

[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 (Karumnagar—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

more nations of the world, more and more people of different countries are becoming appreciative of the stand that India has taken. If I might say so, the words of President Eisenhower that were quoted by our Prime Minister this morning, that true victory cannot be a victory for any one nation but it has to be a victory for all, are a paraphrase of the policy that has been set forth by India, the policy of co-existence. As I listened to the speech of the Prime Minister this morning appealing for a change of attitude which alone can lead to a change in the general atmosphere and elimination of the dangers that the world is faced with, the dangers of an atomic warfare, dangers which not only threaten to wipe out the present generation, but also to damage the generations to come, I felt deeply moved.

A few minutes later came the speech of Shri S. A. Dange, which was a complete negation of the appeal and of the spirit of the Prime Minister's speech. Shri S. A. Dange's speech, if anything, was an echo of what we are used to hearing from the power blocks, peace through strength. He talked of sobriety as a result of the Sputnik. Nobody underrates the importance of the discovery of the Sputnik and all credit to the Russians for making that discovery first. The scientific discoveries of the present age are of very great importance for all the peoples of the world because these scientific discoveries are capable of making a heaven of this earth if they are used constructively and these scientific discoveries are equally capable of annihilating all mankind if they are used unwisely. To use these scientific discoveries wisely, there has to be a change in outlook, a change of heart and a new spirit which looks at human beings as human beings the world over and does not think of people on one side as something worthy of all praise and of every thing good and the people on the other side as something inferior not even worth being called human beings. This was the spirit of Shri S. A. Dange's speech. It was most unfortunate in my view.

While he was supporting the plea for co-existence, his speech, as I have already said, was a negation of it. What was even more surprising was that he wanted to give the credit for the idea of co-existence and the acceptance of this ideology of co-existence to Lenin and Marx. It is well known that Marx and the communist creed set forth by him believe that there is no future for any other ideology except the ideology of communism and all other ideologies must crumble down. And the means the Communists have used are also well known. They have not spared any means because their creed is, the end justifies the means. They believe in eliminating other ideologies and in co-existence with them. Therefore, for Mr. Dange to say that this theory of co-existence, and this ideology of co-existence came from Lenin and Marx was rather surprising to me. He may be a more learned man than I am. But I have also read a little about Marxism and the work of Lenin. To the best of my knowledge, Lenin's stand was that he wanted time for Russia to build her might, to build her potential to face the capitalist world and avoid immediate conflict with the Capitalist world so as to declare ultimately the success and superiority of the communist creed. He certainly did not envisage that there would be any need for these two types of ideologies to co-exist in the world. Mr. Dange's speech was almost reminiscent of the 1942 days when the Communists were so eager to help Russia that an imperial war had overnight become people's war. Similarly, today when the whole world is ready to give the credit to the Prime Minister of India for putting forth this plea of co-existence, Shri S. A. Dange wants the credit to go to Lenin, and not to the Prime Minister of India. It is rather surprising and I must confess, I am unable to understand it, even less to appreciate it.

He also made another statement which, to me, seemed even more objectionable and that statement was--

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

it was contradicted from the floor immediately, but he persisted with the theme—that India and the Indian National Congress had not made up its mind with regard to the attitude that the Indians in South Africa and other parts of Africa should take with regard to the Africans, the nationals of those countries. To the best of my knowledge, it was long before Independence, in the time of Mahatma Gandhi, that he had clearly laid down the policy that Indians were to be brothers with the nationals of those countries. After Independence, if I know anything, the Prime Minister and the Government of India have been often criticised that they unnecessarily go and involve India in the quarrels of the whole world, that we go and condemn the western powers for their colonial policies here, there and everywhere, when we should be sitting quietly and developing our own country and solving our own problems. In the face of this, for Shri S. A. Dange to make the statement that we have not laid down a clear-cut policy with regard to the nationals in Africa is rather strange. We have espoused the cause of every nation, in every part of the world, that is struggling for its independence and we have left no opportunity to condemn in an outspoken manner colonialism in any shape and form.

As a matter of fact when I was in the United States some time back, somebody, a very responsible member of American political life said, you Indians seem to find colonialism under every bed as we Americans seem to see the ghost of communism in every corner. That is in a way a statement which is correct from the point of view of the Americans. I explained to them that we are able to see colonialism and to condemn it immediately because we have personal experience of it, we know where the shoe pinches, and therefore we speak out in an outspoken manner.

