent on any one country or any one group. We are today wanting a loan from the United States of America. It is a very odd thing, if I may say so, that we should go for a loan to a capitalist country, a country wedded to free enterprise, to get loan to build our socialist pattern. Naturally, we should not get it from them. If we want to follow a socialist pattern, we must brace ourselves; we must try to do things ourselves and not base our Plan, especially the core of it, on foreign help.

There has been a reference to the North-east Frontier Agency. That is not strictly speaking part of our foreign policy. But since it has been brought in, since it is under the Ministry of External Affairs, whose policy we are discussing today, I would make a small point in this

connection also. There is considerable trouble there. I believe the trouble is not actually in the NEFA region, but in the Naga Hill districts of Assam. Their basic demand is that they should be taken out from the Hill Districts of Assam and linked to the North-east Frontier Agency. This demand has already being considered by the Government, as we see from newspaper reports and I hope the Government would give it a favourable consideration, so that we are able to stop blood-shed there and free the 17 battalions or so of our Army and many more of our armed police which are engaged there.

I do not wish to take more time of the House. I am in full support of the policy of the Government. I hope that the Government would consider my humble suggestions in the light they are offered.

श्री बाबूगई (बलरामपुर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बात से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता कि पिछले दस वर्षों में हम ने जिस विदेश नीति का अवलम्बन किया है, उस के कारण सत्तार में भारत की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ी है। हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जहाँ कहीं जाते हैं, करोड़ों व्यक्ति उन का सम्मान करते हैं। उन्हें शान्ति का देवपूत कह कर पुकारा जाता है। जब उन का सम्मान होता है, तो वह प्रत्येक भारतीय को, वह किसी भी पार्टी का हो, भ्रान्त्य वेता है। लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि जिस अनुपात में हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ी है, शायद उसी अनुपात में हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कठिनाइयाँ भी बढ़ गई हैं। यदि हम अपने देश की समस्याओं पर विचार करें, तो हम देखते हैं कि हमारी समस्याएँ अधिकाधिक उलझती जा रही हैं। काश्मीर का प्रश्न लीजिए, या गोष्ठा का सवाल, या विदेशों में बसे हुए भारतीयों की समस्या हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की प्रतिष्ठा, उन का मान सम्मान, इन समस्याओं को हल करने में जितना सहायक होना चाहिए था, अभी तक नहीं हुआ है।

हम सारे संसार को अपना मित्र बनाने वाले थे, किन्तु आज ऐसी स्थिति हो गई है

कि हम अपने को सर्वथा मित्रहीन पाते हैं। काश्मीर के प्रश्न पर चिन देशों से हमें व्यापपूर्ण समर्थन की आशा थी, उनसे हमें समर्थन नहीं मिला है। कुछ देशों की हम ने मदद की, उन की कठिनाइयों को हल करने का प्रयत्न किया वे देश भी काश्मीर के सवाल पर भारत के पक्ष का असंदिग्ध रूप में समर्थन नहीं कर रहे हैं। स्वैज नहर के सवाल पर हम ने मित्र के पक्ष में ऐसा रवैया अपनाया, जिस के कारण ब्रिटेन में हमारे सम्बन्ध टूटने की आशाका पैदा हो गई, लेकिन उस मित्र ने, और उस के प्रैजिडेंट कर्नल नासर ने अभी तक काश्मीर के प्रश्न पर भारत के व्यापपूर्ण अधिकार का समर्थन नहीं किया है। यही बात कम्युनिस्ट चीन के बारे में भी कही जा सकती है। कम्युनिस्ट चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र सत्र में स्थान मिलना चाहिए, इस की हम ने घाए दिन बकामत की—और यह ठीक भी है कि उसे राष्ट्र संघ में स्थान दिया जाय। कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने तिब्बत पर जो आक्रमण किया, उस की ओर से भी हम ने अपनी नजर हटा ली। लेकिन काश्मीर के सवाल पर कम्युनिस्ट चीन के नेताओं ने अभी तक हमारा खुला समर्थन नहीं किया है। इतना ही नहीं, पाकिस्तान के समाचारपत्र इस तरह का प्रचार कर रहे हैं— मैं नहीं जानता कि वह कहाँ तक ठीक है, यह तो सरकार का कर्तव्य है कि वह इस सम्बन्ध में सच्चाई पर प्रकाश डाले, लेकिन पाकिस्तान के पत्रों का कहना है—कि चीन के राष्ट्रपति, श्री माओ-त्से-तुंग, ने इस प्रकार की भावना व्यक्त की है कि कम्युनिस्ट देशों को काश्मीर के सवाल पर तटस्थ रहना चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में हमें रूस की नीति को भी याद रखना आवश्यक है। काश्मीर पर पाकिस्तान ने आक्रमण किया, यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र सत्र में हम इस सवाल को ले गए लेकिन जब तक पाकिस्तान ने अमरीका के साथ सैनिक गठबंधन करके अपने को खुले रूप में रूस के खिलाफ नहीं कर दिया, तब तक रूस ने काश्मीर के सवाल पर हमारे पक्ष का समर्थन नहीं किया। काश्मीर के सवाल

[श्री वाजपेयी]

पर तो हमारा पक्ष पहले भी न्यायपूर्ण था। जब पाकिस्तान ने अमरीका से गठबंधन नहीं किया था, तब भी हमारा पक्ष न्यायपूर्ण था, मगर उस समय रूस के नेता नहीं बोलें। खैर, अब बोल रहे हैं, हम उस का स्वागत करते हैं, लेकिन चीन के नेता जो नहीं बोल रहे हैं, उस के बारे में हमारे हृदय में शंका होना स्वाभाविक है, और मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस का निराकरण करें, अगर वह ठीक समझते हो, तो।

इस सम्बन्ध में एक बात और स्पष्ट रूप से हमारे सामने आती है। वह यह है कि अन्तराष्ट्रीय राजनीति नैतिकता के आधार पर नहीं चलती है। उस में निष्काम कर्मयोग के लिए स्थान नहीं है। हम हवन करते हुए अपने हाथ जलाये—दूसरो की समस्या को हल करने में अपने लिए नई समस्याएँ पैदा कर लें, इस नीति को आज की स्थिति में, जब कि हमें सभी देशों का सहयोग चाहिए, सब का समर्थन चाहिए, सब की सहायता चाहिए, जरा सावधानी से अपनाते की आवश्यकता है। जहा तक भारत सरकार की नीति का प्रश्न है कि हम किसी गुट में नहीं मिलेंगे, हम उस का पूरा समर्थन करते हैं। जहां तक मेरी पार्टी, भारतीय जनसभ, का सवाल है, हम इस नीति से सहमत हैं कि हम को न अमरीकी गुट से और न रूसी गुट से मिलना चाहिए, क्योंकि राष्ट्रीय हितों की यही मांग है। आज हम राष्ट्र के निर्माण में लगे हैं। किसी गुट के साथ अपने को जोड़ कर किसी को नाराज करने की स्थिति में इस समय हम नहीं हैं। लेकिन उस के साथ ही यह भी आवश्यक है कि हम दूसरे देशों के झगडों में अपनी टांग न भडायें। अगर उन झगडों से हमारा सीधा सम्बन्ध नहीं है तो हम उन पर चुप रह सकते हैं। कभी कभी राजनीति में चुप रहना भी आवश्यक होता है और अपने देश के हितों के सर्वार्थन की दृष्टि से ही हमें अपना मुह खोलना चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन है कि दुनिया में अनेक समस्याएँ हैं और उन समस्याओं के बारे

