

Mr. Speaker: I shall put the motion for consideration to vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Prevention of Disqualification Act, 1953, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 1, 2, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1, 2, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

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

"That the Bill be passed".

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put this to vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

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".

Normally, on such occasions, this House is interested in the problems which directly affect India, problems of our neighbour countries, of our neighbouring areas such as Pakistan, Goa and, to some extent, Ceylon, as well as other problems. No doubt, we are interested in those problems. But if you will permit me, I shall not refer to them much or at all at this stage. If necessity arises, I shall say a few words about them in the course of my reply, that is, if hon. Members opposite draw my attention to any particular aspect of them which needs reply.

In opening this debate on international affairs, I have both an advantage and a disadvantage. The advantage is that I believe that in so far as the Government of India's foreign policy is concerned, there is such a very wide measure of agreement all over the country and in this House that, to some extent, it becomes for me a question of shadow boxing—so far as our country and this House is concerned. Because the Members not only on my side of the House but those on the other side have been good enough, in spite of occasional criticism, in spite of laying some emphasis on some matter which, according to them, deserves greater emphasis than has been given. But, by and large, they have accepted and approved all the broad policies that we pursue in the international sphere. Indeed, so far as our Government is concerned and so far as I am concerned, I have become more and more convinced of the rightness of that broad international policy after all the experience of the last few years.

I would like to refer briefly to one or two matters which are not in the context of this major international policy but which deserve attention and which of course cause much concern. One is in regard to the situation in Indonesia. The House knows our views about this controversy that has gone on now for many years in regard to West Irian. We have held that both on larger consideration and even, I would say, in regard to the interpretation of the agreements arrived at between the parties, West Irian should become part of Indonesia.

We have also held in regard to that, as in regard to other matters wherever they occur, that it is always better, it is always desirable, to settle these matters peacefully by negotiation, even though that might take some considerable time. Therefore, we viewed with concern these recent developments there which followed—I should like the House to remember—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the failure of a resolution put forward in the United Nations. That resolution, which I thought, and many of us thought, was a very moderate and statesmenlike resolution, unfortunately, not defeated exactly, because it got a majority of votes, but failed to get the two-thirds majority which is necessary in such cases. As a matter of fact, it got 41 votes in favour to 29 against, a considerable number abstaining.

The defeat of that resolution was unfortunate because it was a moderate, conciliatory approach to the problem so that the problem might be discussed further by the countries concerned. But because it did not get the two-thirds majority, it failed, according to the rules of the United Nations. I am afraid this failure had a very strong reaction in Indonesia, and many things happened there which have tended to make the situation even more difficult than it was.

Recently, I believe, the situation has improved to some extent, in the sense that it is fairly well under control of the Indonesian Government, and it is hoped that the improvement will continue. I can only repeat that this question can only be solved satisfactorily by the two Governments concerned, that is, the Indonesian Government and the Government of the Netherlands, taking it up and discussing and considering it, because it is obvious that unless it is solved, this kind of sore will continue, poisoning not only their relations but, to some extent, the relations of Asia and Europe.

One basic fact has to be remembered, regardless of the particular problems that exist in parts of Asia, that in the new Asia that has arisen, it is very difficult for that Asia to stomach or to digest any foreign occupation anywhere. That is regardless of the justification of any particular problem; it just goes against the spirit of the times, the spirit of Asia as it is. Such foreign occupation may continue

for some time, a short time or a long time, but it will always be resented; it will always create difficulties and will undoubtedly ultimately have to be given up.

If that is so, then surely it is the path of wisdom to do that in a friendly co-operative way now rather than later when passions have been roused much more intensely and feelings are much bitter. So I earnestly hope that this problem of Indonesia will, instead of both those countries involved getting more and more angry with each other, whatever the occasion for the anger may be, should be dealt with directly by them by discussing it by negotiation. In fact, that was the resolution which was put forward before the United Nations, which, unfortunately, did not get the concurrence of the majority.

There is another country very near to us, very close to us, viz. Nepal, where the King has recently made a statement about elections. We welcome any statement which indicates that elections will be held there for we feel that the holding of elections, although that may offer some difficulties, is the only proper course to bring about some kind of a Government responsible to a legislature. We hope, therefore, that the recent difficulties which the Government and the people in Nepal had to face will now end for the time being and all their energies will be directed towards the preparation for these elections and the other schemes that they have to improve the condition of the people of Nepal.

Now, coming to the big and broad issue, the major issue in the world which today dominates everything else, the issue of war and peace—I do not mean to say that war is round the corner and suddenly might appear and yet it is, in another sense not round the corner but almost above our heads all the time now—although we have referred to this matter many times here in this House and elsewhere, I do speak about this in terms of greater urgency today than I have ever done before.

The other day, I ventured to make an appeal which was addressed to the other great countries and more especially to the United States of America and the Soviet Union because, after all, it is on those who hold the reins of authority in these two countries that the question of peace and war depends. I ventured to address an appeal to them and I have had replies from both, the heads of both those countries. They have appeared in the public Press and so I need not refer to them in any detail. I am very grateful for the trouble Mr. Bulganin and President Eisenhower have taken to reply at considerable length.

I should like hon. Members to consider those replies because, while there appear to be some differences in approach, some criticism of each other, basically, it will be noticed how strong the desire for peace and for some arrangements to ensure peace is evident from both those replies. It may be that some people may lay stress on the differences; but I think it would be right for us here as it would be right anywhere else for us, rather to lay stress on the similarities, on the common urges, on the common desires and the common objectives than on the differences. There are differences, of course; otherwise, there would be no question of this crisis having arisen. I think the time has come when this issue has ceased to be completely a theoretical issue and is an issue of the highest practical importance.

It is an issue which does not merely demand a moral and ethical approach. I hope the moral and ethical approach is always there; but, sometimes the purely moral and ethical approach is called an impractical one. There appears to be some strange presumption that everything practical should be immoral and unethical. However, today, I would certainly lay stress on the moral and ethical approach because morality and ethics are involved when there is a question of extermination of the human species in a general way, when there is the question of war

weapons being used for mass slaughter. There can be no doubt that from any approach moral and ethical questions are involved. But, there is something much more perhaps which may be appreciated by many people and that is a very definite, practical, and, if you like, the opportunist approach to this problem.

And, all the arguments in the world, blaming one party or the other, will not help us or will not save us or humanity unless there is some solution of this problem. The time has gone by, I submit, when any of these great countries, opposed to each other in military alliances and blocs can morally justify their attitude or their policy by criticising the other party even though that criticism might be justified and might be right. It will not help at all because what the world seeks to achieve is not some self-justification of one's action but survival, freedom from the daily fear that oppresses humanity today.

In Europe, and may be elsewhere, aircraft fly about with hydrogen bombs on them all the time. Why? Because they must be ever ready to, they say, defend themselves. What an extraordinary state of affairs! Every country does the most aggressive things in the name of defence. But, even if that was necessary in the name of defence, it is obvious that even a very slight accident might let loose all the horrors of war to prevent which all this is being done.

Now, a little while ago, there were some resolutions put forward in the United Nations; and I should like to refer to them because they represent an approach which though it may not be considered very satisfactory by hon. Members here—many of them—nevertheless is the only reasonable approach left today to deal with highly controversial problems. One was the resolution on Algeria and the other was the resolution which, unfortunately, did not succeed; and that was the Indonesia resolution which I referred to. If it was accepted nothing much would have happened except that it would have opened the door to

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

talk, for a consideration of the problem without finally committing anybody to anything. Naturally, the time will have to come sometime—however early or late. However, that did not get the two-thirds majority.

Now, Algeria has been a terribly frustrating problem, frustrating to everybody, to Algerians, to the French and the others. There has been a horrible war going on and the accounts we read of that war and of the large-scale killing of people are very bad. How is one to deal with that problem? Our reaction, the reaction of this House, obvious is that Algeria should be independent. True; we agree. How are we to help Algeria to become independent? By passing a resolution in this House? Perhaps, this is an expression of the will of this Parliament but that does not go far. In the United Nations also the same difficulty comes.

Therefore, the attitude we have endeavoured to take up there in such problems, where our views are completely well-known, is, nevertheless, not merely to be the protagonists of one set of views, loudly proclaiming them and condemning those who oppose us; but, rather, we have always endeavoured to try to bring about a method of conciliation. It may fail; it may not succeed; but even an attempt to do that is helpful. In this Algerian affair, a resolution was passed; it did not go terribly far. But it is a remarkable thing, where such passions are involved, that the resolution was passed almost unanimously in the UN. It is a remarkable thing. Only France did not vote for it. Even France did not oppose it. That itself shows that the resolution did not go very far. True. But it helped.

The hon. Members smile. They are welcome to smile. But hon. Members will not smile and may not smile when they have to deal with the problems themselves: as to what exactly has to be done in regard to it. Just taking up a brave attitude, the attitude of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, charging at windmills thinking that

they were the brave knights in armour—that is past except that occasionally it appears in the Opposition Benches.

We have to deal with tremendously difficult problems, which apart from the difficulties involved in them, are on the verge of other major problems of the world. The hydrogen bomb and other ballistic weapons and the like are there to warn you of what would be the fate of the world if a false step is taken. Today, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are the big powers with the biggest, longest and most dangerous weapons. The United Kingdom has also joined with the Hydrogen Bomb Club though, presumably, it is weaker, comparatively than those two. I have no doubt that, within a relatively short time, France will also be experimenting with its test hydrogen bomb explosions.

So, you see how the world drifts on and I have no doubt that other countries will do so in another year or six months. It will go on and it will become absolutely impossible to control this deterioration and decline. Therefore, we are today at a rather critical moment in history—not only in our country but the world. If we fail to take advantage of this moment, the results may be very bad.

Recently, only two or three days ago, a resolution was passed, also unanimously, by the UN—a resolution sponsored by India, Yugoslavia and Sweden, three countries which are not aligned with any bloc of nations. Although they have different ways, they have this in common that they are not in military alliances with any bloc of nations. This resolution was on peaceful co-existence. The resolution referred in actual terms to the so-called five principles which are well-known and which were originally drafted and placed before the public in a document signed by India and China. Since then, these principles have been adopted by a number of countries. It is, I think, a great gain that even in the form they have been

put up before the UN, they should have been accepted unanimously.

I do not attach too much importance to this fact. But, I do wish to point out that all these efforts in which India has played a considerable part together with other countries, who are equally motivated with a desire for peace, do not suddenly take us out of the danger zone. They are all intended to help create an atmosphere where one can consider the problems of today in a very objective way without this terrible oppression of fear.

There was a resolution proposed by the Soviet Delegation on peaceful co-existence in the Political Committee of the UN. So far as the resolution went, it was undoubtedly one with which we agreed. None-the-less, it was not a resolution which, as worded, was acceptable to some other countries. Then, some other countries, notably India, Yugoslavia and Sweden as well as others, conferred and placed a different draft which embodied the substance of the other resolution but tried to avoid anything said in it which might just possibly irritate any country. It was totally unnecessary. Fortunately, we were successful in this. This resolution obtained the approval of the great countries. The U.S.A. supported it warmly. The Soviet Delegation were not only good enough to support this but withdrew their own resolution so that it might not come in the way. I am very grateful to them for this, because, in effect, they had priority for their resolution. But, they withdrew it.

This may mean little but it means a lot too because it shows that once the approach of mutual recrimination and mutual criticism goes, it is much easier for countries to come together because, in the final analysis, there is a tremendous deal in common between these apparently rival great powers. Above all, there is the common desire to survive.

I believe, in the speech that President Eisenhower delivered at the

NATO Conference yesterday—it appears in this morning's papers—he says that the time has gone by when there can be any victory of one side over another. I do not remember his exact words. I am giving the sense. The time has come when any right solution can only be a victory for all, he has said.

Those are pregnant words, they are very right indeed. If that is true, it is not only in the case of war. This is applied presumably to the possibility of war; there could be no victory for any one. The only real victory for everybody is to put an end to this fear of war.

If that is so, that approach also applies and should apply to the cold war. I cannot understand how people talk about peace and the necessity for avoidance of war but at the same time indulge in cold war which precipitates or adds to or increase our passions and brings about a situation which progressively is more dangerous and may burst at any moment.

I would again beg the hon Members to read carefully what Premier Bulganin and President Eisenhower have said in their replies to me and to observe how much there is in common in the approach although they criticise each other. If I may say so, with a great deal of respect, it has become the habit to criticise the other party, although criticism may be needed occasionally. Let us at least lay greater stress on the common bonds than on the points of difference.

Now, it is often said that all this is done for the sake of security, to ensure security. It is a strange way to ensure security, to add to every conceivable danger. But, anyhow, it is in the name of security that all these various steps are justified. In the name of security atomic tests should go on, in the name of security hydrogen bombs should be flown all over the place, in the name of security all kinds of tremendous weapons should be evolved, and in the name

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

of security each party should slant the other and thereby create an atmosphere where danger becomes more acute. I do not myself find it easy to follow these arguments. Of course, I must and everyone must recognise the argument for security. No country and no government can risk the future of itself, or can accept a position when another country can impose its will upon it. I accept that. But, in order to attain security, if measures are to be taken which really endanger it still further, then you fail in getting that security.

I do not propose to discuss the various subjects that have come up in disarmament conferences and in the United Nations in regard to disarmament, because it is a complicated subject. But it did seem to us some months ago, last summer, that for the first time an agreement became conceivable, that means an agreement principally between two, three or four great powers. We may vote and we may pass a resolution about it, but it is a little difficult when the people who possess hydrogen bombs do not agree not to use them. Therefore, last summer, five or six months ago, there was some hope of this agreement, but a little later various things happened which almost put disarmament into the shade, it hardly remained a live issue, it was put aside, there was a complete dead pause and that continues still. It is very unfortunate and very dangerous. The Soviet Government withdrew from the conference—not permanently, of course, I hope, but, nevertheless, for the time being withdrew—and, therefore, at the present moment, there are not even talks going on on that subject, and that is a dangerous position.

So, it is not for me here, and especially for us here, to argue the details of disarmament. It is a fact that the differences at one time were very limited, but something else happened which widened them. That 'something else' has little to do, I think, with the actual proposals made

by this side or that side; that 'something else' is the mental approach to the problem, the approach of fear, the approach of anger, the approach of not being made to appear that one is weak. It is the approach which uses the words: "Let us have a tough policy, let us speak from strength".

We have been hearing these words of "speaking from strength" for many years now. The result is: not the accretion of strength to one side; when one side grows a little stronger the other side grows stronger also, so that merely any reference of strength induces the other party to build up its strength as rapidly as possible, and you are where you were, perhaps in a worse condition.

It is extraordinary how old slogans, old phrases and old pious platitudes go on being repeated without any real attempt being made to grapple and wrestle with this problem and put an end to it, because the time is gone by for resolutions, the time is gone by for just wishful thinking, and we have to, and these great powers have to, come to grips with the actual reality, that any slight slip not even on the part of their governments but in individual gentlemen or commanders or somebody might precipitate a world war. Surely, the first thing necessary for the sake of security is to prevent this odd slip which might occur on the part of tens of thousands of persons who are in command here and there whereby a war will be precipitated.

I should, just to refresh your memory, like to read to you this resolution on co-existence, that was passed by the United Nations a few days ago, which represents an approach, an outlook, which does not solve any problem. I was beginning to feel more and more that the basic difficulty that we have is this mental approach, that is so wrong. There are difficulties apart from that. I do not say that a change of mental approach will solve the problems of the world. Of course, not. But it will change the nature of those problems, it will make

them easier of solution, and it will certainly give some security and peace to the minds of men and women. This was the resolution on co-existence:

"The General Assembly considering the urgency and the importance of strengthening international peace and of developing peaceful and neighbourly relations among States irrespective of their divergences or the relative stages and nature of their political, economic and social development,

Recalling that among the fundamental objectives of the Charter are the maintenance of international peace and security and friendly co-operation among States,

Realising the need to promote these objectives and to develop peaceful and tolerant relations among States in conformity with the Charter, based on mutual respect and benefit, non-aggression, respect for each other's sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity and non-intervention in one another's internal affairs, and to fulfil the purposes and principles of the Charter,

Recognising the need to broaden international co-operation, to reduce tensions, and to settle differences and disputes among States by peaceful means,

Calls upon all States to make every effort to strengthen international peace, and to develop friendly and co-operative relations and settle disputes by peaceful means as enjoined in the Charter and as set forth in this Resolution."

If the spirit underlying this resolution actuated the Governments concerned, well, a very great deal of progress would be made.