There was a feeling amongst the Americans that while we are outspoken in condemning the West for its misdeeds, we are perhaps not equally outspoken when it comes to the misdeeds of the other side. This may be correct or may not be correct, but this is the feeling which is there and we have to take note of it.

I might mention that Shri Dange this morning was talking of all the misdeeds of the Western Powers and stated that these missiles in the hands of the Western Powers were a means of protecting colonialism, while he felt that in the hands of the Russians they were safe. He conveniently forgot the expansion of Russian influence in Eastern Europe, he conveniently forgot the happenings in Hungary and the use of Russian tanks and Russian troops in that country.

The feeling of the Americans is that we condemned the Suez aggression by the Anglo-French bloc, and that was perfectly correct for us to do, but when it came to Hungary we talked and even today talk of "foreign troops", and we do not name the foreign troops, though the whole world knows who those foreign troops were. We certainly should not give the impression that we are not able to say the truth and speak frankly to one side when we do so to the other side.

16.33 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Therefore, it is important for us to note the feelings of the Western bloc. We shall certainly hold our own line of action, our own line of thought, and follow our policy of non-alignment which takes into consideration as to which side is in the right. We shall be with that side on that particular issue. Our non-alignment does not mean that we are trying to follow a

line of appeasement or the line of least resistance, or trying to find an escape for ourselves. Therefore, in our expression of opinion we have not only to be right and fair, we have also to speak in a manner that everybody can say that we are right and fair. I perfectly agree with the Prime Minister that we have to find a way of conciliation. However, I am reminded of the days when some friends of the Fellowship of Reconciliation used to be very active in trying to bring about reconciliation between India and Britain, and how many of us including the Prime Minister used to feel irritated when they were not able to speak in an outspoken manner to the British Government about their misdeeds. We felt that to bring about reconciliation, they must be able to speak the truth and tell each side where they stood, what they thought of them, and having done that, they should try to bring about a *rapprochement*, a reconciliation. The feeling of justice must not be sacrificed in the anxiety to bring about reconciliation. The same thing applies to us today.

If I might say so, when the Americans compare us with Pakistan and put us in the same bracket, we resent it, because, obviously, there is such a vast difference between Pakistan's policies and actions and Indian policies and actions that anybody can easily see it. Therefore, we must in the same manner speak about things which to the others are as important.

I have given the instance of the Hungarian question where the Prime Minister has made it amply clear that we believe that the Hungarian uprising was a national uprising, we believe the foreign troops should get out of that country, we believe the people of that country should be able to decide things for themselves. It is unfortunate that an impression has been created that we are not speaking about the Hungarian situation with the same firmness as we did in the case of the Suez crisis. To us, if I have understood correctly the policy of our Government, both actions were equally reprehensible, and we did not approve

of either of them, we are incapable of approving of either of them.

The Prime Minister rightly said our anxiety is to find out how can we help in the present situation. With all these aeroplanes flying about with hydrogen bombs, anything can happen and the world might be exposed to a holocaust. That must be prevented, and in order to prevent that, the only way is to create a new spirit which is different from the prevailing spirit of today, a spirit which does not try to humiliate either side, which does not try to put either side completely in the shadow, completely in the wrong, which tries to bring out the common points, the similarities, the points of agreement, and tries to save the self-respect of either side and where a wrong thing has to be pointed out, points it out clearly but in as gentle terms as possible. Our scriptures have also said:

“सतं वृथात् प्रियं वृथात्,  
मा वृथात् न्यमप्रियम् ।”

That is, speak the truth, but speak it softly, speak it gently; and if you do not know how to do so, hold your peace, keep silent, do not speak. Therefore, we have to find out a way in which without sacrificing truth or justice the feelings of self-respect of either side is preserved, is protected, so that the present feelings of fear, distrust and hatred are replaced by feelings of mutual confidence and cooperation.