में हमारा एक निश्चित दृष्टिकोण भी है, लेकिन यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि उस दृष्टिकोण को प्रकट ही किया जाय। मैं एक ही उदाहरण दूंगा। रूस के साथ हमारा पंचशील का समझौता है। इस समझौते के अनुसार न वह हमारे देश के अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल दे सकता है, और न हमें यह अधिकार है कि हम उन के अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल दें। पिछले कुछ महीनों में रूस में कुछ आन्तरिक परिवर्तन हुए हैं कुछ मंत्री बदल दिए गए, कुछ स्थान से हटा दिए गए। यह रूस का घरेलू मामला था, मगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने उस के बारे में अपनी राय प्रकट की। यह तो एक आकस्मिक घटना है कि रूस का यह परिवर्तन शायद हमारी दृष्टि से, और सत्तार की दृष्टि से, लाभदायक होगा, मगर कल रूस में ऐसा भी आन्तरिक परिवर्तन हो सकता है, जो हमारी दृष्टि से हानिकारक हो—लोकतंत्र की दृष्टि से, विश्व की शान्ति की दृष्टि से हानिकारक हो। उस समय हम क्या कहेंगे? अगर हम उस समय चुप रहेंगे, तो आज हमारे बोलने का कोई अर्थ नहीं रहता, और अगर आज हम बोलें हैं, तो उस समय भी बोलने के लिए हमें मजबूर होना पड सकता है। रूस में जो भी परिवर्तन होते हैं, वह रूस का घरेलू मामला है। उस के बारे में हमें नहीं बोलना चाहिए। लेकिन दुनिया में जो भी सवाल आते हैं, उन के ऊपर बोलने का लोभ हम सवरण नहीं कर सकते। हमारी—और विशेषकर हमारे आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की—कठिनाई यह है कि वह विश्व के इतिहास के निर्माण में इतना लीन रहते हैं कि भारत के इतिहास के कुछ परिच्छेद उन की आंखों से ओझल हो जाते हैं। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि आने वाली सन्तति हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को विश्व-इतिहास के निर्माता के रूप में याद करेगी, लेकिन ऐसा न हो कि भारत की सन्तति इस बात को भी याद करे कि हम विश्व की समस्याओं में इतने उलझ गए कि हमारी अपनी समस्याएँ ठीक तरह से हल नहीं हो पाईं,

उन में कठिनाइयाँ पैदा हो गईं। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम अपनी नीति में इस दृष्टि से संशोधन करें और सब की मित्रता प्राप्त करने का प्रयत्न करें, तो जिन कठिनाइयों में आज हम अपने को पाते हैं, उन से हम अपने को निकाल सकते हैं।

मैंने प्रारम्भ में विदेशों में जो भारतीय बसे हुए हैं, उन का उल्लेख किया है। मुझे खेद है कि उन भारतीयों की ओर हमें जितना ध्यान देना चाहिए था, हम ने नहीं दिया है।

विदेशों में ५० लाख भारतीय हैं। बर्मा में घाठ लाख हैं और उनकी संख्या कम होती जा रही है। हम बर्मा को हर तरह से सहायता प्रदान कर रहे हैं। हमने उसे कर्ज दिया है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने बर्मा की सरकार को बचाने के लिये बन्दूकों का दान भी दिया था। मगर बर्मा में जो भारतीय हैं उनके साथ ठीक तरह का व्यवहार नहीं किया जा रहा है। संका में दस लाख भारतीय हैं। उनको नागरिकता के अधिकारों से वंचित किया जा रहा है। दक्षिण अफ्रीका की सरकार जो कुछ कर रही है उसको देखते हुए हमने वहाँ की सरकार से सम्बन्ध तोड़ लिए हैं। लेकिन ऐसा करके वहाँ के भारतीयों को हमने वहाँ की सरकार की दया पर छोड़ दिया है। केवल सम्बन्ध तोड़ लेने से वहाँ के भारतीयों की समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है। मौरिशस में ६४ फीसदी भारतीय हैं। वे हमारे अधिक निकट आ सकते हैं। लेकिन मुझे यह देखकर खेद हुआ है कि हमारे जो भी कमिश्नर मौरिशस में जाते हैं वे वहाँ के लोगों की पार्टीबन्दी में फँस जाते हैं। वहाँ के भ्रष्टाचार हमारे कमिश्नर के खिलाफ तरह तरह के आरोप लगाते हैं। वे आरोप भारत में प्रकाशित होने वाले एक सम्मानित दैनिक पत्र में भी छपे थे। मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में एक प्रश्न भी किया था लेकिन यह कह कर कि वे आरोप गलत हैं उस प्रश्न को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया। यदि वे आरोप गलत हैं तो हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय

को अधिकृत रूप से उसका खंडन करना चाहिये और मौरिशस में जो हमारे कमिश्नर महोदय के सम्बन्ध में गलतफहमी पैदा हो गई है, उसका निराकरण करना चाहिये। ब्रिटिश गायना और फिजी में जो भारतीय हैं वे ४४ फीसदी और ४५ फीसदी हैं। यह सभी भारत माता के पुत्र हैं और समान संस्कृति के उत्तराधिकारी हैं। उन को हमें निकट लाने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये किन्तु उनकी ओर हमें जितना ध्यान देना चाहिये उतना ध्यान हम नहीं दे पाये हैं। हमारा ध्यान जो हम से दूर है उनकी ओर अधिक लगी रहती है और उनकी कठिनाइयाँ भी इतनी हैं कि आज हम में इतनी शक्ति नहीं है कि हम उनको दूर कर सकें और उनकी समस्याओं को हल कर सकें।