People seem to think today, some people, that the conflicts, the differences that separate nations are almost unbridgeable; that either war comes with whatever it may bring, or

else rival and armed camps continue glaring at each other, at the most with some kind of uneasy co-existence. Only eleven years ago—or is it twelve now?—the last Great War ended, and if hon. Members can take back their minds to the date of the war, when the war was occurring, they will remember the bitter passions and hatred that were aroused between the enemies, and now we see that those countries that were enemies are closely allied today; they are allies today in military alliances and also ideological and other alliances. And, we see those countries, that were allies, poles apart, today afraid of each other, threatening each other. Is that not extraordinary? But is it not still more extraordinary that people should think that the present bitter differences should continue for ever? All history shows us that friends and allies sometimes become enemies and enemies become friends, and even the history of the last ten years has shown us this. Why then persist in a policy which perpetuates these enmities? Even a bitter and bloody war comes to an end and there is peace at the end of it, after a terrible slaughter and killing and destruction. Why wait for a war before you seek peace?

Surely it should be wiser to have peace before a war comes or to work for it and not to allow yourselves to be driven into a war. That of course would be so at any time, but now, when we have reached the age of these tremendous ballistic weapons, hydrogen bombs and space travel, we have reached an age where all old conceptions do not apply. Nobody knows what the future might be. It is said by people who know something about military and defence matters that in a war that may come things will be completely different, that all the tactics and the strategy learnt previously, even in the last great war, would not apply, because conditions are completely different. That is so.

May I suggest that conditions of thinking, of political and international

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

thinking, are also completely different now? And merely repeating old slogans, old phrases and the old mental approaches does not help today. The problems are different. The way the problems have arisen, the way these big, enormous weapons have come into being—great forces are being released—require entirely a different order of thinking.

I would add, with great humility and great respect, that they also demand some consideration on a different plane than the purely military plane; some consideration which I cannot describe properly perhaps, say, some consideration on an ethical plane; but quite apart from that, even on the strictest material, defence and military plane, which is so alike, on a political plane, because international affairs and defence are closely allied to each other. If defence thinking has got to be on a very, very different line, then surely political thinking on the international plane must also be equally different, and it is not good enough to think in the same old way.

And the full realisation must come—if I may repeat President Eisenhower's statement—that there can be no settlement and no real peace unless it is a victory for all. If any group or country thinks that it is going to score in the cold war it is mistaken, much less in the hot war. In either hot war or cold war you can go on till you destroy each other.

Therefore, the only way is to approach it differently and realise that war can no longer solve these problems, cold or hot, and also realise, which is a fact, that the people of every country, barring none, passionately desire peace. There is no doubt about it; whether it is the people of the United States or the Soviet Union or any other country, they desire passionately peace. Why not then allow this tremendous urge for peace to have full play and to help in reaching agreements between

these countries which ensure their peace?

I would like just to mention one matter. Today, the NATO council is meeting in Paris. It is not for me to advise them, because, as I have indicated previously, we are not very much in favour of these military alliances today; we do not think they create that atmosphere which will lead to a settlement. As I said previously, it is not for me to say, and I am only talking about the position today. Every step of this kind is met by a counter-step on the other side; there you are where you were. Anyhow they are meeting and they consist of great powers, and I do earnestly hope that their deliberations will lead to a peaceful approach and not to this attempt at continued rivalry.

No one knows—I do not at any rate—which power today is stronger. Today, in the realm of these new types of weapons, may be in some the United States may be stronger and in some other matters the Soviet Union might be stronger. But the point is that both are strong enough to destroy the other and the world. So, it matters very little who has got a little edge on the other or is a little stronger than the other. If that is so, then this rivalry in weapons ceases to have much meaning, because, even if you get some slightly better weapon, you will be destroyed nevertheless.

One thing more, just to clarify a matter which sometimes people may not be sure of. It is about Kashmir and the recent resolution in the Security Council and the fact that Dr. Graham has been invited in that resolution to visit India and Pakistan. Our position has been stated with such clarity and force by our representative, Shri Krishna Menon, that it is not necessary for me to say anything about it except to say that what our representative has said there is precisely our position. Let there be

no mistake about it. He has stated our position and the whole history of this Kashmir case with great lucidity.

This problem of Kashmir, according to us, cannot be solved till the whole approach is not a different one, till the whole approach is not one of the vacation of aggression which Pakistan has committed. If that is admitted then other things flow from it. If that is not admitted, then no step forward can be taken about this. Dr. Graham has been invited by the Security Council to visit here. Dr. Graham is of course welcome to come here. He is an esteemable gentleman as many of us know. The other people also, if they wish to come here, can come here. But we have made clear, our representative in the Security Council made it perfectly clear, that we are not prepared to consider this visit of Dr. Graham as some kind of continuation of his previous visits or a continuation of the previous talks which he had with us. Conditions have changed completely and we are not prepared to continue those talks in that context. Otherwise, he is welcome as all others are welcome.

Mr. Speaker: There are a number of amendments. I shall call one after the other.

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 it and approves the said policy."

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): 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,—

(a) that members of the Commonwealth whose attitudes do not appear to be impartial in the situation of Kashmir and Goa be suitably warned in the interest of the Unity of Commonwealth;

(b) that the United Nations be asked to inquire into the source which influenced the decision of the United Nations Department of Publicity according to which Kashmir was shown as a disputed territory in the United Nations map published this year;

(c) that Big Powers other than U.S.S.R. who have not yet taken decisions on the request of the Government of India to stop making experimental tests of nuclear weapons be moved again to take a positive attitude in the interest of humanity at large; and

(d) that recommendation be made for suitable amendment of the United Nations Charter to base the representation in United Nations organisation as far as possible on a population basis, giving due weightage to members with small populations."

Mr. Speaker: This amendment is subject to correction here and there. Some motions may not be in order. I shall have it checked.

Shri Naldurgker (Osmanabad): I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the present international

[Shri Naldurgker]

situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, expresses its concern over the present explosive international situation created by the armament race, vast production of nuclear weapons and cold war existing between some Big Powers agree with the non-alignment policy of the Government of India and approves their policy of maintaining friendly alliances with all nations of the world and commends the steps frequently taken by them tranquillising and appeasing the world tension, which could have culminated into world-war."

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): 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, urges the adoption of a more effective policy with regard to Goa and other Portuguese enclaves."

Shri Radha Raman (Delhi): 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, approves the said policy."

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): 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 policy be approved for it is in conformity with Panch Shila."

13 hrs.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip): Sir 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 keeping in view the present international situation, the policy followed by the Government of India is not only consistent with the aims and objects of Panch Shila but is the only right policy that could possibly be followed and it therefore be approved and commended to Governments of other countries of the world."

Shri Kashtwal (Kotah): Sir, 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 and wholeheartedly supports the praiseworthy efforts of Government in pursuit of a Disarmament Agreement acceptable to all nations."

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Sir, I beg to move:

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

"This House having considered the present international

situation and policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, urges that—

(a) the U. N. be informed that the Government of India is not prepared to hold any parleys with its representative Dr. Graham about the Kashmir issue except in so far as, it concerns the vacation of the illegally occupied portion of Kashmir;

(b) the grave issue occasioned by the continuous exodus of East Bengal Hindus owing to conditions of dire insecurity there, be referred to the United Nations; and

(c) early steps be taken to integrate the liberated areas of Dadra and Nagar Haveli with the rest of India.”

Mr. Speaker: I have received an amendment from Shrimati Renuka Ray just now. It is only a substitute motion on the lines of the other ones.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Sir, 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 opinion that it is the only way through which peace and tranquility can prevail in the world and hopes that the implication of India's objective stand on all issues including these which affect her materially, will be fully understood and find an effective persons amongst the peoples and Governments of all Nations.”

Mr. Speaker: All the substitute motions are before the House. I wish to announce that I propose to allow leaders of groups twenty to thirty minutes and others fifteen minutes. The motion and the amendments are before the House. The discussion may now start.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): Sir, the Prime Minister has made an extremely important statement. At the very outset I have to say that our Party fully supports the essence of the policy that he has outlined in his statement. In this matter at least our party does not stand in what is called opposition to the foreign policy of Government. Therefore, one might think whether I have any further remarks to offer. Certainly I have, because while we do fully support the essence of the policy, and while we fully support the important statement that he has made, we might here and there advance certain arguments in support of that policy. We might here and there emphasise one or the other of the points and in order to point out that emphasis, I venture to offer a few remarks.

The Prime Minister has already drawn the attention of the House and the country to the situation which prevails today in which the great powers possess tremendous instruments of destruction, and in the context of such a situation how it is extremely urgent that the question of peace be taken seriously by all the countries. In accordance with this statement and this sentiment, it is necessary to point out to the people certain recent events in this field and to bring out how a weapon here and a weapon there may be alike in appearance, but the two connote two different things and two different conclusions.

To give an illustration, when the first atom was split in the world, it produced an atom bomb was made in use of the atom bomb was made in order to devastate two cities and wipe out a few hundred thousand people. The same atom was split in another country and on a larger scale and out of it, and as a continuation of that development was born the inter-Continental Ballistic Missile, in short called the ICBM. The ICBM was produced by the Soviet Union. The first atom bomb killed human being of two cities and it is not an accident that the first ICBM was used to launch a

[Shri S. A. Dange]

man-made moon in the space to study the behaviour of the atmosphere in the upper layers and to put that ICBM in the service of human good. If the ICBM can be used as an instrument of destruction, certainly it can be used as an element in the security of the Soviet Union. But is it a historical accident? Is it an accident that the first atom split in America had to be used in war and had to be used as a threat of a new war after the Second War and as an instrument of the policy of cold war? Or is it a pure accident that the ICBM is used to launch a sputnik in the air to give news for human good?

Therefore it is no use our going to the people and saying: instruments of destruction exist; there is threat of war on either side and everyone who has the instrument threatens a war. We must tell the people that instruments by themselves do not create war. It is not merely their foreign policy that creates war. There are interests behind war. It is not just because some people either in America or in England or in France or in Soviet Union get mad and start releasing missiles. No. It is just because there are definite interests.

For example, what are the interests that attack Indonesia? Nothing to do with atom; nothing to do with missiles; nothing to do with the foreign policy of Holland as such. But they want plantations; they want to preserve the mines; they do not like Indonesians to get possession of them. Therefore, they go and take a chunk of the territory of Indonesia and create conditions of war. Now here the foreign policy of Holland may be of world peace. But the very desire to possess colonies pushes it into conditions of war and to conditions of disturbing peace.

Therefore, what I wish to submit first is this: let us go to the people and tell them: instruments of destruction exist, but watch who uses them for what purpose, and what is the ultimate use of these missiles in a

given social system that exists among the different powers in the different countries. For example, the use of war in a capitalist system, in an imperialist system like England, like France and like America, is to do what? To seize colonies, to seize Africa, to attack Egypt, to seize Indonesia, to threaten even the security of India, and as was said the other day, by arming a neighbour next-door and creating trouble in Kashmir.

Now these events follow from a power or two powers who possess the atom bomb, but the same type of events do not follow from another power which possesses the atom bomb, and a better one. Why don't they follow from it? They do not follow from the other powers, that is, the powers of the socialist camp, because they have no need for colonialism, they have no need to hold Africa, or India, or Indonesia or the Suez Canal in their clutches.

Therefore we must not lose sight of the fact. The Prime Minister may not emphasise this; he need not do it; perhaps he may not like to do it because of his position. He has to act as the man who produced this policy in order to get certain things on the peace front done, but certainly we others must study the problem in greater detail and emphasise other facts also. (Laughter) I do not understand the meaning of the laughter, unless it is a private chat.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Is laughter also unparliamentary? We are hearing this for the first time.

Shri S. A. Dange: You are at liberty to laugh.

Shri Nath Pai: First there was an attack on smile, now on laughter.

Shri S. A. Dange: Questions of war and peace are more serious. We are not having war here, I suppose.

Shri Nath Pai: Let us see.

Mr. Speaker: I would like hon. Members to avoid both these as far as possible.

Shri S. A. Dange: As he has said, let us see.

Let us see how the existence of these missiles in the hands of different powers lead to different results. This launching of the Sputnik is one of the greatest events. It is not merely an event in the scientific world; it is an event which affects the whole of humanity not only in its conceptions of the world, the universe, philosophy, religion and so on, but it has an immediate effect. What was the immediate effect? We can read the English papers. *The Economist* wrote that the launching of the Sputnik has strengthened the temerity of the Middle-East countries and the Arab bloc in its defiance against the West. The launching of the Sputnik has strengthened the freedom movement in the Arab countries and has enabled them to defy the demands of either America or of England or of France. It has strengthened the will to fight among the Algerians, the Indonesians and the African people. It has strengthened the will to fight among the Indonesians, because the mighty tone of those gentlemen who talk of taking the world to the brink of war and then withdrawing perhaps in fright or in wisdom—I do not know which—has gone down a bit.

Therefore, the Sputnik served as an element of peace. The ICBM has served as an element of toning down the hauteur of war-mongering diplomats. Therefore, the existence of the missile is not existence in abstract, in the hands of abstract powers. But it is a positive element in the hands of certain powers with a positive, social and political foreign policy. That is a thing which we ought to see and which certainly many people do see in the world.

For example, today, what has emboldened France to walk out of the NATO and defy Dulles's dictates,

because they say, Gentlemen, so long what was the situation in international relations even on the field of war? England used to say, launch a war against France and retreat behind the channel, because so long nobody could cross the channel; even Napoleon and Hitler failed. Then came the bomber. But the bomber could not immediately reach from Berlin to New York. America could say, you fight in Europe and I am at a safe distance. Now they find that something launched from Moscow can reach New York, if you threaten to launch from New York at Moscow. When that knowledge comes, then a certain sobriety comes; a certain reduction of the atmosphere of hauteur comes. Therefore, the ICBM comes as an element of peace. That is what has enabled a power like France which heartily joined England in attacking Egypt for possessing the Suez Canal, to defy Dulles and say—even the other powers say, "None of your medium-range missiles here".

America now talks of medium-range missiles in Paris, Berlin and Amsterdam, because it has not got long-range missiles. A small country like Norway, which some years ago joined the NATO powers, a small country like West Germany, which is a part of NATO, now cautions, "Well, Gentlemen; the argument is very simple. You want to put medium-range missiles in Europe and you retreat to New York. We get the fun of it, is it, at the hands of somebody else? Such a policy is not to our safety. It may be to the safety of the American investment; it may be the safety of the American war-mongers. They have the long-range; we possess the medium-range and you have no range at all and you retreat." This kind of security at the expense of other powers, now the NATO powers are not willing to admit.

So, there is a crack in the NATO front. This solid front which was willing to launch policies of war is cracking. Why is it cracking? Because of the ICBM, because of the

[Shri S. A. Dange]

Sputnik and because of the strength that is now shown against the war-mongering powers. Therefore, the Sputnik is a great event, when it was launched in October this year. It has acted as an element of peace, not because it has a long range, but because the power which possesses that is not an ordinary power in the sense of the term in which we use it, but a power which has no colonial ambitions, no monopoly profits, getting 5 or 6 per cent. bank interest at the cost of under-developed countries. It is a power which is interested in building socialism. Therefore, this new element in the new situation of international politics has got to be taken note of. And it was a very happy thing to find that our Prime Minister took the immediate initiative to call upon those countries which possess these powers to come together again and discuss peace, to agree to suspend the test of atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs and come together for discussions of peace. Therefore, we support that initiative and we congratulate him for having taken that initiative.

We certainly cannot fail to take note that there may be hesitations, bickerings and arguments in the replies that we have received. Certainly, there is an element of truth in the statement of both Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Bulganin. They stand for peace; no doubt they have expressed that they want peace. But one says that he agrees to suspend the tests; the other says that he also agrees to suspend the tests, but if I understand them aright, the Americans want to suspend only on the condition that the disarmament question is resolved. If I understand Mr. Bulganin's letter aright, it is that they are prepared to suspend the tests without any condition, let the others agree. So, it is unconditional in the sense that they do not put conditions of other subjects. The unconditional readiness on the part of Mr. Bulganin is of greater help I feel, than the conditions put by the Americans. But

as our Prime Minister has expressed the hope that they too later on will see the madness of the race and also accept the sentiments which have been put forward from the Prime Minister's side to these countries.