The task before the world is tremendous, the task of the welfare of the 2,000 million people throughout the world, to find a way to satisfy the needs of all these people in every corner of the world. It can be done with the present scientific advances. Therefore, the Prime Minister has rightly pleaded for a change of spirit. The replies sent to him by the Prime Minister of Russia and the President of the United States indicate the desire for peace. There is something to be appreciated in the points expressed by each. One side says that they

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

are agreeable to the banning of nuclear tests provided the other side agrees to it also. The other side says that they are able to stop these nuclear tests provided the manufacture of the nuclear weapons is also abandoned. It is true all these problems are intricately mixed up, they cannot be separated from one another. Nuclear tests and nuclear weapons are a part of the problem of disarmament.

The truth of the matter is that the manufacture of these nuclear weapons, even the working of the atomic reactors, even the tests and experiments for peaceful uses of atomic energy are not one hundred per cent. safe at present according to scientific opinion. The dangers of atomic radiation are there under all these circumstances. I think, therefore, it is very important that all should agree to not only the banning of nuclear tests, not only the stopping of the manufacture of all atomic weapons, but also to put all the atomic weapons that have been manufactured in the custody of, say, the United Nations or any group of nations in whom they have confidence, and in this manner to see to it that nobody can get access to them and nobody can make use of them, till a safe way can be found to destroy them. Because today even in their destruction they are likely to release atomic energy which will expose mankind to danger. It has been pleaded that India should offer her services for inspection. I think it is ridiculous. After all, India cannot go forward and make such suggestions. If India's services are requisitioned for any purpose, then it is a different matter. But we certainly do not want to go and parade ourselves as people who are going to inspect for this side or that side. We can, however offer our services as members of the United Nations, to become custodians of all the nuclear weapons that have been manufactured if it is agreed to store them in a safe place away from the reach of any mad man who in a

fit of anger or in the face of any provocation might be tempted to make use of them and bring calamity and catastrophe to the whole world.

**Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal):** I have a disadvantage in speaking on the motion which has been moved by the Prime Minister this morning. My disadvantage results from the fact that today so far as I am concerned, and the party which I represent is concerned, there is not much of an opposition angle, so far as the foreign policy is concerned. Whatever differences were there, and whatever edges were there, so far as this matter was concerned, have been rounded off, not because of any peculiar virtue of the policy that is being pursued, but because the policy which is being presented to us is so naive, is so obvious and is so non-controversial that one cannot have a different view, from that.

It has been said that the outstanding problem of our foreign policy is the problem of war and peace. But I would most humbly ask this House to point out to me any single country in this world whose foreign policy is a policy of war. Even Dr. Syngman Rhee who was accustomed to talk in the language of war, even Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, are talking in terms of peace. International political choice cannot be polarised between war and peace, and nobody can ever be asked to make a choice by being faced with the alternative of war or peace. Everybody wants peace. Therefore, as I said before, there cannot be much of an opposition angle, so far as these platitudinous problems of war and peace are concerned, so far as the general eagerness for peace and the resurgence of a new mankind are concerned.

I would have expected, and the country would have expected that the Prime Minister should have addressed himself to the brass-tacks, to the more outstanding problems of our foreign policy, which have been agitating us since we became free. So, I have a

disadvantage in speaking on this motion.

Our assessment of foreign policy suffers from a fallacy that the outstanding problem of our foreign policy is a policy of peace. If you kindly scan through the speech that the Prime Minister made this morning—actually, I was trying to calculate the time—you will find that he devoted seven minutes in all to Goa, to Kashmir, to Nepal and to Indonesia. The rest of the 38 minutes were devoted to a discourse on international peace. I am not at variance with the sentiments and the aspirations which he has expressed. No sensible man can be at variance with the sentiments which he has expressed. But the figures will tell us that he devoted seven minutes to matters from West Irian to Nepal and the rest of the time was devoted to the platitudinous question of war and peace. It is a fallacy to say that the outstanding problem of our foreign policy is peace. I venture to think, and you will kindly excuse me for saying this, that peace has been used in this country as a facade for hiding our own failures to solve the outstanding problems of our foreign policy.

If you take the case of Kashmir, if you take the question of Goa, or if you take the question of Indians in Ceylon or the persons of Indian origin in South Africa, you will come to the painful conclusion that our foreign policy has been a waste land and an arid land of failure, though garbed in very poetic and emotional language.