आज के बाद-विवाद में मध्य पूर्व की खर्षों की गई है और यह कहा गया है कि सीरिया में, शाम में एक नया संकट पैदा हो रहा है। वह संकट पैदा न हो इसके लिये हम जो कुछ भी कर सकते हैं करें। लेकिन एक बात ध्यान में रखने लायक है और यह है कि मध्य पूर्व के जितने भी देश हैं वे दुर्बल हैं, बीसियों साल की गुलामी ने अधिक दृष्टि से उनका शोषण कर दिया है। अब प्रधान मंत्री जी यह कहते हैं कि वहाँ पर जो वैकुंठ पैदा हो गया है, जो रिक्तता पैदा हो गई है, उसे वहाँ के देश भरें। यह बात सिद्धान्ततः ठीक है, होना ही ऐसा चाहिये। मगर व्यवहार में ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। उन देशों में आज अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने की ताकत नहीं है। जनसंख्या की दृष्टि से सैनिक बल की दृष्टि से और औद्योगिक विकास की दृष्टि से वे इतने पिछड़े हुए हैं कि उन्हें किसी के सहारे की आवश्यकता है। यह सहारा अमरीका दे सकता है या रूस दे सकता है और अगर ये देश सहारा देने का प्रयत्न करें तो कठिनाई पैदा होगी। एक तीसरा रास्ता भी है और वह यह कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ वहाँ जो रिक्तता पैदा हो गई है उसमें कुछ सहायक सिद्ध हो सकता है, इस का विचार

## [श्री बाबूदेवी]

किया जाना चाहिये। मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूँगा कि केवल इतना कह देने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि वहाँ के लोग उस संकटम को भर लें। प्रश्न व्यवहार का है। संबन्धित राष्ट्र संध या अन्य एशियाई अफ्रीकी देश मिल कर इस प्रकार कोई व्यवस्था कर सकते हैं क्योंकि जिसमें मध्य पूर्व के पिछड़े हुए राष्ट्रों को अपना राजनीतिक, प्राथमिक तथा प्रौद्योगिक विकास करने का मौका दिया जाए, सुविधा मिले। इस दृष्टि से इस प्रश्न का विचार होना चाहिये।

मध्य पूर्व का सवाल आता है तो इजराइल की समस्या भी सामने आ कर खड़ी हो जाती है। कोई भी इस बात से इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि मध्यपूर्व में तब तक शान्ति नहीं होगी जब तक अरब राष्ट्र इजराइल के अस्तित्व को स्वीकार नहीं कर लेते और अगर अरब राष्ट्र इस बात पर कमर कस कर बैठे हैं कि इजराइल को खत्म कर देंगे तो मध्यपूर्व म युद्ध की बिगारी भड़कती रहेगी। कभी शान्ति हो जायेगी मगर फिर से कभी अशान्ति की ज्वाला प्रचंड हो जाएगी। इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार का जो कर्तव्य था उसका उसम अभी तक पालन नहीं किया है। दुनिया के सभी देशों के साथ हमने दौत्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित कर लिए हैं मगर इजराइल से हमारे दूतावास के स्तर पर सम्बन्ध कायम नहीं हुए हैं। क्यों नहीं हुए हैं, इसका क्या कारण है, यह मैं जानना चाहूँगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इजराइल का दूत दिल्ली में हो और भारत का दूत इजराइल की राजधानी में रहे और वहाँ जो घटना-चक्र चलता है, उसके सम्बन्ध में हमें जानकारी हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय अपने प्रभाव का उपयोग करके अरब राष्ट्रों और इजराइल के बीच में सहभाषना उत्पन्न कर सकते हैं और उनको ऐसा करना चाहिये। मगर इसके पहले जो कदम हमें उठाना चाहिये वह यह है कि हम इजराइल के साथ दूतावास का

सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें। इस दृष्टि से अभी तक हमारी सरकार ने कदम नहीं उठाया है जिस को उठाने की आवश्यकता है।

अब मैं गोष्ठा के बारे में एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। जब गोष्ठा के सवाल की चर्चा होती है तो कहा जाता है कि हमारी नीति शान्ति की नीति है, अहिंसा की नीति है और हम किसी तरह का नैतिक बल प्रयोग नहीं करेंगे। गोष्ठा का सवाल किर्त्सा पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। गोष्ठा भारत का घग है, इतना कह देने से काम नहीं चलेगा। पिछले चार सौ सालों से गोष्ठा की जनता गुलामी और अत्याचारों के पाटो में पिस रही है और हमें स्वाधीन हुए दस माल हो गए हैं और दस साल बाद भी उसकी गुलामी बरकरार है। हम कहें कि भारतीय क्रान्ति, इंडियन रेवोल्यूशन, तब तक पूरा नहीं होगा जब तक गोष्ठा आजाद नहीं होगा तो इससे तो गोष्ठा के निवासियों की कठिनाई दूर नहीं होती है। सवाल यह है कि गोष्ठा के लिये हम क्या करने जा रहे हैं। कभी कभी जब गोष्ठा की चर्चा होती है तो मकाओ का उदाहरण दिया जाता है और कहा जाता है कि कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने मकाओ में बल प्रयोग नहीं किया है, तो हमें गोष्ठा पर बल प्रयोग नहीं करना चाहिये। मेरा निवेदन है कि गोष्ठा की परिस्थिति मकाओ से थोड़ी सी भिन्न है। गोष्ठा मैनलैंड में है, मुख्य भूमि का घग है जबकि मकाओ पृथक है और मकाओ को कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने अवैध माल लाने के लिए खोल रखा है। क्या हम यह चाहते हैं कि जो अवैध व्यापार होता है वह जारी रहे। दिल्ली में देखिये गोष्ठा से चोरी से आने वाली वस्तुओं से नई और पुरानी दिल्ली की दूकानें भरी पड़ी हैं और इसका हमारी प्राथमिक स्थिति पर भी बुरा असर पड़ रहा है।