A second event of importance has happened in the international world next to the Sputnik. Sputnik in the domain of science; but there is another event which happened as important as the Sputnik but in the domain of thinking, in the domain of ideology. It certainly is good that that thing has happened in terms of the policies enunciated by our country and that second event is that the 82 countries of U.N.O. have accepted a resolution on peaceful co-existence. Why do I call that a second great event? In the resolution itself, maybe the word "co-existence" is not spelt like that, but as you will see, there is a vision of peaceful co-existence. You can recall the atmosphere that prevailed some years ago when the name of peace was mentioned, the atmosphere that prevailed some years ago when co-existence was mentioned. I will remind the House, from where this word co-existence and this policy of co-existence came. The policy and the word first came into existence in this world when the Soviet Union came into existence and it was enunciated then. It was in those days denied. Even the word was hated because it came from Lenin, because the word came from Marx-Leninism which believes in peaceful co-existence. No diplomat, no organisation, which was not socialist in its very blood would tolerate the word "co-existence". They would say, "Oh! It comes from the Soviet Union. It comes from Lenin; it comes from Communists. No." But here it is good to find that now peaceful co-existence enters into diplomatic correspondence, into treaties, into the resolutions and finally now into the resolution of U.N.O. of which America, we, the Soviet Union and everybody is a member. It is a triumph for

whom? I would say, a triumph of the peace movement of the masses of the people. I am not saying people. I am not saying it is a triumph either of Lenin's policy or of the Communist policy; no. But I want to point out how the idea first came from the camp of socialism, when the Soviet Union said, "You cannot suppress us by your civil wars and by your invasion, as you tried in 1918. You will have to live with us, co-exist peacefully and advance capital goods to the under-developed countries at 2 per cent. interest. Let us see how you do it. We will do it." They failed in the competition and the Soviet Union won. Now, it was a good thing to find that India, Yugoslavia and Sweden sponsored a resolution on peaceful co-existence in terms of a treaty signed by India and China in 1954 and the resolution on peaceful co-existence was passed in the United Nations. This is another great event because it gives the people now in every country a platform to say, peacefully co-exist and compete peacefully and build the whole colonial world, undeveloped world with all your achievements of science, give them capital goods and abolish war for ever so that these achievements can be used for man's good. Therefore, next to the Sputnik, the passing of the Resolution in the United Nations on peaceful co-existence is a great event in the international world.

Maybe that some people may not like either the diet or the hair or the appearance of Shri Krishna Menon who moved the resolution on behalf of India. But, hair and diet are not a part and polite words are not a part necessarily of foreign policy and the success of foreign policy. If that were the only thing, then, the Prime Minister's letters should have been accepted immediately, with the best of manners, with the most fine politeness that can be obtained in international diplomacy. But, you see, it is not the main point. Some people make this as an argument because they have got allergic reactions to the Mover of the resolution, Shri Krishna

Menon. Maybe, I would like my friend Shri Krishna Menon to eat better so that there is no break in the debates. That is only a simple thing. But, certainly Shri Krishna Menon has done the correct thing and has put the case of India properly whether on Kashmir or other question. There is no question of detracting from his services just because here and there he used a word which somebody did not like. Therefore, we are not going to judge the foreign policies put forward in the United Nations, the arguments put forward in the U.N.O. on the basis of the individual who did it or who moved it or who spoke and what he spoke. In a sense the policy was right, in a sense we are represented properly and correctly because, here the policy on foreign affairs is proper and correct. It does not matter which individual does it.

I would like to add one or two remarks on one or two points which may not have been felt quite necessary for reference by the Prime Minister. He has already referred to Indonesia. Certainly, we will stand with Indonesia in its struggle against Dutch colonialism, because we know what it means. When the oil monopolists here dictate prices to the Government of India and to our transport industries and needs of our development, we know what they must be doing in Indonesia. They are doing just what they wanted to do here. Here, they cannot foment military conspiracies and break parts of India from each other. In Indonesia they are doing it. Several number of islands, each one being seized by military juntas, financed by Holland and America and now I am told, by England also; they are trying to break the Indonesian freedom.

It was certainly a proud thing to see that in the matter of foreign policy, in the matter of guarding Indonesian freedom, in the matter of repulsing the Dutch colonialists, a great initiative was taken by the trade

[Shri S. A. Dange]

unions in Indonesia. It is the workers who said, these plantations, these tin mines, and oil wells are our property, our country's property; if the Dutch are going to follow a policy of scorch-ear^h, we shall scorch colonialism, but shall not allow them to be taken away by the colonialists. They took possession of them, plantation after plantation. They said, if you, won't produce coal for your Five year plan, we will take over the coal whether your capital be foreign or Indonesian, you must fall in line with the socialist policy of the country that is being followed by the Government. This is what the Indonesians told the colonialists. And the Trade union organisation, the SOBSI, I am glad to note—I am not just saying it for a record, I am glad to note that in the translation of the foreign policy of the Indonesian people, the SOBSI which is affiliated with us to the World Federation of Trade Unions, took the initiative and hal'ed the aggression of the Dutch colonialists. Therefore, the point that I would like to note is, don't neglect the force of the working class, don't neglect the force of the trade unions in the translation of the peace policy and in the policy against colonialism.

Colonialism cannot be fought only on the basis of resolutions, as he says, only on the basis of a Government and army. Sometimes, Governments and armies cannot do things which the working classes and the trade unions can do. Then, the Government later on can take advantage of it as the Indonesians have done. Who got the plantations? The trade unions. The Government came and said, in order to preserve peace and order, we take them over. The Government of Indonesia would not have dared to take over the factories and plantations of these foreign capitalists who would not work them for the benefit of the country. These trade unions just did it and the Government agreed with

the trade unions and the trade unions agreed with the Government and the working classes had the pleasure^h of saving these plantations and mines for the country. This is a fact which should be underlined. Surely, I do not expect the Prime Minister to underline it, because again, I repeat, in his position he cannot do it. But, it is our duty to underline it because otherwise we will not see the real content of the development, we will not see the real direction of things. Indonesia is not just fighting because it is an independent power. No. It is fighting because in this particular situation, the trade unions and the working classes rose in revolt, the correct action, and saved the country from being defrauded of these mines by the colonialists. This is a point that I would like to underline with regard to the Indonesian situation.

Another thing that I would like to emphasise in the few minutes that I have at my disposal is with regard to Africa. This subject was not mentioned at all. It was not a very complicated subject at all. Africa, in a sense was mentioned by reference to Algeria. I agree with the Government and with the people in general who stand in support of the struggle of the Algerian people for independence. Where is Algeria? Where is Egypt? Where is Tunisia? Next door to Uganda, next door to Ghana, next door to South Africa which is trying to impose policies of racialism against the African people. You remember the Kenya s'ruggle, you remember the struggle that the African people are carrying on. By mentioning that, do I suggest that the Prime Minister has not got that in mind? No. I do not suggest that. Not at all. Because he himself has expressed his support to the Algerian peoples' struggle and the need for peaceful settlement on that question. He himself had sided with the Egyptian people in their just demand.

There is one thing which we must remember. In the struggle of the African people, I do not know whether we are yet decided as to the attitude that the Indians in Africa must take. This is a very sore point in our politics. I do not want to go into reminiscences because reminiscences are more on the other side than on my side. Let me tell you, this African problem was first raised very vehemently not only by Mahatma Gandhi. The Indian Citizenship Association in Bombay and the Congress at that time there was directly connected and they took up the question of the Indians in Africa. At that time, a problem was raised in the politics of the National Congress, as to what should be the approach of Indians in Africa, with regard to the Negro people. Not with regard to Smu's, not with regard to the Boers, not with regard to England, but with regard to African people. Thirty years ago, I remember that a decision was taken that the Indians should not participate in the struggle between Negroes and the Governments of the imperialist powers there. I hope this decision is now changed I know the policy has changed.

Shri Ranga: For the last ten years, it has been changed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am surprised the hon. Member has not followed this policy during the last thirty years. I am not saying that we did not support the struggle of the Negro people. I have not at all said a word that our country or our Government has not supported the Kenyan people or Uganda or Ghana. I know, I have heard some accounts from our Ambassador or Councillor who was there in Ghana himself. I am not charging the Congress at all of not siding or not supporting the ambitions of the Negro people. What I am saying is that if a proper emphasis is not yet being laid, let us make it very clear for our people over there, because there are splits in the Congress organisation in Africa on this question. You cannot say that the split does not

exist. It does exist. A difference of opinion does exist. Therefore, I am saying: let us give clear instructions to those who abide by the foreign policy of this country that—there are quarrels, competitions on account of trade, investments and so on—whatever the quarrels, the Indians must side unequivocally with the African people in their struggle against the colonists who are there. That is all I am submitting. I am not saying that our Government is not supporting the struggle of the Negro people. I never said that.

Seth Govind Das (Jabalpur): Does the hon. Member know that in many resolutions of the Indian National Congress we have said that Indians are not to fight for their rights, but to have a united front with the people of Africa? Does he not know that?

Shri Rameshwar Rao (Mabbubnagar): The Prime Minister explained it, but perhaps the hon. Member did not understand it.

Shri S. A. Dange: I am very glad that as a result of the point being raised, firm assurances are coming forward.

Shri Ranga: It has been our policy.

Seth Govind Das: For the last 12 to 14 years.

Shri S. A. Dange: I know the controversies in the Indian National Congress in Africa that are going on.

An Hon Member: That is a different matter.

Shri S. A. Dange: You may disown them now, I do not mind. I am talking of the organisation there, and some of the people. I am not charging the Government at all. That was one point which I just wanted to refer to, not as a matter of controversy at all nor as charges on the Government or the foreign policy of the Prime Minister that is being followed here.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

Coming to Kashmir, there is no difference of opinion on this question at all,—at least as far as my party is concerned. I cannot speak for all the parties of the Opposition. They may have their own views which they may state later on, but I agree with the Government on this, that there will be no truck, no negotiation unless certain things are admitted by the other side. Of course, the question of hospitality, whether Dr. Graham should be given hospitality or not is a very minor point, though we have a bad habit of giving hospitality to invaders, though I am sure we do not give hospitality willingly to the invaders. If such persons are to be sent by the U.N.O. it is all right. Let there be hospitality in Asoka Hotel or Kashmir, it does not matter, but it is good to hear that hospitality will not go further, and there will be no compromise on that score, because we have had enough of arguments, long, tiring arguments and hours of debate in the U.N. on this question, and it is time we got out and said once and for all: no compromise here on any point.

The thing that I would mention here in connection with this is—there is already a news, and I mentioned it earlier in connection with one of the debates here—that it is high time that we brought about a little change in the Kashmir situation by releasing Sheikh Abdulla. I have already said I did not agree years ago when he was imprisoned with the views he was charged to have held on the position of Kashmir, but at the same time, four years is enough of detention. That is too much, and if Sheikh Abdulla is not considered to be a healthy element in Kashmir itself, let us do some other things, but let us release him from detention. That is, of course, not a question of foreign policy, but is a little element in having certain changes in the integral situation in Kashmir.

There is nothing to discuss about Goa and all that, because after all, we certainly will carry on peaceful poli-

cies, and we should have to wait, as the Prime Minister insists, for peace dawning on colonialists and the value of peace, though it is our experience that colonialism generally does not understand the philosophy of peace; they only understand peace when it is backed by some stronger force. We are not in a position to exert any force. Therefore, we have to accept that unhappy position in Goa. But, if the Indonesian people could act in order to preserve Indonesian freedom and could act in order to reclaim West Irian for themselves, could not the people in this country be once again allowed to act? Government may not act, I do not mind, but let the people act. Maybe there are some differences, but it is time we sat round the table. We have been sitting round the table in the consultative committee on this question and more or less everybody says: "Well, for the time being let us keep quiet. Many people are keeping quiet on many things, some of the Powers are also keeping quiet on some things like this. Therefore, let us not hurry up this question". I am not in a mood to hurry up the question, but surely the question is not being lost sight of, surely we cannot lose sight of it. But then we should have to consider how it is going to be resolved in context of the situation that exists.

In the end I would agree with the message—more or less it is a message, though he does not call it a message—he has sent now to the meeting of NATO Powers which are meeting today that this competition is not going to be a healthy competition. It is better we give up this competition of missiles and war and come to peaceful co-existence on the basis of economic competition, and on the basis of finest five principles which were enunciated by India and China three years ago and are now accepted by the 82 countries of the U.N.O.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): The House will forgive me for narrating two incidents during my recent tour of

Europe which stretched over two months.

I would like to refer to a prison camp and to Hungary.

I was in Poland and I visited the Ostwiche prison camp. I am mentioning this incident because it is directly connected with violence and non-violence. The Ostwiche prison camp in Poland is a place where nearly three to five million people were gassed and executed, and wherein we saw what violence means as against non-violence.

The interpreter who took me around the prison yards was the same interpreter who took our hon. Prime Minister around the place, and he mentioned to me that our Prime Minister actually shed tears when he went round that prison.

When I went round, I was dumbfounded when I saw rooms full of women's hair. I saw several cells full of children's shoes, and one gets a kind of mental paralysis to think of the amount of violence committed by Nazi rulers in that hapless land, a land which was wedged in between Soviet Russia and Germany, which has had a terrible tale of suffering.

Therein we have a moral, and therein I felt the greatness of our policy; I felt that we had not touched any one, that we had not laid our hands on anybody, and that the non-violent spirit of our policy down the ages had been the correct policy to be pursued. When I saw the fate of men and women, especially of the Jewish faith, who were shaved, gassed and executed I thought that India was the only country which had not persecuted the Jews. Therein I felt was the greatness of our land, and that there was some meaning in the Polish Foreign Minister making a proposal at the UNO that there should be a neutral belt free from nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons in and around Europe including Poland,

Yugoslavia, Germany and Czechoslovakia. If this belt is created, we shall have a chance of one vast belt of Europe being free from nuclear weapons.

I also had the chance of going to Hungary, though I did not have the chance of accompanying my friends Shri Kasliwal and Pandit Kunzru. When I went there I felt the shops were full and the restaurants were full and the Churches were full, but that there was one thing that I realised, that had it not been for the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt, there would have been no Russian invasion of Hungary as was reported by the press.

13.39 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Let us be fair, because the Russians had started a kind of exit, but there was trouble in Hungary and they walked back ruthlessly, and the trouble perhaps started after the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt. After all, the West thought that they could strike at the heart of Russia across the Danube, and they felt so alarmed and nervous when the Russians had actually gone away. This is the frank impression of an Indian like me who had been in Hungary for seven long days, who had met the people in the restaurants and in the churches and side lanes. As a matter of fact, one of the foreigners of the West mentioned to me that the prices in the shops were cheaper than they were over a year ago. This is a very cardinal fact, because had it not been for the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt, Russia may have had a better deal with Hungary, the same kind of deal that Russia gave to Poland, in the sense that the Polish people today are able to have a kind of internal autonomy and full sovereignty, but maintaining a kind of armed strength to defend itself against the N.A.T.O. attacks on its border.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

I was also in West Germany, and I saw the Germans in the state of highest prosperity. They were the best-dressed people in the world, and they ate the best. Their industrial machinery, from a little gadget in the bath-room to the highest, namely the plane or the motor-car, was almost perfect. But they have a kind of political philosophy, which is a fulfilment as I described to you, of the Nazi prisons, something horror-stricken. The Germans are capable of sweeping the world, but their political philosophy is something which frightens us. We saw their political philosophy in the prison-yards of Poland and other places. In the city of Hambourg, they said 50,000 people were buried in seven days, and in seven days, they had so many graves, because the British bombed them. I saw also the submarine bases in the Hambourg shipyard, where the British had bombed the submarines that the Germans manufactured in two months and assembled in four days.

The House will forgive me for mentioning these facts, because they are so much connected with a state of violence and non-violence. Though we are today far away from the theatre of war, we have yet to be closely noting what is happening on this side and that side of the world, so that we may be up and careful.

Coming to the N.A.T.O. objectives, what are they? How has the N.A.T.O. armed itself with its mighty thermo-nuclear weapons? That is because the NATO countries feel that they have less man-power in terms of divisions; while the iron curtain countries have got greater man-power. Now, what are the objectives of the NATO? France is demanding a formal reaffirmation at the N.A.T.O. conference this week that Algeria be included in the N.A.T.O. area. If that be the case, we want to know what kind of affirmation the N.A.T.O. has done in regard to Portugal's Goa. Has Portugal, as a member of the U.N.O., and as one allied with the N.A.T.O. powers demanded that Goa also be

included in the N.A.T.O. area, when right this week at the anvil of the N.A.T.O. conference France is demanding that Algeria be included in the N.A.T.O. sovereignty so that nobody can touch it and nobody shall raise his finger?