Co-existence as a tenet of international policy is not the exclusive discovery of our foreign policy. As has been stated this morning very rightly, as early as 1917 even Lenin had formulated this concept of co-existence. In fact, even earlier than Lenin, many political philosophers as well as social philosophers had given expression to this concept of co-existence. I quite concede that Lenin formulated the concept of co-existence, and even Stalin reiterated it. But the

fundamental test is, how it has been implemented. The classic example is that of Hungary. It is an irony of history that the doctrine of Panchsheel and co-existence had emerged out of the "liberation" of Tibet by the People's Republic of China. Therefore, one need not go by all these labels, by all these doctrines, by all these ready-made slogans. So, neither co-existence, nor peace, nor war is really disturbing us at the moment.

The Prime Minister said the other day that India was geographically so situated that it was not very intimately connected with the problem of war that was now facing Europe. If that is so, then I would have expected of him to have devoted much of his attention to the basic problems of our foreign policy.

I shall first take up Kashmir. The Prime Minister has stated that if Mr. Graham would like to come to India, he is an estimable gentleman and he is always welcome to visit this country and we shall extend all the courtesy due to him. The same thing was said when Mr. Gunnar Jarring visited India. You will kindly recall that when the resolution was adopted in the Security Council to depute Mr. Gunnar Jarring of Sweden to examine whether part (B) of the resolution of 13th August, 1949 had been implemented in full, the Government of India, and our representative in the Security Council said the very same thing, that if Mr. Gunnar Jarring was keen to visit India, he was welcome. But what happened? The subsequent events show that the Government of India not only welcomed him but they had also long confabulations, long discussions and long commitments with Mr. Gunnar Jarring, which will be amply borne out by the report which he has produced. In the same way, when Dr. Graham is coming, on the eve of his visit, the Prime Minister is now repeating the same thing that he spoke on the eve of Mr. Gunnar Jarring's visit. Therefore, we would like to know where the Government of India stands. Practically, this commitment has not much of value, in view of the fact that the Government

[Shri Mahanty]

of India had gone back on the principles which they had formulated in relation to Mr. Gunnar Jarring's visit to India.

Here, an unpleasant truth has to be told. In 1948, when the Kashmir question was referred to the Security Council, the Indian delegation which consisted of Mr. Setalvad and the late lamented Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar represented our case before the Security Council. I would like the Prime Minister to reply whether it is not a fact that the Indian delegation and also the Government of India agreed to the extension of the scope of the Kashmir question. Is it not a fact that when the Pakistan Foreign Minister, Mr. Zafarullah Khan, brought all the issues beginning from Junagadh to genocide, canal waters dispute, refugee question—all kinds of questions,—when he enlarged the scope of the Kashmir issue, the Government of India agreed to it? It is now open to this House to ask the hon. Prime Minister to state under what circumstances the scope of the Kashmir question was extended. It is not merely enough to say that we have asked Pakistan to vacate. I venture to think that the initial mistake committed by the Indian delegation and countenanced by the Government of India, to extend the scope of the Kashmir question beginning from Junagadh to genocide has resulted in all this difficulty.

The Prime Minister has stated in regard to West Irian that he views with much concern all that has happened in Indonesia on account of the failure of a resolution in the U.N. relating to West Irian. But in relation to Goa, he has not used that language. On the occasion of the Bandung Conference, beginning from Tunisia up to West Irian, all colonial questions were asked, opened and discussed. But I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the question of Goa was ever discussed in Bandung. If not, why not? If he views the developments in Indonesia, over the liberation of West Irian

with concern, we would like to know how he views the question of Goa.

Shri T. K. Chaudhury has appealed to the collective conscience not only of this country but of all the civilised world as to what is happening in Goa. I can say that we had also sent volunteers to Goa. I can tell the Prime Minister that when he appealed to Indian youth, they did not hesitate to make their supreme sacrifice on the soil of Goa. But what happened thereafter? Was it not the moral and political duty of the Prime Minister to see that the martyrdom of Indian youths on Goa's soil did not go in vain? We would like to have a categorical answer from the Prime Minister as to what 'peaceful negotiation' means, how peaceful negotiation is going to be implemented.