गोष्ठा के प्रति हमारी नीति वहाँ की जनता का मनोबल तोड़ रही है। गोष्ठा के

लोग अगर यह समझें कि भारत की सरकार तथा जनता ने उनके साथ विश्वासघात किया है तो हमें इसको कोई शिकायत नहीं होनी चाहिये। उनकी गुलामी, उनके कष्टों को कम करने के लिये हमने क्या किया है और अगर हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते तो हमें स्पष्ट शब्दों में अपनी असमर्थता प्रकट कर देनी चाहिए, तथा आर्थिक प्रतिबन्ध जो हमने लगा रखे है उनको हटा देना चाहिये और गोम्हा के निवासी पुर्तगाल की गुलामी में किस प्रकार थोड़ी सी सुविधा प्राप्त करें, इसका प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। अगर प्रलयकाल तक हम यही भाषा करते रहेंगे कि जैसे फल पेड़ से टूट कर भूमि पर गिरता है उसी प्रकार पुर्तगाल रूपी पेड़ से गोम्हा गिर कर हमारी गोदी में गिर जायेगा तो यह भाषा हमारी कभी पूरी नहीं होगी। इस सम्बन्ध में ब्रिटेन और फ्रांस का उदाहरण देना ठीक नहीं है। पुर्तगाल एक तानाशाही देश है, वहां पर विरोधी दल नहीं है, वहां पर सरकार की आलोचना नहीं हो सकती है, वहां पर जनमत को वहां के शासकों के खिलाफ नहीं खड़ा किया जा सकता जबकि ब्रिटेन तथा फ्रांस में यह परिस्थिति नहीं है। ऐसी सूरत में गोम्हा कैसे आजाद होगा, यह मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ। मुझे याद है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने एक बार भविष्यवाणी की थी कि केवल गोम्हा ही आजाद नहीं होगा लेकिन पुर्तगाल में सालाजार का जो शासन है वह भी समाप्त हो जाएगा। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ज्योतिष में विश्वास नहीं करते। शायद यही कारण है कि उनकी भविष्यवाणी पूरी नहीं हुई। गोम्हा तो गुलामी से मुक्त नहीं हुआ और सालाजार का पुर्तगाल में शासन तो कत्म होना अभी दूर की बात है। हमारा सम्बन्ध तो गोम्हा की आजादी से है।

इस बारे में, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात कहूंगा कि जब हम अहिंसा और शान्ति की बातें करते हैं तो दुनिया इस बात को देखती

है और चाहती है कि उसका व्यवहार देश के भीतर भी होना चाहिये, उसका प्रबलम्बन किया जाना चाहिये। जब हम दुनिया के सामने पंचशील की बात कहते हैं, शान्ति की तथा अहिंसा की उद्घोषणायें करते हैं तो हम क्यों देश में जनता को दबाने के लिए लाठी और गोली का प्रयोग करते हैं। ऐसी सूरत में अगर दुनिया पंचशील की घोषणा पर हंसती है तो यह दुनिया का दोष नहीं है, उसको हम दोष नहीं दे सकते हैं। जिस देश में छोटे छोटे बच्चे पुलिस की गोली का शिकार बना दिए जाते हैं, जिस देश में जेल के घूमर लाठी चार्ज करके शान्तिपूर्ण सत्याग्रहियों को मौत के घाट उतार दिया जाता है, उस देश के प्रधान मंत्री और पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बर शान्ति और अहिंसा की बातें करें, इससे बढ़कर विडम्बना कोई नहीं हो सकती। पंचशील देश के बाहर भी चाहिये और भीतर भी चाहिये। अहिंसा चाहिये तो पाकिस्तान और पुर्तगाल के साथ ही नहीं चाहिये बल्कि अपनी जनता के साथ भी उसी अहिंसा की तथा शान्ति की नीति का प्रबलम्बन किया जाना चाहिये। सारा देश विदेश नीति के सवाल पर प्रधान मंत्री के पीछे है। हमारे मतभेद भीतर के मतभेद हैं। लेकिन उस सहयोग को लेने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया जा रहा है और उस सहयोग से जो जनता की शक्ति जागृत होनी चाहिये उसे जगाने की कोशिश नहीं की जा रही है।

हम तटस्थ रहना चाहते हैं। तटस्थ का मतलब है, तट परस्थित तटस्थ। जो किनारे पर खड़ा है वह तटस्थ है। जब कोन किनारे पर खड़ा रह सकता है।

छोटा मोटा देश और कमजोर आदमी किनारे पर खड़ा नहीं रह सकता। छोटा मोटा पौधा एक ही लहर की लपेट में बह कर थला जायगा। छोटा मोटा पत्थर का टुकड़ा एक ही प्रवाह की आंधी में नदी की बीच थार में आकर टूट जायगा। किनारे पर बही खड़ा रहता है जिसकी जड़ें पाताल से जीवन रस प्राप्त करती हैं। जो देश अपने सम्मान,

[श्री बाजपेयी]

नरीब और गरिमा के साथ और राष्ट्रीय शक्ति चारित्रिक बल और अनुशासन के साथ जनता के समर्थन से आगे बढ़ता है वही देश तटस्थ रहता है। आज आवश्यकता इसी बात की है कि यदि हम तटस्थता की नीति अपनाना चाहते हैं और उस पर बलना चाहते हैं तो सच्चे अर्थों में हम उसको अपनायें।

**Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad):** May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a point? I find there is an article in the United Nations Charter, probably article 5, which says that any member of the United Nations Organisation or of the Security Council shall not render any kind of military aid to a party whose dispute is pending before the Council. May I know why no action is taken under that article before the United Nations Organisation?

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Against whom?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the point that the hon. Member has raised is, I think, due to some misunderstanding.

17 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I have not got the United Nations Charter in front of me. I think it must probably apply to a country against which the United Nations has acted, not in regard to a country about which a dispute is pending.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had the advantage of listening to various viewpoints and comments in regard to our foreign policy. I have been told on the one hand that we should cease to be crusaders or messiahs of peace, and the same hon. Member two or three minutes later said that India should play her role in bringing about peace in the Middle East. Now, it seems to me that there is some slight contradiction between these two statements. Another hon.

Member went a little further and said India's role should not only be to support national interests but to support peoples' demands in other countries.

Now these statements require little consideration. So far as we are concerned, it is entirely wrong, if I may say so with all respect, to say that we go out anywhere as crusaders of peace or with any idea. It is true that when we go out or when we remain in our country, we talk about peace, because that is dear to us, because we consider that of vital importance in the world and to our country.

Now, it so happens that in many parts of the world, indeed I would say, in every part of the world, the idea of peace appeals to people and, therefore, there is talk of it. It is not that we go out to convert people or to carry on any kind of a campaign in regard to it. Because I do not think that that is the right approach to this question, for a Government—I am not talking about people—to adopt, if I may use the word, an agitational role in other countries. If that is so, even in regard to what I might call the propaganda for peace, to which we are so intimately attached, the second idea that we should support peoples' demands in other countries simply means that we should support, encourage and help agitational demands. I am not using the word 'agitational' in a bad sense at all. Of course, obviously it has a good sense, too, but such demands in other countries are presumably made against their governments; obviously, people's demands are made against their governments. Now we are asked by at least one Member here to support people's demands in other countries. How would that hon. Member like some other government supporting somebody's demands in India? If that kind of policy is adopted by governments, that is a policy of continuous and persistent interference, to which we certainly, our Government, would take the strongest

exception; and I am quite sure this House would object. And if that is so, surely we cannot play that part in other countries, apart from the fact that we are not made that way. We have not the resources which other countries may have, but it is not a question of resources; it is a question of doing something which we do not want others to do. It is a bad example to set.