The United States is ready to offer missiles to any N.A.T.O. member that wants them. But the nuclear war-heads and missiles will be held under the custody of the U.S.A. only, a few feet from the launching platforms. The missiles could be armed with war-heads only at the first sign of attack only through mutual agreement. The French or the Germans will need U.S. consent to use the war-heads, and U.S.A. will need French or German consent to use the missiles which carry the war-heads. Britain wants the member-nations of the N.A.T.O. to subordinate their foreign policy to the N.A.T.O. These are the objectives.

Where do Asia and Africa stand? Asia is in a turmoil. Asia has shaken off its shackles. And Africa has come of age, and we were proud and happy to note that the African members in the recent Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference stood up like one team, and they sat glued to their seats. And even Mr. Gaitskell, noble and honourable as he is, made one of the massive statements in a very matchless exposition of the N.A.T.O. ideals in his speech on defence and international affairs at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference. He said that Britain had also to look to the colonies and the minority interests. The Uganda member then got up and said that while the minorities were just one per cent. of the population, viz. the foreigners, but what was to happen to the 99 per cent. of the population in Africa. If this questioning is done by Mr. Gaitskell as the former Chancellor of the Exchequer of England, that the British Labour Party or the bipartisan policy of the U.K. has still to worry itself about minorities in the colonies, I want to know what is going to happen to the world. Are they going to measure Africa in this fashion? Are they going to have this

best for Asian and African nations? We cannot permit it.

That brings me round immediately to the question of Goa. The hon. Prime Minister mentioned Irian, and he said how we sympathise with the aims of Indonesia. That again is based on our Goa policy. India has exercised non-violence in regard to the settlement of the Goa question, because we were nurtured in the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi, and we have, therefore, taken no violent action in regard to Goa except for some minor incident. But does Indonesia stand calmly? Can Indonesia afford to do the same with regard to West Irian quietly and say with folded hands, let the Dutch rule over us. Today, the action which has been taken by the Indonesians is proof of the fact that we have been very non-violent, that India has been very patient, that India's patience also may be exhausted one day, and that a day may come when the whole nation and a whole non-violent army of Indians may march into Goa and capture it.

We are not sure what the motives of the U.S.A and the U.K are. We want to know what their honest and straightforward declarations in regard to Goa are. We have exhausted the fund of non-violence with us, and perhaps a day may come when India may itself, as non-violently as possible, take such action as the Indonesians have done in regard to West Guinea.

Coming to Kenya, what is the position in Kenya? Can we sit with folded hands and watch thousands of homeless and fatherless children walking in the towns of Kenya? Mr. Jomo Kenyatta is in prison. One thousand people of Kenya have been executed. Fifty thousand people have been in the prison-yards of Kenya. Today, it is a grave; it is the peace of the grave there. And we have to shed some tears. We have to know what is happening in Kenya. We may not be able to do anything. But these are the problems.

If Africa has come of age, and if the British Government mean business, then the least that they should do is to grant immediate self-government to all these countries in Africa, which are under the boot-heel of half a dozen powers of Western Europe.

Let us now turn to the Kashmir problem. What is the Kashmir problem? The British Cabinet Mission in its declaration of 12th May, 1947 said:

"His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all other rights surrendered by the States to the paramount power shall return to the States".

In January, 1948, under a Britisher, the noble and famous Mountbatten, who was the Governor-General, this matter was referred to the U.N.O. out of a sheer state of idealism. India stuck to its policy of non-violence. India does not say one thing at the Goa border and another at the U.N.O. So, India referred the dispute to the U.N.O. out of sheer idealism, though India would have been justified in walking even into Pakistan. Today, the original dispute regarding Kashmir has been completely forgotten. Today, once again we have to accuse Britain of partiality in this dispute, for the simple reason that Britain has been inspiring resolutions behind the stage which openly show that Britain has not appreciated the stand that India took on Kashmir, namely her spontaneously referring the dispute to the U.N.O. and thereby standing as a humble innocent plaintiff that wanted justice to be given by the United Nations.

The Maharaja had been told with the consent of the Prime Minister—and that is what we are told in the book on Mountbatten, written by Campbell-Johnson—that he could accede either this way or that way.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

That was the freedom given to the Maharaja with the consent of the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, through the British Governor-General, perhaps with the full consent and knowledge of the British Government. If those things are not sanctioned by the present British Government, and if Britain gets irritated on the Egyptian policy and acts in a different way, then we have every right to know why the British Government has not acted in an honourable way in dealing with both the parties. We appreciate the motives of the British Labour Party when they say at least that they shall be impartial in regard to the Goa question.

I was referring to the manpower position of the East and the West, as to how one-sided the superiority of the East is and how the western side is trying to match their strength to the division strength of the eastern side. This is the secret of nuclear arming by the powers of the West Liddell Hart has said:

"Russia and her satellites from a total population of 300 million maintain standing armies of about 260 active divisions—of which perhaps 160 face westward. The NATO countries have a population of 230 million in Europe and 400 million in total; yet produce barely 20 active divisions (of which the majority are not ready for action) to cover the western and central area of Europe."

The extreme disparity of ground forces is the cause of all the trouble. In view of the disparity of manpower, the western powers say that they shall arm themselves with ample nuclear power. The hon. Prime Minister has described how the USA and USSR are equally balanced in thermo-nuclear weapons with the U.K. trying to come a good third. The USA is positively alarmed that a fourth power may come and a fifth may follow, and that the whole alliance may be split up.

We are wedged in this horrible set-up. So the policy we have followed has been justified, and the Motion which the hon. Prime Minister has moved for acceptance by the House of the principles of this policy is in sound accord with our past policy.

सेठ गोबिन्द दास : सभापति जी, आज अन्तर्-राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति और हमारे वैदेशिक विभाग की चर्चा का स्तर ही दूसरा हो गया है क्योंकि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने प्रारम्भिक भाषण में कहा कि भारत के प्रश्नों को गौणता दे कर इन समय वे सारे संसार की क्या परिस्थिति है, इस पर हमारा और संसार का व्यापक आकषित करना चाहते हैं। मैं यह स्वाभाविक मानता हूँ, वरन् मैं तो यह भी मानता हूँ कि इन के पहले भी वैदेशिक विभाग की चर्चाओं के समय वह बक्त आ गया था जब हमें इस प्रश्न को प्रधानतः इसी दृष्टि से देखना चाहिए था। यातायात के शीघ्रगामी साधनों के हो जाने के बाद, और उन के निरंतर अधिकाधिक शीघ्रगामी हो जाने के कारण यह संसार इतना छोटा हो गया है कि पहले जो समस्याएँ एक देश के भिन्न भिन्न भागों में सम्बन्ध रखती थीं, आगे चल कर जो समस्याएँ एक देश और दूसरे देश के सम्बन्धों में सम्बन्ध रखती थीं, वे समस्याएँ आज सारे संसार की समस्याएँ हो गई हैं, और स्वभावतः इन समस्याओं में शांति और युद्ध की प्रधान समस्या है। यदि हम मानव इतिहास का देखें तो हमें ज्ञात होता है कि युद्ध और शांति की समस्या सदा मानव जीवन में और मानव इतिहास में प्रधान रही है। इस का कारण यह है कि निसर्ग ने मनुष्य को अन्य जीवों की अपेक्षा एक भिन्न ढंग में गढ़ा है। अन्य जीवों के लिए जीवन में तीन चीजें प्रधान रहती हैं : आहार, निद्रा और मैथुन। परन्तु मनुष्य में, पशुत्व होते हुए भी, इन तीन बातों का जीवन से सम्बन्ध रहते हुए भी, पशुत्व के साथ देवत्व भी होता है। और उस देवत्व के कारण वह इन तीन चीजों के

परे की बातें भी सोचा करता है। सदा सोचता रहा है, आज भी सोचता है और सदा सोचता रहेगा। फिर इन तीन बातों के परे जो कुछ बह सोचता है, उस विचार को कार्य रूप में भी परिणत करता है। अतः यद्यपि जीवन संघर्ष, स्ट्रगल फार एग्जिस्टेंस, मानव जीवन में रहा है तथापि धीरे धीरे जैसे जैसे मनुष्य अधिक सम्य, अधिक सुसंस्कृत बनता गया, वैसे वैसे जीवन संघर्ष, स्ट्रगल फार एग्जिस्टेंस के सिद्धांत उस के लिए गौण होते गए और उस के परे की बातें प्रधान होती गई।

इस बात को जब मैं कहता हूँ तो मानव का सारा इतिहास, इतिहास का एक छोटा सा विद्यार्थी होने के कारण, मेरे सामने आ जाता है। पहले मनुष्य मनुष्य को खा जाता था, आज यह भ्रवस्था नहीं है। फिर एक समय आया जब युद्ध एक कर्तव्य माना जाता था। हमारे यहाँ पर जहाँ चार वर्णों के कर्तव्यों का वर्णन है, वहाँ क्षत्री वर्ण के कर्तव्यों के सम्बन्ध में कहा गया है शीत ऋतु में क्षत्री को, राजा को, युद्ध करना चाहिए युद्ध उस का एक कर्तव्य था। पर धीरे धीरे हम देखते हैं कि युद्ध अन्धरी चीज न मानकर बुरी चीज माना जाने लगा। यदि इस जमाने में कोई युद्ध करता है तो युद्ध करते समय बीस बहाने देता है। युद्ध करना बुरी चीज है, युद्ध हम नहीं करना चाहते थे, मानवों के संहार से हम विरत रहना चाहते थे, रक्त प्रवाह हम इष्ट नहीं मानते, इतने पर भी विवश हो कर हम को युद्ध करना पड़ा। आगे के मानव इतिहास में देखिए, यह बातें नहीं कही जाती थी, धीरे धीरे युद्ध को बुरा माना जाने लगा और यह बातें कही जाने लगी।

नाशकारी आयुधों के अधिकाधिक होना पर भी मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि एक और यदि नाशकारी आयुध बनते जाते हैं, तो दूसरी ओर जहाँ तक चिन्तन का सम्बन्ध है, जहाँ तक मानव के मानस का सम्बन्ध है, वह शांति की

ओर बढ़ रहा है, वह युद्ध को भार नहीं बढ़ रहा है। कदा जाना है कि युद्ध मना में होना रहा है, मदा होता रहेगा। पर मैं तो यह मानता हूँ कि ज. चीन मश में होता रहा है, वह सदा होता नहीं रहना, और यदि युद्ध सदा होने वाला है तो फिर हमें आशावादी के स्थान पर निराशावादी हो जाना चाहिए। जब पहले पहल बारूद इजाद हुई थी, पहला विस्फोटक पदार्थ बना था, तब किसी ने यह नहीं सोचा था कि आगे चल कर यह विस्फोटक पदार्थ अणुबम और उद्जन बम का रूप ले लेगा। आज अणुबम और उद्जन बम के आविष्कार होने के बाद हमको यह भी मानना पड़ेगा कि एक ऐसा समय भी आ सकता है जब कोई ऐसा बम बन जाये कि जा हमारे इस भूमंडल, हमारे इस प्लेनेट, के ही टुकड़े टुकड़े कर डाले। तो या तो आप इस बात को मानिये कि एक न एक दिन, आज, कल या परसों, युद्ध बन्द होने वाला है, या फिर आप यह मानिये, निराशावादी हों जाइये, कि युद्ध बन्द होने वाला नहीं है और एक दिन ऐसा आने वाला है जब एक न एक बम ऐसा निकलेगा जिससे हमारे भूमंडल के ही टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायेंगे।

कहा यह जाता है कि मनुष्य में देवत्व और पशुत्व दोनों हैं, इसलिए संघर्ष सदा रहने वाला है। मेरा इस सम्बन्ध में यह निवेदन है कि मनुष्य में पशुत्व रहने के कारण एक व्यक्ति से दूसरे व्यक्ति का संघर्ष रह सकता है। एक आदमी से दूसरे आदमी का झगड़ा हो सकता है, मारकाट भी हो सकती है, हत्या भी हो सकती है, परन्तु मेरा यह मानना है कि यह संघर्ष व्यक्तिगत रूप में रहेगा, यह संघर्ष सामूहिक रूप में रहने वाला नहीं है। आज आप देखें, जो सेनायें युद्ध करती हैं वे सेनायें एक दूसरे की शत्रु नहीं होती। उन सेनाओं के सैनिक एक दूसरे के शत्रु नहीं होते। उन्होंने तो एक दूसरे को देखा भी नहीं रखा। तो मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि मानव में

[सेड गोविन्द दास]

पशुत्व के कारण उसका व्यक्तिगत संघर्ष रह सकता है, किन्तु इस सामूहिक संघर्ष का अन्त होना ही चाहिये ।

जब मैं पांच वर्ष पहले इस संसार के प्रायः सभी देशों को देखकर आया तो मैंने यह कहा था कि मेरी यह मान्यता है कि जिस प्रकार की लड़ाई १९१४ में हुई या १९३९ में हुई वैसी संसार व्यापी लड़ाई अब होने वाली नहीं है । उस समय जब मैंने यह बात कही तो अनेक लोगों को आश्चर्य हुआ था । पर अब अनेक लोग इस बात को मानने लगे हैं कि उस प्रकार की संसार व्यापी लड़ाई नहीं हो सकती । कोरिया का जिस प्रकार का युद्ध हुआ या स्वेज कैनल पर जिस प्रकार का युद्ध हुआ इस प्रकार के छोटे मोटे युद्ध अभी कुछ समय तक आगे भी शायद हों, पर अन्त में व्यक्तिगत संघर्ष ही रह सकते हैं सामूहिक नहीं, साथ ही आगे १९१९ या १९३९ के सदृश संसार व्यापी युद्ध तो होने वाला है ही नहीं । और जब आज की इस पृष्ठ भूमि में युद्ध और शान्ति की बात देखी जाती है, तब अमेरिका और रूस देश तथा राष्ट्र संघ हमारे सामने आ जाते हैं । सबसे पहला यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रयत्न लीग ऑफ नेशन्स की स्थापना के समय हुआ था । हम देखें लीग ऑफ नेशन्स और यू० एन० ओ० में कितना अन्तर हो गया है । लीग ऑफ नेशन्स की स्थापना अमेरिका ने की थी, अमेरिका के उस समय के राष्ट्रपति विलसन ने उसे स्थापित किया था । परन्तु लीग ऑफ नेशन्स की स्थापना अमेरिका की ओर से होते हुए भी अमेरिका उस संघ में सम्मिलित नहीं हुआ था । इसीलिए लीग ऑफ नेशन्स बहुत कमजोर संस्था रही । राष्ट्र संघ उससे कहीं अधिक मजबूत है, और मैं तो इस बात का मानने वाला हूँ कि धीरे धीरे वह समय आने वाला है जब राष्ट्र संघ ही आगे चल कर संसार की एक हुकूमत बनाने में सफल हो सकेगा, और संसार की एक हुकूमत,

संसार का एक शासन, होने पर ही इस संसार में सच्ची शांति स्थापित हो सकेगी ।

अभी श्री डांगे साहब ने एक बात कही । मैं उस बात का समर्थन करता हूँ कि वैज्ञानिक आविष्कारों का अर्थ युद्ध नहीं है । हम उन वैज्ञानिक आविष्कारों का किस प्रकार उपयोग करते हैं यह हमारी मनोवृत्ति पर निर्भर है । आगे चल कर यह आविष्कार हमें निर्माण में सहायता देने वाले हैं । मेरा यह मत है कि इन वैज्ञानिक आविष्कारों का उपयोग हमें नाश के काम में न कर निर्माण के काम में करना चाहिए । मैं बड़ा आशावादी हूँ, इसलिए अभी जो उपग्रह छोड़े गये हैं यह मानता हूँ कि इन उपग्रहों का आगे चल कर यह नतीजा निकल सकता है कि हम दूसरे ग्रहों में पहुँचें । और इस अवस्था में पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार ही हम चल सकते हैं । डांगे साहब ने जो को-एग्जिस्टेंस की बात कही और जो उन्होंने यह कहा कि यह मार्क्सवाद या रूस की देन है, मैं उस से सहमत नहीं हूँ । को-एग्जिस्टेंस शब्द कहा से आया इस पर मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता । परन्तु जहाँ तक को-एग्जिस्टेंस की भावना का सम्बन्ध है मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि को-एग्जिस्टेंस की भावना का यदि बे पता लगाना चाहते हैं तो वे हमारी सस्कृति के पुराने इतिहास को देखें । उन्हें पता लगेगा कि को-एग्जिस्टेंस की भावना हमारी सस्कृति में सब में पहले आयी और उसके बाद वह संसार में फैली है ।

उन्होंने अफ्रीका के सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ बातें कही । मैंने उनको टोका भी था कि इंडियन नेशनल कांग्रेस के प्रस्ताव आज के १२ या १३ वर्ष पहले इस सम्बन्ध में पास हो चुके हैं जिनमें स्पष्ट कहा गया है कि वहाँ के भारतीयों को केवल अपने हक के लिए नहीं लड़ना चाहिए, वरन् वहाँ के निवासियों की ओर अपने हक की इकट्ठी लड़ाई उन्हें लड़ना चाहिए ।

अब समय आ गया है कि अणु बमों और उद्बलन बमों का प्रयोग बन्द हो। मैं रूस को इस बात के लिए बधाई देता हूँ कि उसने इस बात को स्वीकार किया है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि अमरीका भी इसको स्वीकार करेगा और हम बिना किसी शर्त के इतका प्रयोग बन्द कर सकेंगे।

गोआ और काश्मीर की बातें जो भारत से सम्बन्ध रखती हैं उनके विषय में भी यहां कुछ कहा गया है। काश्मीर के लिए ग्राहम साहब फिर आते हैं। उन्हें हम यहां पर कोई कष्ट न होने देंगे इसलिए कि वे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की ओर से आ रहे हैं। पर हम एक बात और भी जानते हैं कि यदि वे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की ओर से न आते तो इस देश में साइमन कमीशन का जिस प्रकार बहिष्कार हुआ उसी प्रकार सर्वमत से उनका भी बहिष्कार होने वाला था। लेकिन हम इस तरह की कोई बात नहीं करना चाहते पर साथ ही हम यह भी मानते हैं कि काश्मीर के प्रश्न का अन्तिम निर्णय हो गया है। जहां तक गोआ का प्रश्न है वह आज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परमो भारत का अविभाज्य अंग होने के कारण हममें सम्मिलित होने वाला है।

मैं सदा से हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ। महात्मा गांधी ने जिन सिद्धान्तों को हमारे सामने रखा है और जो सिद्धान्त भारतीय संस्कृति के सबसे पुराने सिद्धान्त हैं उन्हीं के अनुसार वह चलती है। इसी कारण मैं उसका सबसे बड़ा समर्थक रहा हूँ और आज भी उसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

Mr. Chairman: Shri Asoka Mehta.