Finally, I come to the question of war and peace, to which the Prime Minister had devoted 38 minutes this morning out of his speech of 45 minutes. It is really very heartening to find that the heads of the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. have responded to the fervent appeal of our hon. Prime Minister for disarmament. The President of the U.S.A. in his reply, if I remember correctly has formulated that the question of Disarmament should be linked up with the stoppage of production of nuclear weapons. We would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what are his reactions to this formulation of the President of the U.S.A. as regards disarmament. As a layman, I can say that experimentation of production of these nuclear weapons is now over. There was a time when all the big nuclear powers were engaged in experiments. Now that phase of experimentation is over. Now, they are on their ground; and can produce these weapons of mass destruction, without any more experiments.

Therefore, I think there is a good deal of force in what has been stated by the President of the U.S.A., that this question of disarmament should be linked up with the overall production of these weapons. We would

like to know from the Prime Minister how he is viewing this and what are his reactions to this formulation of the President, because history will record that the Prime Minister of India had a great role to play in this 'war for peace' drama that is being waged all over the world.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, let me at the outset congratulate Shri Krishna Menon on the signal services that he has rendered to his motherland from the forum of the United Nations Organisation. In recognition of his services, he should be made the Deputy Prime Minister of India and the Foreign Minister of the Government of India. He should also be made a Bharat Ratna. If there is any man in this country who understands the problems of foreign policy, the problems of international politics as well as the Prime Minister, it is Krishna Menon and nobody else.

**Shri Nath Pal:** Let him not underestimate his own contribution.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I regret he was made to withdraw—or he withdrew of his own accord—certain remarks which were historically correct. The history of this country cannot be rewritten to suit the exigencies of power politics or national interests. It is not discourteous to call a spade a spade, an exploiter an exploiter and an imperialist an imperialist. Great Britain did not conquer this country by methods of truth or non-violence. If the Kashmir problem has not been solved, the responsibility rests entirely on the shoulders of America and Great Britain. If legal accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir cannot become valid till it is ratified by the people, I venture to submit that the sale of Alaska cannot be valid unless it is ratified by the people of Russia. India should withdraw from the United Nations Organisation if the legal accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir is not recognised as such by that organisation.

Now, let me come to a minor point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am sure with this lower pitch, he might be able to continue for 15 minutes; otherwise, he would get tired.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I feel keenly that there is a conspiracy against Krishna Menon, a meanness on our part and, therefore, I felt rather ruffled. I am one of those who never rotate round a Minister. I do not know Shri Krishna Menon personally; I have never even greeted him.\*

Now, let me draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a minor point which I wanted to raise in the form of a question but unfortunately could not do so.

17 hrs.

A few years back I had tabled a resolution; it was probably in the year 1955, if not in 1954. I had said in that resolution which did not see the light of day that the land communication between India and Russia, and between India and China, should be made perfect, and that all avenues should be explored. I was pleasantly surprised to read in a paper that a claim was made by a Soviet newspaper, an organ of the Council of Ministers for Construction Affairs, that a tunnel across the Himalayas would be constructed which would take only 3 or 4 years to complete or half that time if work began at the same time from the Indian end also. If the construction is completed, the distance between India and Russia would be shortened by many hundreds of miles.

**An Hon. Member:** Is this a minor point?

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I do not think there is any possibility of India being invaded by Russia. If there is no such fear then this offer made by the Russian Government should be accepted.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why need we go underground when there is enough space above?

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** All facilities should be accorded to the Russian engineers to begin work at both ends (*Interruption*) If Indian engineers can begin the work from this end, nothing will please me more

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** Then, I would draw the attention of the Prime Minister to another small point I am referring to the speech of Mirza Afzal Beg delivered on the floor of the Kashmir Legislative Assembly which was broadcast from Azad Kashmir Radio. Somebody came from Srinagar to Delhi and from Delhi the tape records were handed over to our enemies. Who was that man who did it? The Government of India must investigate and the criminal should never be spared. (*Interruption*.)

It is not a pleasure to me to speak in a strange manner or to suggest certain things which seemingly run counter to the official cult. But the interest of the country demands this and I cannot be untrue to myself or to my great leader or to this country or to this august House.

I said some time ago on the floor of this House that we should borrow nuclear weapons from the Soviet Union. I say so again. Very soon Syria, Egypt and China will get nuclear weapons from the Soviet Union. We should not lag behind. Our enemies are conspiring since the last 10 years to liquidate us. We are not yet out of the woods. If Russia is prepared to supply nuclear weapons exactly on the same terms on which America gives nuclear weapons to France and West Germany, we should gladly take them.