We talk about Panchsheel. In Panchsheel, there is a very definite clause to the effect that there should be no interference—apart from external interference—in the internal affairs of a country. I forget the exact language, but even ideological interference is mentioned there—any kind of interference, including ideological interference.

So that I just do not understand how we are asked to go and support peoples' demands. Let us admit that we in our hearts and minds sympathise with those demands; they fit in with our policy and ideals. I can understand that. And, it is not for me to say what individuals may do or private groups may do but for Government to go about supporting peoples' demands against their Governments in other countries would be really an extraordinary proposition which would land us into great difficulties and land other countries too in difficulties if they do so.

I know and I regret that some countries do this kind of thing, sometimes overtly and sometimes otherwise, and our voice is raised here and elsewhere against this kind of thing and we say that it is far better for the peace of the world that every question of interference is put an end to, interference of one country in another.

There are world forces at play and today they cannot be kept away by any kind of barriers even if Governments want to put up barriers. Thoughts flow, ideals flow and all kinds of things flow; and there are economic forces at play and political

forces at play, and all kinds of forces. Well and good. If we agree with some force we encourage it in our own way but not, I submit, by interfering in the slightest degree in the country's affairs.

If we look at the countries of the world, there are 70 or 80 countries—I forget how many there are—which are supposed to be independent, of all kinds. Some are more powerful, others are, well, more or less strong but middling; many are weak and they have all kinds of Governments. Many or some are communist governments which are supposed to be authoritarian. Others are what are called Parliamentary democracies, a very few of them. Some are called democracies which, on closer analysis, have not much of democracy about them in their country; yet they are called democracies. Some, I need not mention names, call themselves democracies with no elections and nothing. They simply carry on.

Now, we do not go about criticising them. There are monarchies which may be called free monarchies so far as the people are concerned. There are authoritarian monarchies; all kinds of countries and States in the world. Are we to set about telling them which of them is good and which are bad and criticising everybody? That would be extraordinary presumption, apart from its being extraordinary folly. So, we really do not try to criticise other countries. As a Government I am talking about it. If I am Prime Minister, unfortunately I cannot wholly disentangle myself from my position in Government. Even in private I cannot go about criticising other countries because immediately it will be difficult for me to say, "I did so in my private capacity and not as Prime Minister." So that point should be borne in mind.

Our policy has been, as I stated in the morning, to express our viewpoint. When we have to do so, whether in the United Nations or here in Parliament or elsewhere, we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

are trying as far as possible not to criticise other countries. It is true that sometimes we have to do it, inferentially, indirectly, or sometimes even directly. But, broadly speaking, we do not want to do so because there is today far too much not of criticism only but something much worse as between countries, and that has spoiled the atmosphere of any problem being considered objectively

The first thing, therefore, is to remove this tension, this new type of diplomatic and public language which is coming into play and we try to avoid it. I do not say that we are virtuous or that we always succeed or that we are better than others. I certainly do not say this. But, we have had a certain, first of all a certain kind of training in restraint of expression under our leader Mahatmaji. We tried to avoid it in the days of our struggle tried it against our opponents the British, against whom we felt so strongly.

So, now, as a Government surely it is not merely Gandhi's teachings but the normal practice of Government which, I am afraid, is not normally followed now, but still it has been the practice of Government. But, apart from that, looking at it purely from a narrow, personal, our own country's point of view, there is no reason why we should allow ourselves to get entangled in the conflicts and troubles of the world. To some extent we cannot help it, because the world is becoming more and more inter-related, and we have to deal with problems in the United Nations or elsewhere—our chanceries have to deal with them. Nevertheless, we do not wish to get entangled in these problems as far as we can help it. Sometimes it is not possible to keep away from them. We express an opinion. Even then we express an opinion in a more or less restrained language.

The hon. Member who spoke just before me referred to what I sometimes said about me personally—I am sorry to refer to a personal matter—that I am so involved in world issues that I forget my own country. Well, it is not for me to talk about myself or to judge myself. But, my own feeling about this is that I rather not have anything to do with world issues; we have enough problems in our country to solve. And, also, I know very well, and this House knows that, if we want to play any part in world affairs that part is completely dependent not on our loud voices but on the internal strength, unity and conditions in the country. By purely just criticising others we may for a moment create some impression here and there but, ultimately, the country finds its own level and other people know exactly in what depth of water it is and what strength it has, and only attach that much importance to its voice. Therefore, both from the point of view of our primary needs and primary concern being our country and, secondly, from the point of view that if we wish to play any part in world affairs it can only be by developing the strength and unity of our own country, we have to pay the first attention to our own country's affairs.

Having said that, I should also like to say that apart from our general inheritance, in the past it is our inheritance, let us say, against colonialism, in favour of freedom—that is there—we feel that still; we have not forgotten that, and our sympathies go out. Apart from that, it has become obvious that if certain things happen in the world, more especially, of course, if the war occurs, then it does not matter what our internal problems may be; everything is subordinated to this great disaster. All our problems, all our planning etc. go to pieces because the whole world goes to pieces, and we are part of that world. Therefore, it has become necessary and incumbent on us to see what is happening in the world.

The world and world affairs are impinged upon us all the time. It has become impossible for us to take, if I may use the word, a parochial outlook. We cannot understand our own problems if we look at them that way. Therefore, we are interested.

Now, take, for instance, the situation in, what is called, the Middle East, and which really is for us the west, western Asia—those countries. At the present moment, probably, that is the most difficult and explosive part of the world surface. Now, it will be untrue if I said that I am not very much interested in what happens there. I am not only interested as I was interested, as this House was interested, in what happened last year in those very middle-eastern regions, in Egypt etc., in connection with Suez Canal or intervention of other powers, in which we were interested, if you like, emotionally interested, psychologically interested but, ultimately, politically interested, but it affected us—what happened there. Whatever consequences they had, they had far-reaching consequences. So, we tried to help there insofar as we could; there too. Although we took up a fairly clear and unequivocal line we tried to avoid just condemnation of any kind even though we felt strongly about matters. I believe we were of some little help in finding some solution, whether it was subsequently about the Suez Canal or other matters. What happened then affected us. It affected our Five Year Plan and our economy and all that. Something happens, let us say, in the Middle East, in Syria. Even if they are small beginnings of a conflict, it will affect us. But there is hardly such a thing now that we can think of, that is, a small conflict. However, a small conflict has the shadow of a big conflict behind it and the big conflict has a shadow of a world war behind it, and if there is that danger there, we are interested, every Member of this House is interested,

this country is interested, because it will affect us and affect the world.