Shri Nath Pai: May I request that on behalf of our party both of us would like to speak and we may be called after 2.30?

Mr. Chairman: All right. Shri Bharucha.

Shri Nagsbir Bharucha: Mr. Chairman, I desire to confine myself only to the question of Goa and the ineffectiveness of the Government's policy in this connection.

Sir, we are all aware that the Government has prescribed certain restrictions in its approach to the problem of Goa. First, the Government has laid down that there will be no use of force. Secondly, the Government has laid down that the liberation of Portuguese enclaves is a matter for the Goan nationals themselves. Thirdly, the Government have said that the Government will not permit Indian nationals to be associated with any activities in connection with Goa.

Of course, the Government of India have expressed their sympathy. Not only have they expressed their sympathy, but, time and again, our Ministers have said that Goa and other Portuguese enclaves are part and parcel of this country. It is obvious to my mind that the Government have got no plan; and the purpose of my speech here today is to disclose a plan which will achieve the purpose that India has got at heart within a couple of years without infringing any of the limitations which the Government have laid down. The basic idea would be that we must strike a completely new direction in tackling the problem of Goa.

My suggestion is this. Dadra and Nager Haveli, the two liberated enclaves should be created into a sovereign State. The House is aware that it is accepted by many theorists that in order to constitute a sovereign State, we must have territory population, Government and sovereignty. All these attributes of new sovereign State are possessed by these two enclaves. If the Government were to recognise such a State as a sovereign State, leaving to this State the responsibility of organising campaigns to liberate the Portuguese enclaves, the thing could be done.

[Shri Naushir Bharucha].

I may outline in some detail how it could be done. It might seem ridiculous that such a sovereign State of such a small territory could be created. But, in the international law, the size of a sovereign State does not matter at all. Once such a sovereign State is created, it should be possible for such a State to promulgate certain decrees.

These decrees could lay down that all territories of Goa, Diu and Daman belong to it and also that all Goans would automatically become citizens of this new sovereign State. Goan nationals wherever they happen to be on the soil of India shall owe allegiance to this State and shall pay tax. Non-allegiance or failure to pay tax might become an extraditable offence.

Where does the Government of India come in? In this manner, as between two high contracting parties, the Union Government recognises the new State and enters into a treaty with it. In that case, the treaty can provide extradition of certain Goan nationals with regard to this new State of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and permit Indian nationals to relinquish their Indian nationality and assume the nationality of the new State. The Government of India can also lease certain portions of its territory round about Goa to enable Nagar Haveli to organise its campaign against Goa from such a point.

In international law the Government of India cannot be blamed because the entire campaign would be the responsibility of a new sovereign State. The Government's limitations that Indian nationals should not participate are also fulfilled. If Indian nationals can relinquish their nationality, and there are tens of thousands of them prepared to assume the nationality of the new sovereign State, it can organise a liberation campaign with their help.

It may sound something unusual. I can assure the House that from the

international law point of view, the plan is absolutely sound and it is capable of releasing Goa—a thing which the Government of India in its present position cannot do within any foreseeable future.

It may be urged against this plan that probably India would be accused of aggression against Portugal in international field. When India makes the claim that Goa is part of Indian territory, that itself is sufficient aggression against Portugal. Let us, therefore, not be afraid of new ideas. I am prepared to stand down if the Government of India can produce a better plan than this one.

The second point which arises from this is that in the World Court where this matter has gone already, four preliminary objections have been decided against us and two are going to be decided after hearing the merits of the case. I am not quite sure that our preliminary objections have been exhausted. I would appeal to the Government of India to instruct the lawyers in the World Court to consider the desirability of raising further preliminary objections. The point is this. What is the status of Dadra and Nagar Haveli in international law?

Even assuming that the Government of India does not recognise Dadra and Nagar Haveli as a sovereign State, my submission is that it is, in fact a sovereign State. It has neither the status of an insurgent or belligerent because for three long years, Dadra and Nagar Haveli have managed their administration and have successfully broken themselves off from the parent State. Therefore, the additional issue might be examined by the World Court whether India can be forced to give the right of way to Portuguese troops to cross its soil and attack what virtually is a friendly sovereign State.

I am only focussing attention on this because I find that the question of Goa bears no promise of solution

even if we were to wait for a thousand years. Let the Government say that they have got better plans, in which case I stand down. Otherwise I urge that they consider and pay attention to the plan that I have outlined.

Shri Anthony Pillai (Madras North): We have listened very carefully to the statement made by the Prime Minister, but unfortunately the statement does not indicate to what extent there is a reappraisal of the world situation since this House debated this question last time. Vast and significant changes have taken place in the world situation, but unfortunately the statement does not bear them out.

First and foremost, Russia announced the invention of the I.C.B.M. She has confirmed it dramatically by launching two satellites into outer space. This has completely shattered the old balance of power and the NATO and the other pacts like the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO Pact which formed a military *cordon-sanitaire* around Russia. This military *cordon-sanitaire* has been shattered, and no longer can Mr. Dulles indulge in brinkmanship. Nuclear war can no longer be fought by the USA, allowing the allies to bear its brunt; it has come to the doorstep of the U.S.A. It is a very important change in the military situation of the world. I do not think there has been adequate appraisal of it.

Secondly, various hopes were held out that even within the Soviet bloc there were tendencies towards democratisation after Stalin's death. The theory of collective leadership was trotted out. The cult of personality was run down. But this collective leadership has faded out during the last two years like the cheshire cat leaving behind the enigmatic and self-assured smile of Mr. Khrushchev. Similarly, various hopes were held out that there would be democratic tendencies in other parts of the Soviet bloc. Emphasis was placed by the Chinese communist leader on the

slogan. "Let a hundred flowers boom, and a hundred schools of thought contend." But even a single poppy which tended to show its head taller than the others has been slashed down. Instead, we see, far from democratisation a new stalinist dictatorship coming back into power. What this portends to the world in general and to India in particular, we can make only a hypothesis.

A year and a half ago, even the old Cominform was dissolved. There are tendencies for reviving it. Very recently, the mundane, territorial satellites—Sputniks—met in Moscow. And, these Sputniks, these fellow-travellers of the Moscow Bloc have passed a resolution to the effect that they will not form immediately into a Comintern, but they will meet from time to time to co-ordinate their policy.

There has been a slight change in the emphasis of the policies that have been laid down. No longer is it to be one of peaceful co-existence, it is to be one of sharp rivalry of economic systems. A popular front is to be formed and a peace offensive is to be launched by all the various Communist parties. Thirdly, Sir, despite the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East, Russia has now become an important power in the Middle East. Jordan has now become tied firmly to the chariot wheel of the United States and, on the other hand, Syria, Yemen and Egypt have also become tied to the war chariot of the Soviet Camp. The Middle East has become the cockpit of a potential new war.

In the analysis of Shri Nehru, in the speech that he made today, basically what he says is this, that there is a war psychosis, that the world is filled with fear, hysteria and hatred. And, what does our psychotherapist want to do with it? Our psychotherapist would indulge in a little more platitudes, a little greater frequency of syrupy words, and that is all that he has to offer.

[Shri Anthony Pillai]

We are continuing to indulge in a parlour game in the United Nations as to whether we should abstain from the vote or whether we should vote, whether it should be a 32-man disarmament commission or a 25-man disarmament commission, as though the whole problem of war and peace would be settled on the question as to whether it should be a 25-man commission or a 32-man commission.

I believe that all that our foreign policy amounts to is a very timid, a very tame rehash of what Norman Angel called "The Great Illusion." But that analysis is only a surface analysis. There is no attempt to go deeper and find out why there should be a war psychosis. I do not think there is any intelligent man today who does not accept the proposition that war may mean total annihilation not merely of the human species but all other species on this earth of ours. But, then, the question arises, how and why should there be a war psychosis in spite of the fact that there is universal acceptance of this obvious truth?

Sir, many of these regimes depend for their existence on a war psychosis. Let me put it on a different plan. Now, the Pakistan regime, in my opinion, cannot exist without creating a war fever. If there had been no Kashmir problem, probably it would have to invent one. The same applies also to these great blocs. On the shoulders of the workers and peasants in Russia a monstrous bureaucracy has arisen, and this bureaucracy cannot exist for one day without a war psychosis being created, without continuously telling the people that there is a possibility of war and their being subjugated.

Today, in my opinion, the biggest counter revolutionary force that exists in the world is this monstrous bureaucracy in Russia. In 1945 the people of Warsaw rose up in arms against Hitler to welcome the Red

Army. After the events that have happened throughout Eastern Europe, I do not think there is any working class anywhere in the world which would welcome the Red Army.

Shri Dange was so pleased to state that the ICBM in Russian hands has a different character; in other words, that the ICBM in Russian hands is a peaceful force according to him. But, Sir, if the Hungarian people, if the Polish people have not been able to get out of the Russian grip, it is precisely because of the fear that any kind of serious resurgence may mean world nuclear war. Let me remind him that, for the balancing of forces, Yugoslavia might also have gone the way of Hungary

Similarly, America too today is merely seeking to fill the vacuum which other Imperialists have abandoned. She too needs a war psychosis to enable her to drag in other under developed countries behind her imperialist chariot, and to keep at bay the forces of socialism and Asian and African nationalism

Today, by a conjuncture of circumstances India finds itself as the keeper of the conscience of the world. Is this Government today exploiting this wonderful opportunity that is conferred on it? A few days ago Shri Nehru in this House said that over a long period of time he has conditioned himself to see only the good in others. By that self-same process he has also self-induced a blind spot, a kind of myopia with regard to world affairs. He is unable to see reality as a whole. I do not say that we should not see the good in others, but it is also desirable to see the reality as a whole, so as to take note of the selfish self-interestendness of Imperialism on the one side, and Soviet bureaucracy on the other.

Unfortunately, though we seek today to follow a neutralist path we seek to play this neutralist role by

trying to move between the various authorities in power. We do not seek to mobilise behind us the force of the people who are being oppressed by our self-same powers. Instead of playing this parlour game, as I said, in the United Nations, a real genuine neutralist policy which can bring about real world peace should be adopted, where we not only try to be the arbiter mediator or umpire between two powers, but we also go deeper and expose the fact that war psychosis is the creation of bureaucracy on one side and imperialism on the other. Unless we do this, there is no possibility of the war psychosis ever being removed.

In playing this neutralist role, unfortunately, to some extent our hands are tied. In the Kashmir question to some extent we are beholden to Russia for the veto. With regard to Kashmir, there is indeed a great deal of reticence in the country, and only a few courageous souls are able to speak up their minds. I am glad to note that there is a shift in policy, such that some of the repressive measures which have been taken in Kashmir are to be relaxed. It is now time that in Kashmir we removed some of these transitional provisions in the Constitution so that fundamental rights may be fully enjoyed by the people of Kashmir, and so that we need not have a half-hearted case before the world.

Again, with regard to our friendship with various other countries, we profess friendship for everyone. But unfortunately, Sir, I note that our friendship is a little too Platonic. It does not lead to any issue. In regard to Ceylon, we have a Delhi pact under which it was assured that the problem of our former nationals would be settled; though a promise was given several years ago that with regard to Indian nationals who had acquired Ceylon citizenship, there would be the creation of some moved constituencies or colleges for the election of four members to the House

of Representatives, our Platonic friendship over all these years has not led to the solution of this problem, or the implementation of the assurances given by the Ceylon Government.

Similarly too, in the world, we try to play the role of a mediator even when those issues intimately affect us. In many of these questions in which vital interests are at stake, it is useless to take such a course. At least history has shown that it is useless merely to talk pleasantly or talk politely. It has shown that unless and until some crisis is created friendly negotiations on vital interests are fruitless. The Indonesian people and the people of Algeria have also shown that way, and shown to us that unless and until a crisis is created nothing ever gets resolved.

Similarly, with regard to the question of Goa a crisis must be created. Unless and until crises are created, none of these vital interests will be safeguarded, and we will never be in a position to secure the liberation of the Goanese people.

Lastly, I would like to refer to the fact that the throwing up of the two satellites into outer space has at least awakened the peoples of the world with regard to the significance of the Russian revolution. Today, with a planned economy, despite its bureaucracy, Russia is creating—an industrial and scientific revolution. But, unfortunately, this 'bleep, bleep' in outer space, while it has awakened other people, seems to have lulled us into a lethargy. In the world elsewhere, it is recognised that the foundations for the new technological and scientific revolution is the system of education that Russia has been able to adopt. But here, we are stultified by our own language controversies and we are not aware that our standards of education have deteriorated considerably.

In a larger sense, the question of democracy is, and will really be, decided on the Asian arena. We are

[Shri Anthony Pillai]

really in competition with China. As to whether the democratic way of life can survive will depend not on pious words but on production indices, and as to whether we are laying the foundations of our democracy in the way that we will be able to meet the challenge, is still in doubt.

Unless and until we adopt, not a pious or platitudinous attitude but a more realistic attitude towards world events to mobilise on a world scale a third force the force of the international working class and the exploited peoples of the world there can be no real solution to the problem of attaining world peace.

Shri Barman (Cooch Behar-Reserved-Sch. Castes): Mr. Chairman, the subject of discussion before this House is an important one. The subject is the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto. Everyone knows that the international situation today is very grave. At the moment, the world is standing on the edge of a precipice and any moment, a third world war may start, and if it starts, it will mean the devastation of the present civilisation and the devastation of mankind. At such a moment, what part can India play so far as the international situation is concerned? That, to my mind, is the subject of discussion before this House.

Since the atomic age came and the last world war ended by the use of atomic weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world has far advanced today in the development of new weapons of destruction. There is now the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb and the inter-continental ballistic missiles, which are known to us. We do not know what other weapons have been developed by the opposing groups by this time which are not known to us. Therefore, it is a very critical moment that this world faces today.

The two blocs, the Communist bloc and the Anglo-American bloc or the capitalist bloc, are opposing each other in mistrust. Each one is trying to develop its own power and to gain supremacy, but none is yet certain whether one can devastate the other before the aggressor itself is devastated. I think that is the only reason why war is not starting yet.