I do not think any good will come out of collaborating with the West. If we have got any illusion on that score that illusion will be removed soon. We ought to cooperate with America only on those issues which do not adversely affect the power position of Russia, China or of any other country of Asia and Africa.

If Kashmir is with us, it is due to the support of Russia. If Turkey has not attacked Syria, it is not because of America or the United Nations Organisation. It was the fear of Russian retaliation that prevented Turkey from attacking Syria. If great Britain and France withdrew from Egypt, it was not because of American attitude; it was not because of our *Panch Shila*; it was not because of the United Nations Organisation; it was because of the threat given by Marshal Bulganin and Khrushchev that—I am sorry—it was due to the threat given by our Russian comrades that London and Paris would be bombed. It was this that brought sense and sanity to the statesmen of Great Britain and France.

I do not think that even if America asks Pakistan to attack India, Pakistan will attack India because they know much better now. The day they attack India, Russia will attack and liquidate Pakistan. So, if this country is free from Pakistani attack, it is not due to the goodwill or generosity of America but it is due to the goodwill and friendship of Russia. If Russia ceases to exist, India may again pass into the western orbit.

I think that we owe our freedom to a very large extent to the emergence of Russia as the greatest the strongest and the largest military power on the Afro-Eurasian land mass. If Russia had been defeated in 1945, Great Britain would not have relinquished power in 1947. It was the fear of India going red that impelled Great Britain to concede freedom to India.

I am in favour of a military alliance with China and Russia. If that is not possible, if the Prime Minister is allergic to military alliances, let him enter straight into a Federal Union with China and Russia.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. I just now observed that whatever is talked here in this House is very

serious. So, it should not be taken lightly.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I am not in favour of seeking any loan from America or Germany or Great Britain or France, because I am not in favour of industrialisation of this country at the present moment.

**An Hon. Member:** Start from yarn.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I am not in favour of seeking any loan for the purpose of developing our industries. We do not need to beg or borrow.

**An Hon. Member:** Steal.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** Wait for a decade or two. We have waited for two centuries without industrialising ourselves and the heavens have not fallen. We can wait for a decade or two more. All the old means of production have become obsolete. India should not be made the dumping ground for obsolete instruments of production. Industrialisation within a decade or two will be on the basis of nuclear energy and automatons, and all the old instruments of production will hamper industrialisation on the basis of nuclear energy and automatons. Africa has got the best chance of industrialisation in future; there is a clean state to write upon. Do not create difficulties in the future industrialisation of this country by dumping obsolete weapons and obsolete instruments.

I have to make many suggestions to the House, but, as the time is up and you have rung the bell, I will make one more suggestion and conclude.

Sir, charity begins at home. I am a friend of Pakistan as much as I am a friend of this country. The Prime Minister and our leader, Mahatma Gandhi had said during the time when we were fighting for the Independence of this Country, that we were one people. We have been one people since time immemorial. The legal fact of Partition cannot make any distinction in my heart of hearts.

Otherwise, our nationalism is spurious. I suggest that the Government of India should make an offer of disarmament to Pakistan. If Pakistan is prepared to do the same, there should be no hesitation on our part to disarm, before we ask Russia and America to suspend nuclear tests or to throw away their conventional weapons we have also got a duty to perform.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):** I want that our hon. Prime Minister must think every morning why he thinks as he thinks. He thinks as he thinks because he got English education. I think as I think because I was for 31 years abroad in non-English countries. I was in Germany, America, Afghanistan, Japan, China and so on. I am influenced by the ideas prevailing in free independent countries and our friends here are influenced by English ideas because they were under the British. This fact must be understood.

Now, I go further and I say that as regards the foreign policy, I do not agree. I highly admire the hon. Prime Minister for his figure, for his way of speaking and for his energy. I was quite astonished how one day he was in Madras and the next morning here. I admire all this. But, I do not agree with his foreign policy and I present you my foreign policy.