Therefore, we are concerned about it, and therefore we venture to say, and in this matter it is no good my criticising any country or condemning any country's action. I may have some views but even so, although perhaps I have more information at my disposal than most Members of this House, obviously I do not know what is happening there behind the scene, what has happened or that is happening. Some bits come to us and we have to pick and choose what is true and what is not true, and we form some kind of notion which is checked as we have further knowledge.

But the main thing is that here is a dangerous and explosive situation in Syria. We have seen previously how things happen in the middle-eastern countries and we should be warned by what has happened and what has been happening in the past and other countries should also be warned and should not make any country in the Middle East a plaything of their policy. It is a dangerous thing, dangerous from the larger viewpoint of even major wars developing.

I said this morning there is no immediate crisis in the sense of war. That is true, but, nevertheless, there is plenty of crises brewing all round which may suddenly burst out. And therefore I should like to repeat my appeal which I said in the morning about conditions in the Middle East, that it is unsafe, it is dangerous, for policies to be pursued in which those particular countries become merely playthings, chequer-boards, for other major conflicts to be played out. It is a dangerous policy as things are today. The major power groups are each too powerful to be sat upon by the other. That is a practical fact which you may like or dislike.

If that is so, if something is done by one, the other responds to it by

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

doing something to counter that; and so, step by step, one may be drawn into the conflict. Therefore, we have seen in the past how one led to another; it is quite extraordinary. If you look back at the history of these middle-eastern countries including Egypt and western Asia and the roundabout countries, if you look at their history for the last three or four years,—not very long,—you will find how one step has led to another and how one step which was meant to protect, presumably, the interests of one group of power, has actually led to an injury of that interest, because somebody else is taking some other step and then they are worried and then they take a third step and so it has gone on, step by step, whether it is Baghdad Pact or something else. It has not brought peace or security or any measure of freedom from conflict there. Conditions in the Middle-East countries since three or four ago may not have been what might be called ideal. They were not ideal. They were not ideal anywhere. But will not everybody admit that conditions today and the last year or two have been worse than before? They have been. So, there has been progressive deterioration.

So, all these things, the Baghdad Pact and various other pacts, intrusions, etc. have worsened the affairs. That is obvious. One might say, "Oh! Yes, it is true, but other facts have occurred too." I admit it. One fact has led to another. One interference has led to another. Here we are, therefore, instead of learning from this and keeping out, leaving those countries to work out their own destiny, with our goodwill, with our help, if you like, but not this military help, not this military intervention, not military threats, not all kinds of pressure tactics being exercised. I do earnestly hope that these words, which I say with all humility and respect, will have some effect on those who may hear them.

We do not wish to interfere in international affairs, except where we feel that we might be able to be of some help, or except where we cannot help it. But where something affects us directly, then naturally, we have to say something. For instance, what has happened in regard to Pakistan, the military help given to it, is not an international matter about which we may have some views. We have views, of course, but that is a matter that has an immediate direct effect, an adverse effect, on us. Then we have to express our views clearly, strongly and unequivocally. Or, when something is said about Goa—Goa affects us. Goa may be a small thing in the world context, but Goa affects us and if something is said in regard to Goa which we think is not only wrong, but offensive to us, well, we have to reply to it.

So, you have to test our policy from that point of view, not a crusading policy or a seer-like policy; we are too humble for that. We know our limitations. We do believe in something stoutly and we express our opinions in a friendly way, but I hope, clearly when occasions arises Where world peace is concerned, naturally we want to have our say, as a member of the world community. Where India's interests are directly threatened, whether in Goa or in Pakistan, we must have our say, a loud say, a positive say. There we cannot remain quiet. So, you have to balance all these things

Somebody said about Kashmir. One hon Member said, it has been suggested, "Withdraw your complaint from the U.N." I do not understand this. I should like hon. Members to realise that there is no such thing done. It cannot be done simply. Also, somebody said, "withdraw your plebiscite offer" I do not know where the question of withdrawal comes in, continuing the offer or withdrawing it. Originally the plebiscite offer was made to the people of

Kashmir by us, if I may say so; I do not call them a plebiscite. I am not trying to juggle with words; but in the course of the last few years, we have had two general elections in Jammu and Kashmir State, except that part which is under the illegal and unlawful occupation of Pakistan. I do not call them a plebiscite. But anyhow, the people of those territories have been given a chance to elect their representatives. Some people say that these elections were bogus. Well, I think that charge is wrong. I do not say, and I cannot say naturally, that all those elections were perfect elections; there were no mistakes or no errors committed. I cannot say that. But I do say that by and large those elections were good elections in the circumstances and even now an Election Commission, consisting of some Judge, I believe, is there. I speak from memory—a retired Judge from India has been asked to look into this matter; a High Court Judge, I think. Now election petitions go before them and they will be decided. There can be no doubt at all—barring some irregularities or mistakes—that in the main those elections represent the viewpoint of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. There is not even a shadow of doubt about it. If many of them were uncontested elections, well, I would submit, Sir, that the persons who did not wish to contest had no chance and therefore they did not contest them. Maybe, some people had a chance, but they did not. Whatever the reasons they are there.

What I wish to point out here is that in the course, of the last five years or so, there have been two elections, general elections. On the other side, there have been no elections, no attempt at elections. In fact, conditions in the Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir have been very extraordinary. News does not come very frequently; sometimes it does come and in today's papers there is something about that.

Then again it was said by an hon. Member that the accession of Kashmir

was not only accession of the ruler of the State, but accession of the people. Well, I agree. Further it was said that it was accession to the Constitution of India. That is a wide statement, which is not quite clear to me.

When the accessions took place, not of Kashmir only, but of the other States of India in those days in 1947, the accessions were on three subjects only at that time: defence, foreign affairs and communications. The accession documents of all the major States of India contained only these three subjects. It was then thought certain States, at any rate the big ones, will have their own Constituent Assemblies to frame their Constitution, naturally in line with our Constitution, but not necessarily adopting it completely. That was the original idea. Some months later Sardar Patel discussed this matter and, in fact, some Constituent Assemblies were formed in some of the States.

Some Hon. Members: Mysore.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am told that seven Constituent Assemblies were formed in the other States. Meanwhile, of course, our Constituent Assembly for the whole of India was functioning here. Later Sardar Patel and many of us discussed this matter with the then representatives of the States as they were and it was felt unnecessary, and perhaps, if you like, undesirable, for all these Constituent Assemblies to function, because their representatives had been imported to our Constituent Assembly; they were there. So, the idea of these separate Constituent Assemblies was given up. Their representatives functioned in our Constituent Assembly and helped us in making our Constitution.

While all this was happening, something else had happened in Kashmir. First of all Kashmir did not come in before independence or even at the time of independence. Then came the Pakistan invasion and aggression and war was being carried

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

on. It was a completely new situation. Kashmir acceded to us and acceded to us on those three subjects. And in fact, it was made clear even then—I forget now, I am speaking from memory, I hope I do not make a wrong statement—certain provisional matters were even then incorporated in the Constitution in regard to Kashmir.