At the same time, everyone knows that if war starts, both will be equally affected. At such a time, India, so far as military power is concerned, does not count. So, what part can she play? India, as you know, is pursuing two policies in this regard. One policy is the policy of non-involvement, because she does not believe in destroying each other.

14-37 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

India knows that if this sort of mad race for fight and war preparations goes on, some day war will start and then not only the warring groups—the two groups—will be destroyed but it will affect other powers also who are not directly involved in war. So, not only in the interests of any policy which is only for the good of others but also from the point of view of our own self-interest, India's duty is to see, that so far as it lies in her power, peace between nations should be brought into being. That is the constructive policy which India is pursuing so far as it lies within her power.

Now, some may say, what effect can India bring in the international situation, being herself a power not militarily great. But we have seen that in several conflicts amongst countries, as between two opposing blocs, India has been called upon to undertake tasks of a neutral power. In the Korean war and in the Viet Nam contests also, and recently in the Middle East as well, the Indian army was accepted by both the groups to

do certain jobs of neutrals. This only goes to prove that India's foreign policy has succeeded at least in this respect, namely, both the opposing groups, though they entertain mistrust against each other, confide in India in that India is strictly following a neutral policy and the policy of peace. To that extent, India is doing her best and let us hope that with the confidence of both the opposing groups, India will succeed at last in bringing friendship and amity between these two opposing groups. This is the only part that India can play and India is playing her part fully well. Recently even in the West Irian contest, the Dutch have confided in India and asked India to mediate. That is another proof of India's policy being realised by the whole world.

I think only yesterday India's policy of Panchsheel in a way has been accepted by the United Nations. A resolution sponsored by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia has been accepted by the United Nations Organisation. I also find from the P.T.I. newspaper reports that on December 14 when the political committee of the United Nations were discussing about the subject of peaceful co-existence, which is the main principle of our Panchsheel, Mr. Jawad opined that now the world has five world capitals and among these five world capitals, Delhi has been named as one. From this we can infer that though militarily India does not count in the contest of the two powerful blocs, India's policy of peace and her peace mission have been recognised even by the political committee of the U.N.O. I think that whether India's policy succeeds in the long run or not, it is a policy that is being recognised by the world powers and if the world powers try to realise that is only by peaceful co-existence that they themselves can prosper and develop, then certainly we can say that India's policy has succeeded a great deal.

The two opposing groups are having mistrust of each other, because otherwise they would have themselves

tried to come to a peaceful settlement. But one does not believe in the other. What is the root cause? The root cause is the two opposing ideals of capitalism and communism. The root cause of the ills today is that there is a large part of the humanity that are under-developed in economic, social and political spheres. That is the main cause which troubles the world today. If both the groups understand that instead of engaging themselves in this arms race of which no one is certain about its own success, they follow a policy of economic re-construction of the world, then I think this mistrust will gradually go. But until and unless the world is regenerated, and levelled up, until not one country or the other, but all the countries of the world, not one class or the other, but each and every individual has developed economically, the root cause will not go until then. But that is a subject on which I do not consider myself competent to say much.

But my impression is that one country is apprehensive of the domination of the other, because none feels itself safe within its own limits. Otherwise, this armament race which has created this present critical international situation should not and could not be the ideal of any one group, because in the case of war, both will be equally affected by it.

Anyhow, so far as India's policy regarding the international situation is concerned, I hope and trust that this policy of peace which has been started by India—and is playing her part in the international situation—will succeed and the nations will come to their sense. I whole-heartedly support the policy of India in this international situation.

Shri Dinesh Singh (Banda): Sir, we are grateful to the Prime Minister for his assessment of the international situation and I should like him to know that we all stand united behind him in his efforts of peace, in his efforts to create areas of non-involvement and in his efforts of lessening of

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

tension. In this direction, I should like to make a few suggestions.

I should like to draw the attention of this House and of the Government towards Africa. Dr. Darge has already referred to Africa, but I would like to refer to it in a different way. As the House is aware, in Africa, many new and independent nations are coming up. There are many other nations that are striving to become independent. At the same time, in Africa there are millions of people living under subjugation, under colonial domination, under racial domination, economic domination and other forms of political influences. Africa is a big continent. It is a new continent in the way of politics and it is not unlikely that the cold-war and other intrigues which are taking place in the other parts of the world will be extended to Africa. We know that these people are very anxious to preserve their freedom. They are very anxious to keep out of involvements, of pacts and to pursue a life of peaceful development.

It is, therefore, natural that they should look to friends who would offer them a helping hand, who would advise them in a friendly way, without trying to further their own ends. In this direction, India, which has fought foreign domination at home and which has always championed the cause of the dominated people, is their natural choice. They want to be friends with us; they want our help. We should give it to them in every possible way. We should send them people who would mix with them, who would study their problems, who would advise them and help them in their tasks of reconstruction. We have diplomatic missions there; we have other commissions there. We should try to staff these commissions and diplomatic missions not with the bureaucrats which we have here, but with people who would want to help them, who should not treat these missions as

clerical outposts of the Ministry of External Affairs, but we should make these missions as friendly homes of the country in which they are situated, where people can go and meet them, where they can go and meet people, understand them and help them. In selecting the personnel that we send there, we should bear in mind that we want people to serve there; we want people to help there. We do not want people there to go to office at 9 o'clock and come back at 5 o'clock. It is very important matter, if I may say so, and I should like to emphasise this question, because we have great interest there, interest as a friend, interest as we have a large number of people of Indian origin who have made Africa their home. We naturally have sympathy with them. Then, we have another interest, a very important interest. And that is, if we are able to help these people, if we are able to help them to maintain their independence, both economic and political, then, we would have extended the area of non-involvement, we would have extended the area of peace over a very large part of the world. These people understand our point of view better because they have had a common background, they have been dominated by foreign powers and they have known the humiliation of domination. These people can appreciate the lofty ideals of Panchsheel much more than the people in Europe, who are tied up in pacts, who are tied up in economic arrangements. Some of them so tied up that they have even ceased to think independently. It is therefore important that we should try to help these people. We should try to help them to remain independent and to remain progressive build up their country in the way best suited to them.

When I had the occasion to speak in this House last time, I had mentioned that our foreign, defence and economic policy should be an integrated one. I was very happy to hear

from the Prime Minister today that he felt that international affairs are intimately connected with defence. I should like to submit we should also integrate the economic policy in the same way that we are thinking of the defence policy.

Again, if I might draw the attention of the House to the two delegations which recently went abroad to seek economic assistance, one delegation was an official one led by our Finance Minister. As Members are aware, this delegation was not able to get much help, such assistance, as we had expected. There was another delegation, a delegation of industrialists, which went abroad, practically to the same countries to seek economic assistance. This delegation seems to have come back with all sorts of hopes of assistance, of collaboration and even, I believe, of some loan. It is interesting that we have two delegations going practically to the same countries, but coming back with different results. It is quite obvious to my mind that these western countries are willing to help us in the private sector, are willing to help the capitalists in this country for their programmes but are not willing so much to help the Government in the public sector, to help us in our policy and programme of socialisation. I mention this in the foreign affairs debate because it is a problem which is connected with our foreign policy. We have here our economic policy which is based on certain amount of loans, on a certain amount of aid and assistance from these countries. But, these countries are not willing to give us this assistance in the same way we want or to the amount we want. It is very important. If we are going to retain independent foreign policy which our Prime Minister has so ably conducted uptill now and which we hope he will continue, it is necessary that we should not be completely dependent on foreign countries for our economic existence or well being. We may accept loans and help from them. Certainly we want help from all the

countries which can give us and the more we get, the better. But we should not be completely dependent. It can only be done if we integrate these policies, foreign policy, economic policy and the defence policy.

We have been talking about the banning of nuclear tests. It is a very necessary thing. As the Prime Minister, has himself mentioned in the House, the very existence of the human race is threatened by these tests. We should also consider what are the difficulties in the banning of the tests. We have received replies from the great countries which possess these weapons. One country is willing to abandon these tests unconditionally, that is to say, if the other country also abandons. The other country is not willing to do so unless there is a general settlement on disarmament. I feel that we should try to press this point more in the Disarmament Committee. The main difficulty I believe is that the U.S.A. feels that the Soviet military power is much greater. The U.S.A. has based its defence and its military policy on the use of these atomic weapons and they feel that they cannot suddenly abandon them. We should, therefore, try to see whether we can bring about any lessening of tension and try to remove their fears and at the same time press that these tests be abandoned.

I do not wish to take the time of the House any more. I should like to say once again in the end that we whole-heartedly support the foreign policy of the Prime Minister of India.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, the man-made moon that is now hurtling around this planet has shown the tremendous advance the human intellect has made and also indicated the vast possibilities of even richer and greater triumphs and conquests that are within man's reach. But, Sir,

[Shri Nath Pai]

his mind remains, so far as its primal urges are concerned, at the same stage as that of his early ancestor who was terror struck when he first beheld the eclipses of the Sun and the Moon, tormented and dominated by fear, suspicion and fierce hatred.

In his letter to Marshal Bulganin and President Eisenhower, the Prime Minister has referred to the terror that is enveloping the world and darkening our minds and our future too. One is reminded of the words of the poet—they were never more true—when we listened to this succinct summary of the “position, the mental agony through which mankind is passing; all of us seem to be on the darkening plane, swept by confused alarm of struggle and plight, where ignorant armies clash by night”.

15 hrs.

But he has warned us, and it is true, that very often the foreign debates in this House take an academic turn. We often go on telling what other nations should do or should not do, often ignoring what we have got to do. He himself has further told us that such points as have been left by him the Opposition will be joining and then he would be dealing with them, and so we shall be failing in our duty and his expectations if we do not refer to some of these points.

Having owned his general background, I shall first begin at home, at home in more senses than one. I shall make a reference to Goa. People may think: why talk of such a small thing when the whole universe is going to crash? But remember we come from there, and when your house is on fire, you think of it first. It is in this spirit that I wish to say something regarding the problem of Goa.

Goa continues to bleed and suffer. Before our very eyes, before our

very nose; on the free soil of India, a small and minor European nation continues to hold more than half a million Indians in medieval tyranny, hurling a challenge to our national self-respect and even to our sovereignty. The glory and the might of Free India hardly avail the Goans who continue to suffer under the jack-boot of Portuguese militarism, under the yoke of Portuguese tyranny. All that we get from the Government is a platitude of a nature which hardly avails the Goans suffering there. It is said that the independence of India will never be complete unless Goa is liberated and integrated with the rest of India. How little it avails the Goans? It does not show what the Government is going to do to put an end to this suffering of the Goans on the soil of India.

It is true that there is a responsibility on the world too since we are pledged to solving this problem peacefully, and since, for more important, justice is on our side too, but we can hardly go on blaming the world for failing in its duty, because if the world has not done justice unto us it is primarily because, I beg to submit, the Government have never planned effort to awaken the conscience of the world to the agony of Goa. Rightly we have renounced the use of force. May we know, may the Goans know, may the nation at large know what peaceful seeps the Government is contemplating to bring about this integration and to put an end to this repression of our own brethren which is being carried on to our shame before our very eyes?

Having said this, I shall turn my attention to another problem which is quite of old, that of Kashmir. There are many aspects of it which I shall not be touching; I shall concentrate on one. We do not agree with the Government in every aspect of foreign policy. We have some differences, and we have the courage and the honesty of ventilating them but on the basic, cardinal principles

underlying the Kashmir policy, I should like to say that whosoever speaks for Kashmir for India outside this country speaks not for this Government or this party, but speaks the voice of four hundred million Indians.

I do similarly hold that there is nothing more desirable than friendship with Pakistan, and we believe that no price is too high to win that friendship. We should be ready to go to any extent to cultivate and win that friendship of Pakistan, but there are limits to that. I was suggesting this, that that friendship is desirable and we should go to any extent short of this. Pakistan must never make this mistake. Kashmir may be a convenient peg for Pakistani politicians to hang many an inconvenient problem on, but as far as we are concerned, it is the pivot round which revolves the delicate fabric of the secularity and unity of this nation. On this issue we cannot compromise, unless we want to compromise the basis of the democracy of this country. This we shall never tire of convincing the world too.

Having said this, I shall now turn to another problem, knowing the brief time at my disposal. I will be travelling west, to West Asia which concerns us again. We hope that those who advocated the theory and the policy, the approach and the attitude of filling a vacuum have realised the futility, the vacuity of that policy. There is no vacuum that needs to be filled because the throne from which Britain and France had to descend has been occupied by the triumphant nationalism of the Arab nation. A failure to come to terms, to realise this to make peace in that part of the world, really leads to conflict. But there is this failure of our Government in this. Rightly we have allied ourselves with the genuine aspirations and expectations of the Arabs, but there is one aspect of the conflict to which we have not addressed ourselves, that is the Arab-Israeli conflict. I do think that knowing the

good will that this country enjoys both among the Arabs and the Israelis, we ought to have taken our courage and honesty in hand and proposed the *modus vivendi* between the existence of Israel as a nation and the legitimate aspirations of the Arab nation. It requires, I submit, both honesty and courage and some sacrifice, but the time has come when this nation, if any, alone can also address itself to this problem and remove one more cause of tension in that unhappy part of the world.

But there is this aspect of the West Asian problem also that failure to recognise the claims and aspirations of Arab nationalism is likely to lead to conflict, may spark a conflict. It is equally true that those who really and seriously mean peace must take care to see that they do not try to fish in troubled waters. In concrete terms, this is what I submit.

The Big Powers can make a contribution perhaps by making proposals which I do not pretend are novel; they have been advocated. But here again, our Prime Minister and this Government can effectively undertake their advocacy. They are that the Big Powers concerned will guarantee the present territorial integrity of all the nations in that part of the world, will agree not to interfere in the internal affairs of these nations, and immediately put an embargo on the supply of arms to any nation. When these steps are taken, the chances of peace in that part may brighten. Apart from sympathising with and standing by Iran in her hour of trial—and in the case of Syria and Egypt also we did it and we are proud of it—I hope the Government will address itself to this other aspect.

Now I will turn to another point, since the whole debate is turning round the problem of peace or war in the world. Another troubled spot is Germany—the problem of Germany, German reunification. Very constructive proposals have come during

[Shri Nath Pail]

the past few weeks, some of them old. They were always advocated by Eric Ollenhauer, the leader of the German Socialist Democratic Party and Mr. Aneurin Bevan. I hope he will one day be the Foreign Minister of Britain, if it is not interfering in Britain's internal affairs. And now we find a well-known authority on this problem, Mr. Kennan also advocating it. The possibility that this may succeed is hinted at by the reception the proposal has been given by the Polish Foreign Minister and Eastern Europe in general. Those proposals will have to be something like this, if we are to express ourselves. Some people may ask: why do they go on advocating solutions to others? Simply because if anything goes wrong, in Germany as it did in that fatal June of 1933, it affects India, it affects us. These are trouble spots which do not concern the two nations only, but the entire world, and that is why in all humility we venture to make some submissions. It will be this, that free elections will have to be held in the whole of Germany. But the Germany which emerges as a result of these free elections will have to be wedded to neutrality. The prior stage, of course, will have to be that kind of disengagement in Europe, from both the zones, from both Eastern Germany and Western Germany, and perhaps, as the Polish friend had indicated, from Poland and Czechoslovakia in the initial stages. That has to be followed by free elections in both the zones. But that is not a great price for forging Germany's reunification and peace in the whole of Central Europe. That such reunited Germany is dedicated to neutrality or is bound to neutrality, that such a problem can be solved in this way is indicated by the successful solution which the then Allies—I do not know what they are now, but they are the Big Powers—found to the problem of Austria. I am not undertaking, during the short time before me to provide a solution to all the problems that are before

us. A simultaneous solution to all the problems that confront us is not possible, but we can perhaps undertake to solve them piece-meal, one by one, and in that lies a hope.

I shall now address myself to the main issue arising out of the letter written by the Prime Minister to Mr. Bulganin and President Eisenhower. I should at the beginning say once again that he has rendered a signal service to the cause of peace. That is an unusually fine piece of the earnestness of a nation reflected in a few words on a very vital issue. The response,—I am not presuming to pass judgment or sit in judgment on somebody else—has been on the whole encouraging, if we carefully go through the letter by Marshal Bulganin, which I must say is forthright and hopeful. But there is also considerable hope for rapprochement indicated in the letter of President Eisenhower. One naturally gets confused that here comes the reply to India's Prime Minister's earnest desire for peace, both saying, we want peace, but the next day, when we open the papers, what do we find? Four Ministries in the Soviet Union are integrated for Defence, for stepping up war production. And we find also that the Western Allies are conferring in Paris to build up their so-called security and defences. Then, we saw another news item emanating, I think, from the Tass saying that the Russian armed forces have been alerted. What is this? I think the real desires of these nations and these governments were perhaps reflected in their replies to the Prime Minister, but this big talk that 'We get ready because you get ready, we build here, because you build there' and so on is for their mutual consumption. To this otherwise dark cloud there is this silver lining that is reflected in their letters to the Prime Minister.