I say, let us be out of the Commonwealth and let us stop this *Panch Shila* business. I tell you that this was invested by Russia and China to get some time for preparation now, the U.S. agreed to it because the Generals of the U.S.A. told the President: "Sir, Soviet Russia seems to be a little ahead because Sputnik was put in the space; so, let us also wait and let us have *Panch Shila*." For every thought that comes out of the mind there is always a reason.

For instance, I have written in my world federation circular that a great deal is made of this Sputnik business. Why? It is also a propaganda. It is the propaganda of

[Raja Mahendra Pratap].

Soviet Russia to fight the U.S.A. with this idea. I may tell you, my friends, this communism is not itself any danger to anybody. I may tell you what is capitalism. Capitalism is a system in which a man who is a little cleverer can amass wealth. Communism came out of the minds of Jews, the great Karl Marx and Engels. Because the Jews were suppressed in Russia, in Germany, they said: "What shall we do so that we may also get forward?" As I always say, races, tribes and castes always struggle to come forward

The Jews found out that the king, businessmen and the priests really rule the society. It is a fact. In our Hindu society also the Brahman, the Rajput and the Bania were in alliance and they ruled the Society. So the Jews found out that if they could show something against the king, against the priests and against the bania or businessmen then they could also rule.

I am speaking from my own experience. After 1917 I was in Russia and, as I told you, I was ten times in Russia. I found that all the important posts in Soviet Russia were occupied by the Jews, Mr. Trotski, Mr. Lunacharski, Mr. Radek, Mr. Kamenev, all these great leaders of Soviet Russia were Jews

So, I must explain to you that here sometimes our gentlemen, and especially our Communist friends do not really realise what is all this business. The business in the world is that, there were small States. They fought and bigger States developed, and bigger States developed. Till before the First World War there were only about 14 big States in the world, after the first world war several were eliminated. After the Second World War some other were eliminated.

Really, the struggle today is between the Anglo-Saxons on the

one side and the Slavs on the other side. They use communism and also democracy to influence the people and get a big following. I am sorry to say that this very important question is not properly heard in the Parliament. In fact, hours are needed. I will tell you what I have seen in the world in 31 years. You will be astonished, that what you are thinking is nothing but something put into your heads by certain circumstances.

I wish that sometime the hon. Prime Minister will appoint a day and call a meeting, and let me speak for one hour and then I shall tell you my foreign policy. Sir, my foreign policy is this, that we approach the small States of Europe, especially Germany and Japan who are very angry with Soviet Russia America, and we approach Latin America, and we also approach the independent States of Africa and Asia and have a big following for India. So we can defeat the Soviets and America in U.N.O. with our following and outside we make such a big following that war between United States and U.S.S.R will become impossible I am again, Sir, reminded of one thing. There is a word 'ass'. Somebody could say like this: "U.S.S.R. said to U.S. "U ass" and they replied "U ass ass are".

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri D. C. Sharma. He should conclude at 5.30. I have to call the hon. Prime Minister at 5.30.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is a very uphill task for me to hold the floor of this House after we have listened to two very stimulating speeches. I am afraid at the fag-end of this day it may not be possible for me to express all those things which I had in my mind when we started the debate.

But, when I was listening to the hon. leader of the Communist Party who spoke in this debate this morning, I felt very proud of this great country which upholds democratic traditions at all levels in all places and under all circumstances. If I

had forgotten where I was, I would have said that the speech of Shri Dange was a speech which was being made not somewhere in India but somewhere in the United States or Soviet Russia. I do not think he had much to say about India. All the time he was telling us about the scientific achievements of Russia; all the time he was telling us about the social philosophy of Russia. I think it was only at the tail-end that he talked about Goa and about Kashmir. I did not calculate the time that was given to him as leader of the Opposition group, but I would say that the proportion of time that he devoted to the exposition of the social philosophy and the scientific achievements of Russia was out of all proportion to the time which he gave to our own problems.