From the very beginning it was clear that the accession of Kashmir, complete as it was, as the other States' accession was, did not mean that everything in our Constitution automatically applied to it. In the course of the next year or two further amendments and changes were made in consultation with the then Kashmir Government and their representatives. So, that, to say that Kashmir acceded to the Constitution of India is an incorrect statement. The House may remember that subsequently there was a Constituent Assembly in the Jammu and Kashmir State. It really would have functioned long before it did, but because of military operations and other difficulties it was postponed. Ultimately, when nothing came of these talks in the United Nations, we could not leave Kashmir in mid-air and, therefore, with our willing approval, they elected their Constituent Assembly.

The first thing that that Constituent Assembly did was to change the nature of the Head of the State there. The ruling family there of the State was removed—although the son of the Maharaja was elected, was chosen as the Head of the State, the Sadr-i-Riyasat. That is the very first thing they did. And this was reported to the Parliament and to the President, because the President came into the picture; and we made necessary amendments to fit in with that in our own Constitution. Later, other changes came in. As their Constituent Assembly went on making changes, they were reported to us, and we accepted those changes after discussion etc., and they were engrafted on to our Constitution.

Their Constituent Assembly finished their Constitution-making in October last year, I believe—about a year ago, maybe October or November. Meanwhile, of course, that Constituent Assembly had also functioned as a Legislative Assembly and carried out very far-reaching land reforms and other reforms. So that, this Constitution-making has legitimately gone on there in conformity with our Constitution, and we have frequently adopted, made some changes, to fit in with that, in our own Constitution.

At the present moment it has come very near to our Constitution in many matters. Only in a few matters they have kept apart. One matter to which they attach great importance and which has come up in the shape of questions here is about their ownership of land. It is an odd thing against our Constitution. I cannot go and buy land or possess land in Kashmir. It is restricted to, well, if I may use the word, genuine Kashmiris.

**Shri Hem Barua:** What about you Sir?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** They have got, I believe, certain definitions—people, that is generations, who have been there, who have been born there, and all kinds of things. There are two or three groups or classifications of them. I can very well understand this. It is an old rule, not a new rule, from the old Maharajas' time—not this Maharaja, but from his father's or grand-father's time. And the rule was framed, I am told, firstly because of their fear that, Kashmir being such an agreeable place for foreigners, for English people specially, English people will come and practically physically take possession of it, start living there and take property. No Englishman, not even the biggest Englishman—they could go there of course as tourists—could get any property there. A great favour was shown to them about thirty, forty or fifty years ago when they were

allowed at Gulmarg, which was a very favourite place, to build a cottage there for ten years after which it lapsed to the State. Because, I remember one of the Maharajas thirty or forty years ago telling us that he had failed in many ways but at least he had kept out the British people from settling down in Kashmir, because it was such an attractive place climatically. The rule applied, of course, apart from the British, to people from other parts of India, moneyed people who could go and buy up property there, because Kashmir is a poor place with poor people, and they were afraid these moneyed people would buy all the delectable spots in Kashmir. So, they made this rule, and when this matter was put to us about their desire to continue it, we agreed. We said: "No, we do not wish to come in your way, certainly continue it"—as indeed in quite another place we ourselves in our Constitution have made a rule, if you remember it. In some of the hill districts of Assam there is a definite rule that land cannot be transferred to outsiders etc., because we wanted to protect that land so that it may remain with the tribal people there.

Therefore, in regard to Kashmir I would beg of this House to remember always that all these nine, ten years there have been two armies facing each other on the cease-fire line. There have been frequent attempts by Pakistan to create trouble inside Kashmir. Recently there have been almost deliberately organised attempts to do so. As the House knows, in answer to some questions I have said so. Because of all this you cannot treat Kashmir as a place which can be completely normal. As a matter of fact, as far as the common man is concerned, normalcy has returned. He does business; he has much more business than he has ever had; he has more food and all; but nevertheless, there is this danger hovering over it of spies, espionage, sabotage and all that, and if the Kashmir Government takes some special measures to meet the situation, I do

not quite see how we can blame them or ask them to remove some of the special powers that they have taken.

There was a reference to Sheikh Abdullah. I have often said in this House that few things have disturbed and pained me so much as the arrest and detention of Sheikh Abdullah. I would not go into the past history. Sometimes we have to take steps which are exceedingly distasteful. This is one of them. I did not take the step, but certainly indirectly—not directly, but indirectly—we were approving or consenting parties. I shall be very happy indeed when this state of affairs is ended.

I was referring to Pakistan. Now, there are two or three matters which I should like to mention. It is really quite extraordinary, the kind of false statements that are made now with greater frequency than before from Pakistan. The other day a statement was made with a great air of secrecy by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that Russian planes were landing in Kashmir, and that Kashmir or India, I forget which—India, I think—had become a Russian base. Now, one would expect of a Foreign Minister some slight adherence to truth. It is really quite extraordinary. India is not a closed land, nor is Kashmir. It is not particularly easy for people to go to Leh. It is physically difficult, and otherwise we do not encourage people going there either, but there are thousands and thousands of tourists in Kashmir and in India, of course. I gave a very specific denial to each single fact. I invite Pakistan, and I am prepared to do the same, to give the names of every foreign person employed directly or indirectly in our defence services or in the construction of anything connected with defence like air fields, like barracks, like anything. I am prepared to give every name, to publish them. Let them publish the names of all the foreigners they are employing there in their defence services, not only actively in the defence services, but—of course, what happens is they do

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

not have an exact position in the defence—of the advisers, the builders, the trainers, the vast crowds of them that function there.

One thing we can never forget, and that is the exodus from East Pakistan into India, this tremendous exodus which shows the state of affairs in East Pakistan, and in Pakistan generally, a fact which we know very well, but which few foreign countries realise; that mere fact brings out the picture of our relations with Pakistan and the conditions in Pakistan much more vividly than almost any argument that we could put forward.

Some hon. Members said something to the effect that our Defence Minister had said something. What did he say? It is about Goa. The Defence Minister had made some kind of an appeal to the United Kingdom and the United States of America about Goa. I understand from him that he made no appeal. What he had said was—I speak subject to correction—that the case of Goa was such that countries like the UK and US should express themselves clearly as to where they stood. Am I right?

**The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon):** Did they support colonialism or oppose it?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Yes. Did they support colonialism there or not? It was a kind of an enquiry. I have said previously in this House that the case of Goa is incontestably a colonial domain of Portugal; it does not matter how long they have been there. It is colonialism functioning, and functioning very badly.