Here, I have got something to say: The past few years have proved the barrenness and futility of the policy of negotiations from positions of

strength. But if talking from positions of strength, based on capacity for massive and instantaneous retaliation at a point or points of our choice, is a futile policy, then talking from Sputniks with the glow of power and glory that it brings is not likely to lead to more constructive. If Marshal Bulganin, in reply to our Prime Minister's appeal had stated that the USSR was going to suspend all atomic explosions as from the 1st of January, it would have been the most coveted Christmas gift to an anxious world, and it would not only have been the best wishes for a new year but perhaps opened the dawn of a new era in international affairs.

In regard to this suspension of tests again there is something of hope in what Mr. Khrushchev has said; if he is fairly reported as indicated he has once again hinted at the possibility which has been previously exploited mainly through the good offices of this nation, that is, that if there are nations whose *bona fides* the Russian Government did not question, they can be entrusted with the task of exploring the possibility of putting an end not only to the explosions but more to the tricky and knotty problem of inspection.

In the past, this nation has performed such delicate tasks and has rendered some service to mankind. A very large part of the credit should go to the Prime Minister. Having criticised him frankly, we should be generous enough to give the credit where it is due, and my party has taught me to do it. Once again, perhaps, in the light of what is indicated by Mr. Khrushchev, there are some possibilities, of which, I am sure, the Prime Minister is aware, because I have very carefully studied his appeal letter, and he has made a reference to direct talks, though it is found towards the last para of his letter. This perhaps emerges from that talk of Mr. Khrushchev, that he has pointed out that it may be acceptable to the USSR if the delicate task of inspection is undertaken by a nation

like India. Today, in this line, perhaps, we can explore very humbly, but nonetheless the effort may be undertaken. We, Sweden and a few other nations enjoy, it seems the confidence of all concerned. Shall we not offer our services? I am not suggesting that we should go out of our way. But too much is at stake that we should stick to our seats and sit on considerations of prestige or say that we are not being asked. In the past, we have done so, and we have done so boldly and served mankind. Once again, perhaps, I think we shall be justified in offering humbly our services, but nonetheless we should offer the good offices of this country to a world whose only chance lies if we take up this courageous effort. Otherwise, I, for one, do not see a way out of this vicious circle where it is said, 'First suspend; then inspection. We do not accept inspection; so, there is no suspension' and so on. How are we to get out of this vicious circle? This is perhaps a way out.

In my concluding remarks, I would try to confine my attention to one very delicate aspect of how we can discharge this mission, which perhaps history and destiny have called upon this nation to discharge. Our non-alignment has stood the world in good stead in many a crisis. There is responsibility on the world also not to trifle with this non-alignment either by ridiculing it or by condemning it, because India today is the only 'erosive' force in the world which is tragically divided into two blocs. There are sections, I know, in this House which would like to put this nation into one bloc, and there are other elements which would like to put this nation in some other bloc. But in trying to do this, they are not serving either this nation or the wider cause of peace.

At this destiny-laden hour, however, we shall have to exercise the greatest restraint and balance, not only in what we say but in how we say it. I would like to say this that

[Shri Nath Pai]

no spokesman of India can afford to succumb either to hysterics or to indulge in histrionics. Too much is at stake. Ours is a mission for healing the wound. All that we have to offer is our honesty and our sincerity. How can we talk language that can give offence? The Prime Minister, I submit, should ensure that spokesmen of India exercise a restraint and balance and discretion, which is worthy of the traditions and which is worthy of the task they are called upon to discharge.

Finally, our actions and our words must not compromise that slender chance which there is still left for the world. We can play our part in this world once again, as we did in the past, to which I had referred in this House once before, during the crucial times, during the Korean war, during the Indonesian crisis, during the crisis in Indo-China and on many an occasion, provided we convince all concerned—and I emphasise the word all—of our basic sincerity, of our objectivity and of our impartiality, because if India's sincerity and India's impartiality become suspect, the whole future of peace is in jeopardy.

It is in this light that I submit that we continue to serve in this spirit of humility, and in that lies the hope not only of furthering our interests but those of the world, because our interests at this juncture of our history are not in conflict with those of the world at large.

Shrimati Bannka Ray: Through a decade of troublesome times in the world, India, after she has become free, has crystallised and shaped her foreign policy based on a new approach, yet one which is very ancient, which the first lieutenant of Mahatma Gandhi, the leader of this country, espoused some ten years ago. As I was listening to the debate and some of the speeches from the Opposition, I was very gratified to find that those who once had scoffed have now turned to praise. Shri

Nath Pai was very eloquent and most of what he has said—in fact all that he has said—is true. At the same time, I am glad that he has given recognition to the fact that it is a policy that has been consciously shaped and is now showing results

This morning, I was a little bit astounded—as perhaps most of the Members must have been—though not really surprised when Shri S. A. Dange was speaking. It came as a reminder perhaps of the fact that even today the two power blocs exist, and exist very forcibly; it is not one side alone; the other side is also equally vehement, equally non-compromising up to now, and the efforts of countries like India—and not India alone—however weak they may be in arms and armaments are necessary to help bring about that rapprochement and that understanding which is required, even though there may be differences of ideologies, differences of approaches, of races and every kind of outlook. In spite of these differences, there is a common basic understanding amongst men and women throughout the world. The Prime Minister has so lucidly brought out this morning,—and has mentioned so often—that amongst the peoples of the world, there is the greatest desire for peace, and even amongst their governments, while very often vested interests come into play, there is that acknowledgment that there is no other way out for the world but the way of peace, the way of understanding. The objective stand India has taken.

We heard this morning about co-existence from Mr. Dange, who seems to consider that this too is a part of foreign contribution which he refers to his own. Existed Co-existence is a very ancient thing, of times when India and China, two civilisations existed side by side and allowed each other to co-exist and drew much from each other, and yet there was never

any question of domination—ideological, colonial or any other kind of domination. That was the ancient past, and that is the stand of modern India today. It is not something that comes out of any new ideologies that have appeared in the 19th or 20th century. It is an ancient thing reiterated today. I have dwelt on this subject because it is known in the India of today that it is not something that we imitated from any other land but it is something inherent in our past. It is easier, therefore, for the masses of this country to understand and appreciate the foreign policy that India is following.

Now taking an objective stand, we have been placed in the greatest of difficulties on more occasions than one. Shri Nath Pal mentioned the position of India in regard to Goa. It is because we take an objective stand, because we do not want to swerve from the path of non-violence. It is because of this that we have to show so much patience, though there cannot be any two ways of looking it; there cannot be any question that what is part of India, even if it is under medieval rule today, cannot be taken away as something that is not a part of India. It must come to India. It may be that it will take time to make our approach felt. Similar is the policy with regard to Kashmir and many other questions which affect us very closely. Yet in every issue, we have taken this objective stand.

Now, does the world outside understand our foreign policy and its implications as the people of India do? It may be that we have placed our policy before the governments of other countries. It has come up time and again in the U.N. But I would humbly submit that not enough has been done to explain the foreign policy of India and her stand in those matters particularly amongst the people of other lands which affect us, on a day to day basis, which is required.

I want to substantiate what I said just now. Recently, I was in London.

I was very surprised to find that very little in fact is known in a proper manner even about the Kashmir issue there. Very little or nothing at all is known about the situation in East Pakistan, from where day after day come refugees in a one way traffic. In regard to the canal waters dispute, distortions have come to stay. Even people who have a fund of goodwill forwards India, complain of the fact that information is not supplied to them even when they would like to contradict some of the distortions and exaggerations that have been put forward by Pakistan. Sir, do you know that in every school almost, in large numbers of schools, in institutions and in colleges, Pakistan's case against India in beautifully illustrated booklets have been placed? But what of India's case? Those who support us also ask this question: why is it that you have not contradicted it? It may be that our High Commissioner in her speeches does contradict it effectively. It may be that our Ambassadors in Embassies do contradict it when they can. On the brief and rare occasions that our Prime Minister is in some other country, India's foreign policy is placed before the people of those lands. But what happens on the day to day basis? This is a very important matter which needs to be thoroughly looked into.

I want to lay special stress, as I did on the occasion of the last debate, on the question of this unending exodus from East Pakistan, about which the rest of the world knows so little or nothing at all. A few days back there were parliamentary delegations in India. Most of the members of those delegations who were representatives of their countries, obviously important representatives, never knew of this problem. They knew that when partition came, there was a refugee problem both for India and Pakistan, but they do not know why from the East Bengal region in Pakistan to the eastern region of India this exodus continues daily. They do not know, not only those persons, but

[Shrimati Renuka Roy]

in other countries they do not know even today, although it has been placed for the first time in some detail before the UNO during the discussion on the Kashmir issue but not as a separate item, by the leader of our delegation. People do not know that this thing is going on. They do not know that from her own funds and from the limited lands at her disposal, India has been rehabilitating and providing for 4 million persons, and there are 8 millions still in Pakistan. These people who may have to come away are not Hindus only but other non-Muslims as well. I know—I have personal experience of the fact—that those who come away are not only Hindus; the large bulk of them may be Hindus, but there are other non-Muslims, Christians and others. They all have to come away.

Why do they come? Pakistan may put forward the propaganda that India welcomes them. But those who have seen the conditions under which we have to provide for them cannot say such things. Today in our Second Five Year Plan of development, we have to face many difficulties because of lack of funds, and yet crores of rupees have been spent, and will have to be spent, for those persons who have come away because they are victims in a country where minorities cannot be tolerated. Surely, some kind of remedy must be found. Surely, this matter must be placed before the bar of world opinion in a proper and legitimate manner. Either the climate in Pakistan must change or India be given the land and resources for the resettlement of the members squeezed out—into India for resettlement.

But even in England, a country which has some idea of India, they do not know properly about this. There was one little pamphlet that reached the High Commissioner's office recently entitled "Unending Trail".

I do not know how many copies have

gone similarly to other Embassies. Much material has been supplied by the West Bengal Government and presumably the Ministry of Rehabilitation also, but, I do not know why the External Affairs Publicity has not utilised all that. I am saying that it has not been utilised in a proper way. I would request, in all humility, the Prime Minister who, I know, is busy with many things and has to undergo great strain, to look into it himself because, otherwise, this will not be done. This is a sad travesty of facts.

It has been pointed out to us that the contradictions that are sent in by our Press Attaches in the Embassies and High Commissions are not put in because of the newspaper combines. Contradictions as such may not come out. But, there are a large number of independent-minded authors, journalists and writers in other lands who, if they knew the facts and were convinced, would put them out themselves. Why have we not made sufficient approach to them? I would ask again, in all humility, that the actual facts, particularly of the exodus from East Pakistan should be placed before the people of other countries. Otherwise, how do we expect them to understand our viewpoint? We may be just in our approach; we may be right; but, if the right thing is not known and if contradictions and distortions are heard—and if we do not contradict them—how are the people of other countries to understand what we stand for? What are we doing in regard to these things which affect us?

There is no doubt that vested interest today will try to distort the truth. It is no doubt true that those who believe in Apartheid, those who believe in colonialism, or in ideological domination—whether they belong to one side or the other—do not always find the policy of India a convenient one. If we do not place our views before the people of other lands in a sufficiently forceful manner, how can we expect that they will understand

what we are doing in regard to those matters which affect us materially? Though we have taken an objective stand in all matters, even to our own detriment sometimes as in the case of so many disputes with Pakistan, it is not known outside, though it is known to Indians. It must be placed properly.

I have reiterated this point because I feel that not sufficient attention has been focussed on it and I feel that in every country there must be a proper effort to explain the standpoint of India, not only on the occasion of rare visits of foreign dignitaries or that of our Prime Minister to other countries, but throughout on a day to day basis. When false propaganda is going forward, it must be contradicted there and then. Truth may be on our side; but, let us not forget that a lie oft-repeated takes on the guise of truth. In the literate world of today, the magic of the printed word accounts for a great deal; and if we find so many things in print put forward against India and no contradiction, then, we cannot entirely blame the people of those countries if they do not understand our point of view.

We have stood for certain things which every right-thinking man and woman in any country must and will support. Today the Opposition in this country has understood our point of view. The policy of India would be understood and appreciated by the peoples of every land who are hungering for peace and tranquillity, who want that warfare especially modern nuclear warfare and even experiments on that line will never be possible. Yet, in spite of that, they too misunderstand us sometimes in certain aspects that affect us. I would, therefore, say with all the humility at my command, that this matter should be investigated properly and a machinery for explaining our point of view must be set up.

With these words I support the foreign policy of India and I do

think that if this policy is understood by the peoples and countries of the world in the right way, those who have not got vested interests to serve will support that policy and endorse that policy and bring pressure on their governments to follow it.

Shri T. K. Chaudhary (Berhampore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I feel a little bit hesitant to strike a note of discord in this House of seeming unanimity. We are almost on the point of attaining what is called in other countries a bipartisan foreign policy. We have known what our foreign policy is for the last so many years; and, today, we have heard from the leader of the principal opposition group, Mr. Dange, that he unreservedly supports that policy.

I will have nothing much to say today against the generalities and the abstract principles or the basic approaches of that policy. But, I must state frankly that I am not a little sceptic of the so-called policy of co-existence which is being shouted from housetops as the panacea for all ills. Let us also consider the fact that this theory of co-existence might transform itself into an argument for *status quo*. Co-existence is not only a problem between two rival blocks. We have also to decide today whether we want to co-exist with imperialism, with colonialism, with exploitation, with inequality and suppression of human liberties. Unfortunately it seems that the big powers, the imperialist powers who have thriven on the exploitation of other peoples are waking to the convenient argument that this plea of co-existence puts into their hands. That is why we have just seen, only two days back, as the Prime Minister told us, 75 nations belonging to the United Nations Organisation have accepted virtually the principle of co-existence while the French rifles, sten-guns and bombs are shooting down Algerian *falleghas*, while forces are at work inside Indonesia to subvert the lawful government of the State and to

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

put in power forces which would uphold the cause of colonialism. All the 75 nations unanimously accepted that we should approach the solution of our problems and the issues that divide us in a spirit of peaceful negotiation. But that has not helped to provide solution for a single outstanding question that besets the world.

Coming nearer home, we find that all the problems with which our own interests and our national prestige are intimately related not only, remain unsolved, they remain where they are. Recently, the whole country has more or less relied to the support of the Government's Kashmir policy. Parliament has expressed itself strongly in support of the case that was put on behalf of India by Shri Krishna Menon in the U.N. We have said that he has represented truly and correctly our case in the highest international forum.

But one thought has worried me and I have a question to put to the Government. We do certainly stand behind the Government so far as the Kashmir issue is concerned. We also know that the Commitment that we have entered into with regard to the plebiscite in Kashmir was conditional upon the vacation of aggression by Pakistan. But by putting forward that argument are we not indirectly entering into another kind of a commitment? Supposing for argument's sake, Pakistan is persuaded to vacate aggression and withdraws its armed forces from the Kashmir territory, would we agree to a plebiscite then? Or, would we tell the world straightaway that conditions have changed so much during the course of the last ten years that we consider the question of plebiscite does not arise at all? I was very much encouraged a few months back when the Home Minister of our Government made some such statement. But at the same time, it seems to me from the stand taken by our representative in the UN, that we have indirectly and unwittingly perhaps entered into a fresh

sort of a commitment. In case Pakistan is persuaded to vacate aggression from Kashmir territory, what would be our position? How would we extricate ourselves from the embarrassing situation that would arise in that case? It is this question that has been worrying me for some time past.

Now I come to another subject to which many other speakers referred: Goa. The 380 million people of India want freedom of Goa and sympathise with the right of the Goan people to integrate themselves with democratic India. Our Government also wants that the Goan people should enjoy the rights of democratic freedom and must have the right to come back to India. But some how or other, it seems to me that the sense of urgency is no longer there in our minds. Shri Dange said—and I think, rightly—that our attitude seems to be that because we cannot go to war and there is nothing much to be done about it. We only express our sympathy with the Goan people and with their freedom fighters and shrug our shoulders: What can be done? Nothing which is feasible or practicable in the immediate present. That seems to be our attitude.

In order that we may wake up to a sense of urgency, I must tell the House under what conditions not only the Goan people but Goan freedom fighters have to pass their days. Apart from the Goan people, there are nearly 400 convicted political prisoners. In this country, we also fought against British Imperialism. Many of us have had jail records and lived in imprisonment as political prisoners. So, the mere fact that there are also 300 or 400 political prisoners does not seem to arouse much of a sentiment here. We seem to think that we passed through the same experience. It is only right and proper and natural that the Goans who are fighting for their freedom should also pass through a similar experience and should undergo a certain amount of suffering. We

perhaps think so and so we ask, what is there to be surprised in it?

We in this country and perhaps the world do not know: We have not taken any steps to make relevant facts known to the world. The conditions in which the Goan political prisoners are kept are subhuman. If I am speaking with a certain amount of emotion, it is only because I have known from my personal experience what those conditions are. But it may seem to hon. Members here and the outside world that I have some political prejudice against the Portuguese Government.

Let me, therefore to a foreign observer, who, some months before our release went there to see the conditions in which the political prisoners lived there. I refer to Mrs. Tayazinkin, the noted British lady journalist, the correspondent of two responsible British journals, *Manchester Guardian* and the *Economist*. She had been there round about November last year. Apart from the cell in which we were lodged, she was allowed to go to the best cell, the best association barrack in the best jail in Goa. I refer to the Aguada Fort. This is what she saw and she was allowed to visit only one room. She says:

"Jails are choking full with political prisoners who are piled under the most appalling conditions. In the room I saw fit to house perhaps thirty people, under very cramped conditions lived 68 people."

There were double beds. There was a second row of beds above the first. She says further:

"Their beds were touching each other and the wall, leaving only a narrow passage between, and there was a second row of beds about the first, so low that people in the lower bed had to lie down rather than sit up, as did the people on the top row."

"In that room which has practically on windows and only one door, there is a cooking corner and facing it one hole in the ground for w.c. and bath combined. The prisoners locked for the whole time except for five spells of thirty minutes every week, and if they complain they get beaten. "

As I was telling you, Sir, this was the state of affairs in one of the best rooms which she was allowed to visit. This was published in the British journal *New Commonwealth* some months back, in February, this year when we were released. That is why I say that we must try our best to arouse world conscience about the conditions under which these 350 people have been kept.

Then, consider the sentences that they are undergoing. It is not merely sentences like two years, or three years' sentences. I remember that during the 1942 days the highest sentence was perhaps the given to Shri Jaglal Choudhuri of Bihar on a charge of arson. He was an ex Minister and he was given a sentence of six years. And, here, for the mere crime of shouting 'Jai Hind' in the streets of Panjim or other towns of Goa people have been straightaway sentenced to 16 years. Majority of the people above 16 years have been given a sentence of 8 years to 21 years and some 28 years for their non-violent struggle. Shall we tolerate these conditions in the soil of India, where people would be kept in dungeons like these for 16 years and for 28 years?

If I am speaking here with some emotion, mind you, Sir, I am speaking on behalf of those 400 incarcerated souls, and I want that this House, not only this House but the world, should take note of the conditions in Goa. The struggle that the Goan fighters for freedom are waging is not only the struggle for their own freedom. We must remember that Portugal is one of the last strongholds of

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

European fascism, and the struggle that the Goan people are waging is a part of the struggle against fascism, imperialism and colonialism.

Whatever might be our attitude towards world problems, let us declare here once for all that in spite of our adherence to the theory of co-existence, for the ideal of co-existence, we shall not co-exist with the type of authoritarian rule, with the type of colonial exploitation, with the type of brutality and sadism that is rampant in Portuguese Empire and, particularly, we shall never allow that to be perpetrated on the soils of India.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, recently we have traversed the subject of foreign affairs so much that, perhaps, anything we might say will savour of repetition. I propose, Sir, to deal briefly with three points and to present them, perhaps, in a way in which they have not been presented so far.

The Prime Minister's recent appeal to the leaders of the great nations to suspend nuclear tests has, I believe, understandably provoked not only speculation but worldwide interest. And I think that it can be said for this appeal that it has been acclaimed not only in India but, I believe, it will be acclaimed by the common people throughout the world, because it expresses the longing which we know the common people feel, this longing which they have for some kind of relief from this growing world tension, for some kind of relief from this race to world suicide.

I believe that the Prime Minister feels, and I venture very humbly to agree with his feeling, that this suspension of nuclear tests might not be remotely effective in achieving any measure of disarmament, but that it would represent a gesture, I would say a dramatic gesture, and that it would

help to break the ice of this increasing cold war, it would help to generate an atmosphere in which the leaders of these armed giants can come together and begin to discuss methods for evolving step by step some kind of progress towards disarmament; because I believe that the Prime Minister also knows that in this present atmosphere of cold war, of an armaments race, this progress towards disarmament must be a step by step and even, perhaps, a painfully slow process.

In this role that India is seeking to fulfil I feel that she must persevere in it, because on this role depends, I also feel, the survival of the human race. But it is important that in seeking to fulfil this role, which is essentially the role of a mediator, which is essentially the role of a conciliator, we give no suggestion of leaning towards one formula or the other put forward by either of the two blocks.

I believe that the USSR appears to be prepared to suspend nuclear tests while the western democracies would appear to be of the view that a mere suspension of nuclear tests does not in any way give any kind of guarantee of disarmament, that merely a suspension unaccompanied by effective control and inspection may, on the other hand, aggravate insidiously the danger of a sudden attack. As I have said, India must persevere in this role of trying to be some kind of a bridge in bringing these armed giants together and it is important to remember that in seeking to fulfil this role we do not lean towards one formula or the other.

Sir, I also believe that India continues to play a very important part in championing the cause of the colonial people. We continue to express our concern—it has been expressed very much in this House today—over expressions of colonialism, particularly in Africa.

16 hrs.

It is natural that India should raise her voice against manifestations of colonialism wherever they occur. It is equally natural that we should be affected particularly strongly by these manifestations where they affect the non-White people, because we have some kind of a common psychological bond with these people which makes us react particularly strongly to these exhibitions of colonialism when they are directed against non-White people.

But I feel that in our very proper policy of resisting colonialism, wherever it is manifested, we should not circumscribe our attitude. There is a tendency on the part of some people to charge India with partisanship; who say that we only condemn colonialism where it suits us and when it suits us to condemn, and that very often we connive at colonialism where it also suits us. I do not believe that that is a fair charge, but I feel that we should not expose ourselves to this charge of partisanship when we condemn, wherever it may be, this colonialism. When we condemn colonialism whether in the U.N. or in this House, when we condemn it in Africa, we should not forget to register our protest against colonialism which is perhaps much more brutal in form behind the iron curtain.

I am one of those who believe—my friend Shri Dange is not here—that colonialism should be fought everywhere. Shri Dange, usually like his Communist colleagues, waxed eloquent about the socialist democracy. If he were here, I would have asked him, what has happened to Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. Can we believe that the peoples of Hungary, the peoples of Czechoslovakia, are less helots of colonialism than the people in Algeria? In our thoughts, our solicitude for oppressed or the enslaved peoples everywhere, let us sometimes not forget to express solicitude for what is happening behind the bamboo curtain. When the Chinese Communist dictator asserted in a

speech that we must now allow even a hundred flowers to bloom, there were many people—I was an exception—who hoped that this would represent the beginnings of a little political tolerance, the glimmerings of some kind of civil liberties for the peoples in the Communist dictatorships. But that hope has been tragically short-lived. We have reason to believe that those flowers that attempted to bloom are today being ruthlessly pruned, and that at least a million people if not more have been at least politically if not physically liquidated behind the bamboo curtain.

We have, since our last discussion on foreign affairs in this House, also seen—it has not been underlined—a very significant change in the USSR. With the very recent political liquidation of Marshal Zhukov, there cannot be the slightest doubt about that. M. Khrushchev today stands in the shoes of his former master Stalin. There is not the slightest doubt that all the strings of the ruthless Stalinist dictatorship are now held in the hands of M. Khrushchev. It is well to remember that Indian tradition and Indian thought have always deprecated dictatorship because we have always believed that it inevitably leads not only to the enslavement but to the degradation of the individual.

The Kashmir problem, since we last discussed foreign affairs, appears in some ways to have been aggravated. I believe that the recent attitude of the western democracies has upset many of us in India. It has even angered some of us, because we feel, whether they have intended it or not, that the attitude of the Western democracies has been such as to re-activate a question which carries with it the potentials of unbounded misery and suffering not for four or five million people but for tens of millions of people in this country.

Shrimati Renuka Ray underlined at considerable length her belief that India's case on Kashmir has not been.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

and continues not to be, adequately put. We have received increasing evidence of this fact that India's case has not been effectively put so far as world or public opinion is concerned. Mr. Saund was in India recently. He was the first United States Congressman of Indian origin. He repeatedly made this assertion that India's case on Kashmir has not been put clearly or intelligibly to the public of America. He made it very clear that there is a fund of goodwill for India, but that this case has gone by default, because for one reason or another, we have not put it simply; we have not put it intelligibly so that it can be intelligible to the common man. He suggested, and I agree with him, that marathon speeches may be all right in the Supreme Court; they may be all right before the specialists, experts; but marathon speeches so far as influencing public opinion is concerned only have the effect of getting our case confused in details and sometimes in irrelevancies.

It would appear that after several years at last we have been able to achieve this, namely, on this Kashmir question we have been able to get somebody to understand what is the elementary, basic position so far as the Indian case is concerned, and that is, that it is India that has referred this question to the Security Council and that what we referred was this very simple issue of Pakistan's aggression. That is obviously the first basic point in India's case, and, at long last, we have been able to get it stated. And we say that as in any tribunal or forum when a matter was referred we expect that tribunal or forum to decide that matter, to decide the question has been referred to that body.

I feel, in my humble way as a lawyer, that if India's case on this basic issue was referred to the world court, the decision would be clear and inescapable. I also feel that we have yet to come to formulate our second

basic point with regard to India's case on Kashmir. Pakistan has been able to blur over this first unassailable legal position of India's, because Pakistan has been able to make an emotional appeal to public opinion throughout the world. Why have they done it and conveniently overridden the first legal position? They make an emotional appeal, asking what about self-determination, what about the rights of Muslims to live with Muslims, what about India's offer to have plebiscite?

I feel that if and when we formulate our second basic item in India's case we can formulate it much more strongly, on the basis of an emotional appeal, than Pakistan has been able to do. What is this second basic item as I see it? We have not yet told either the U.N. or the peoples of the world that partition was the last price we were prepared to pay to this medieval doctrine of peoples being divided along religious lines. We have not done that. We have not also said this, and my friend Shri T. K. Chaudhuri has raised this issue. We have not made it clear that this offer of plebiscite had nothing to do with this legal issue. It was completely *ex gratia* and we made it at a time when we were paying this price of partition in a communal holocaust at that time. Even though the offer was *ex gratia*, we were not bound to implement it either morally or legally. At that particular time, if there was a plebiscite, whatever communal consequences that might have arisen, it would have been part of this larger communal holocaust that occurred at that time.

But today what is the position? We do not state our case properly that this *ex gratia* offer which we made then as part of the price that we were prepared to pay for partition has lapsed. Why? Because, the U.N., the Security Council, if you like, shirked their duty not deciding this only issue that we referred to it. Having shirked their duty, how do they expect us for

an interminable period of time to keep open an *ex gratia* offer? This is the second basic item in our case. It was an offer which today if it was implemented would lead to a fierce hate-filled resurgence of the communal holocaust of 1947.

One of my American friends, whom I met recently in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference told me that the people in America are not even aware that apart from Kashmir, any Muslims are living in India. That is the extent to which we have stated our case to the peoples of the world. We have not yet told them very clearly and this is the thing which we have yet to tell the people that by keeping alive this Kashmir question, not only Pakistan, but those who have helped her to keep it alive are keeping alive a question which does not affect 4 or 5 million Muslims in Kashmir, but it affects 45 million Muslims in India, a larger number of Muslims than in Pakistan. That is the point which we have not made clear, which is a simple point, but which apparently has never been made. As Mr. Saund said, not six American Congressmen are aware of India's case on Kashmir. We have not made this point that Pakistan is continuing to trade in religious hatred and that those countries that support her help her to continue to trade in religious hatred.

The question we should pose—I do not know why we have not posed it—if you want us to resurrect this old question of a communal holocaust in this country, it will mean you are helping Pakistan to continue to trade in religious hatred. Ask Pakistan, ask the western democracies: Let us assume we refer this matter to a plebiscite, are you prepared to transfer not 4 million Muslims in Kashmir, but 45 million Muslims of India? That is the simple stark question that I would like to ask Pakistan. It is not a question of Kashmir alone. When you place your case on this emotional plane, it is bound to have a much more powerful appeal than any

amount of emotional blaring that Pakistan has indulged in.

Go to the people of America and tell them what Kashmir represents for India. Kashmir represents for India a symbol of India's faith in secular democracy, a symbol of the faith in the policy that minorities belonging to different religions can live together with honour and self-respect. These people who are supporting Pakistan on Kashmir are trying to make a symbol of faith not in secular democracy—they may not mean it, but they are doing it indirectly and unintentionally—but a symbol of continuing religious hatred, a symbol of theocracy, a symbol of the mediaeval doctrine that peoples of different religions cannot live together with honour and self-respect. That, I feel, is something which has not been put in the way it should have been put, namely, to ask Pakistan, Britain and America, whether they are prepared to undertake not the transfer of 4 million Muslims of Kashmir, but whether they are prepared to undertake the transfer of 45 million Muslims of India who today are given a place of honour and self-respect along with other minorities in India.

Finally, I want to say that I was very glad that the Prime Minister condemned categorically the lack of courtesy which our representative at the U.N. was guilty of. I shall put it quite frankly that there is an increasingly uneasy feeling in this country, which is not only shared by this side of the House, that today particularly because we are faced with Herculean economic tasks, for our representative to be gratuitously rude, to adopt an almost calculated pose of bad manners is to render a wanton disservice to India as a whole. I had the privilege of being one of India's representatives to the recent Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference. What every delegate from outside said publicly was this that the dominant impression

[Shri Frank Anthony]

they received in India was the impression of the maturity and the refinement of the Indian people, bespeaking India's ancient civilisation and culture. As I said, rudeness is repugnant not only to India's tradition, but it is repugnant to the traditions of mature and refined diplomacy. I would say, let us not try and emulate the representatives of some of the dictator countries who have brought a new type of diplomacy to the international arena, who seem to think that not only offensive, but abusive language is an indication not only of firmness, but of strength

16.17 hrs.

[MR SPEAKER in the Chair]

Finally, I would ask the Prime Minister about a matter which I read in the Press a few days ago. I read a statement by one Mr. Isha Anshari, leader of the largest party in Indonesia. He said that agents from communist countries outside had been deliberately attempting to subvert and to overthrow the Indonesian Government. I would like to know whether the Indian Government has any information in this matter and if they have the information, whether the Prime Minister would be prepared to share it with the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I hear that tomorrow and day after have been assigned for discussion of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Commissioner's report, in which case, the Bill which this House discussed yesterday, the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Bill, 1957, will not be taken up until Friday morning. May I submit that in the event of the Bill being passed here and going to the other House and if some amendments are made there, we would not be in time in this House to reconsider it, because the House would have

adjourned on Saturday. So, I suggest that this matter may be disposed of tomorrow before the report of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Commissioner is taken up, so that if it becomes necessary for the Bill to come back to this House, we may take advantage of the fact that the House is sitting on Saturday

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Or, we might cut short the present discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Sometimes I am not able to follow whether he says it in jest or seriously. I think he says it in jest. If the hon Member goes on joking, you do not feel that at any time he is serious.

An Hon Member: It is not that every time he jokes

Mr. Speaker: In view of what the hon Finance Minister has said, what is the objection if we take it up first? The same time—2 days—will be given for the Scheduled Castes Commissioner's report. The time taken up by this Bill will be added

Shri M. R. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved—Sch Castes): There is no objection to that

Mr. Speaker: Whatever time is taken away from the debate on the Report of Scheduled Castes Commissioner will be added on to it.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): The time should not be cut short

Mr. Speaker: No; so long as the hon Member is here, it will not be cut short

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the speeches from both sides of the House and I must say that it is a matter of gratification to find a general support from all sides of the House for the policy that our Prime Minister has been pursuing. It is also a matter of gratification that more and