Now, when people in other countries talk about colonialism vanishing and their being opposed to colonialism, we are justified in asking them, in all politeness: how does this fit in with your anti-colonial declarations, this continuation of Portugal in Goa? We are entitled to ask them this question. Apart from the major questions with regard to Goa, one continuing pain

and torment for all of us is the continuation of hundreds and hundreds of Goans in prison there. There are a few Indian nationals too still there, whose nationality is challenged by the Portuguese. I think there are about 5 or 6. But there are hundreds of Goans suffering tremendous, long terms of imprisonment, quite apart from those who have been put to death or who have had to submit to all kinds of torture in the past. It is a horrible thing and it surprises me that this is ignored by these great powers and small powers.

It does not surprise me that in the context of world events Pakistan and Portugal in Goa are closely knit together and are close friends. And yet, it is rather extraordinary. There was the Bandung Conference which talked about colonialism and all that. And partly Pakistan had actually supported it. We did not expect Pakistan to stand out as a crusader of anti-colonialism. They could well have remained silent over the issue. But no, they have gone out of their way to support Portuguese dominion in Goa. Their newspapers supported it. The present Prime Minister, before he became Prime Minister, was the advocate for Portugal—I believe the legal adviser and advocate for Portugal. It is an extraordinary thing that simply because of their hatred of India they should descend to such levels.

An hon. Member referred to Indians abroad, Burma, East Africa and Mauritius. In some places Indians have to suffer some disabilities, I think, in Burma, except the one common factor in many places about facilities for sending money which are not easily granted. Now, we do not grant them easily to others. So we cannot very well complain. Most of these countries are in difficulties about foreign exchange and we can hardly call upon them to adopt a policy in regard to Indians which they are not adopting for their own people.

But the major fact is that Indians spread out in the past because they were to some extent more adventurous people, whether they were business people or others or they went in search of employment. And, wherever large numbers of people go to another country, a certain problem arises there subsequently. Everywhere there is this question of unemployment and the tendency of that country is to reserve its employment for its own nationals. It is difficult to criticise that tendency. And, Indians get into some difficulties. The way we look upon it is this. Where the country has slightly to face difficulties we advise our countrymen to put up with those difficulties, the other country's difficulties. We cannot ask for special privileges. But where any unfair treatment is given to our countrymen, then, of course, we protest. But even there we have to protest in a friendly way; we cannot issue any threats. We refuse to do that. That is not the way to deal with such matters because there is a case. And again where there are Indians abroad, we have left it to them entirely whether to continue to remain Indian nationals or to adopt the nationality of that country. It is entirely for them to choose.

If they remain Indian nationals, then all that they can claim there is favoured alien treatment. They are aliens and they should get as good treatment as any other alien gets. They cannot vote there. Obviously, the aliens have no right of vote. But they have all the civic privileges; they have the privileges as friendly aliens. If they adopted the nationality of that country, then, they should be treated as citizens with all the rights of citizenship. But, then, we have no concern with them. Sentimental concern, of course, there is; but politically, they cease to be Indian nationals and we have no concern. The problem is of people who are not Indian nationals.

There are two clearly. There is the problem of Indian nationals. Admittedly, Indian nationals who have gone

there with visas, many of them have come back. Now, if Indian nationals who went there for a period are asked to go back we cannot object. We can say, well, do this in a phased way. Do not push too many people back. But they are people with visas and the Government concerned has the right not to renew the visa. But we ask them to exercise that right in a way so as to cause the least inconvenience and injury to the people concerned.

Then, there are the other people; that is, those whom we do not consider our nationals, who have been there 50, 60, 30 or 40 years, whatever the period may be, and they have settled down and many of them have been born there. Their problem is there. So far as we are concerned, strictly, legally and constitutionally, it is none of our problem. They are not our nationals. It is a problem of Ceylon. But we do not take up that particular attitude although it is the correct attitude because we are interested in their welfare and we are interested in finding a solution because there is a history behind this.

For the last 30 or 40 years, before we became independent and before Ceylon became independent, all kinds of agreements and other things were being made. We are independent. But fundamentally it is a problem of Ceylon dealing with its own people.

Finally, Sir, Shri Mukerjee again appealed to us to break the old moorings of thought and action which tie us to the Commonwealth. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat what I have previously said. It is perfectly true that there are certain old moorings of thought which necessarily affect our action sometimes, not in regard to England only but in regard to so many things. Those old moorings have carried us to this Parliament, which is largely modelled after the British parliamentary system. There are so many other things. That is true, but so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, I think that it should be considered

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

entirely apart from any sentimental point of view—that is, our association—but purely from the point of view of whether it is good for us and for world peace or not, whether we can balance the advantages or not. I feel I have been convinced, and I am still convinced that our association with that serves some useful purpose for ourselves and for the larger causes that we support in the world. That has grown. The fact of new countries coming in like Ghana, like Malaya, possibly a little later Nigeria—I do not know—brings about continuous changes in the complexion of the Commonwealth and makes it, I think, even more desirable and necessary for us to remain associated with it.

One of my young colleagues, I believe, in the course of his maiden speech here, said something about the Nagas. Of course, this is not a problem of international affairs at all. It is entirely a domestic problem for us and, therefore, the question does not arise. But, since he mentioned this I should like to say to this House what I have said previously, that our approach to this Naga question is, has always been, one of friendship and of dealing with our own countrymen, some of who may have gone astray but whom we have to win over and make friends. Even if they are not our friends today we propose to continue that approach.

Recently some kind of a convention was held at Kohima. It was held with the permission of the governmental authority, otherwise it could not be held, and large number of representatives or delegates of the Naga Tribes came to it. They, ultimately, after two or three days passed a number of resolutions. I have received some brief telegraphic information about them, and I was asked if I would accept a delegation from those Naga representatives. I replied that I would be glad to receive them,

talk to them, discuss matters with them. Presumably, in the course of the next few days, I do not yet know when, such a delegation will come here, we shall discuss matters in a friendly manner and I have every hope that these discussions will lead to satisfactory results for us, for them and for India.

Sir, we discuss these various matters, internal and external, especially external matters, and I have no doubt that every Member of the House feels their importance. It is not merely a question of our discussion or of our indulging in debate and answering each other's points, but the basic realisation that for us and, perhaps, for other countries also it is a question of survival of what happens in the world, what happens in our country. It is from that point of view that we have to look at it and bend our energies so that we might survive and nothing may happen in the world which affects our survival and other people's survival.

May I say that I gladly accept the amendment moved by Shri Jaganatha Rao?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will now put the amendment to the vote of the House

The question is:

"This House having considered the present International situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, fully agrees with and approves the said policy."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker:** So, for the original motion this motion is substituted and the amendment by Shri Raghunath Singh is barred.

17-56 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 3rd September, 1957.*