I do not say that we should not talk about Russia. We must talk about Russia. What I mean to say is this. To Compare one country with another so far as scientific achievements are concerned and to say that the scientific achievement of one country is wholly for peaceful purposes and the scientific achievement of another country is wholly for destructive purposes is, to say the least, not very fair. Science is not static. It is something which is dynamic. Though we are behind others in the field of science, with achievements which dazzle the imagination of the people and which sometimes inflame also the hopes of the people, I would say that scientific achievement goes either towards the end of peace or towards the end of war. This has been the history of science ever since people began to study science. Therefore, I say that though I am happy that the Russians have invented the Sputniks, though I am happy that they have made a big stride forward in the field of scientific development, I must say, as has been said, that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. So also, I say that scientific achievements corrupt and scientific achievements which are

sometimes thought to be spectacular and unprecedented also corrupt absolutely.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I also say that there is danger in saying that—one country has done this and another country has done that. I think so far as the field of scientific achievement is concerned,— I do not want to be platitudinous in this country, we have to take note of one thing. That is, our scientific achievement is going to be only for peaceful and constructive uses.

On the floor of this House somebody put a question to the Minister of Defence the other day whether we are going to give training in atomic warfare to our military personnel. The reply was that we do not want to give any kind of that training and that whatever atomic energy establishment we have in this country will be used for peaceful purposes. One achievement balanced against another achievement. One achievement is held up for the destruction of the world in contrast to the other achievements.

These things are all very good. But I would say that the cause of humanity will be served only if all the nations of the world, whether they belong to the Russian bloc or the other bloc, vow like India that whatever achievement they make will be turned to peaceful constructive uses to the good of humanity and to the welfare of the people. That is the way that will solve our problems.

Of course, much has been said about peaceful co-existence. I did not hear who invented this word. There has been a lot of talk on the floor of the House as to the author of this word, who first used this word and so on. One thing which I read in the life of Great Buddha was this. There was a bird and one person was trying to shoot that bird. There was another person who was trying to save the life of that bird. Both of them went before the Lord and

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

asked, to whom does the bird belong? He said, the bird belongs to him who tried to save it. So peaceful co-existence can be like a weapon to fight other persons. But peaceful co-existence in the form of a policy which seeks amity and goodwill, I think, has been brought into this world by India. I am glad to see that our Prime Minister is sitting here. If I say anything in praise of him, it may be misunderstood. But I say that the conception of peaceful co-existence—the phrase might have come from any source; it might have been coined by any person—but the content and the significance and the meaning of this phrase “peaceful co-existence” has been given by our country, by our Prime Minister. It has been propagated by him and it has been made effective by him. I think the whole world knows it.

Therefore, I would say that so far as India's foreign policy is concerned, it is a policy which has turned its back upon some of the old-fashioned outmoded and obsolete conceptions of diplomacy and foreign policy. We have turned over a new leaf. The Prime Minister was pleased to say one day when he was taking part in a debate on the floor of this House—of course, he said it very modestly—that this was the only policy which was going to do good to the people. Some people have said that this policy is not moral. I do not want to use those harsh words here. Some said that this policy of non-alignment is no policy. Some persons have said that co-existence is not productive of any results. I would say, as the Prime Minister said in that debate that this is the only right policy. I am very proud and happy that our country follows the right policy. Whether it is understood or misunderstood by other persons, it is the policy aiming at the welfare and good of this country, of the neighbours of this country and of the world at large.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ventured to bring forward before the House a motion for the consideration of international affairs. An hon. Member opposite criticised the fact that I spent about 7½ minutes in discussing various matters more intimately connected with India and about 30 minutes more in discussing broad issues of war and peace. His criticism may or may not be justified, but his facts are correct. In fact, I stated this morning that I would deal with this broad issue and if necessary deal with other matters in my reply.

I should like this House, again, to bear in mind what we are discussing and I say so because, towards the end of this debate, a certain measure of levity has been introduced into it. It is customary,—it used to be, I do not know what the practice is now—in the Indian theatre, even in the case of a tragedy, to end up with a farce so as, perhaps, to lighten the burden and the tension in the audience. So we have had something in that nature perhaps to lighten the burden of the tremendously difficult situation that the world has to face.

It is true that we in India, or in this House, are hardly responsible, are not responsible for this, and perhaps it may be true that what we do or do not do does not have too great an effect on world affairs. Let us recognise that our capacity to affect world opinion is limited. That is so. Nevertheless, whether we can affect world opinion or alter in the slightest the course of events, undoubtedly we shall suffer by the course of events if things go wrong. So, I ventured to place these major considerations of war and peace and what is happening before this House.

I referred to an appeal which I addressed in all humility to the two most powerful countries of the present age because the future of war and peace and indeed, of the world itself, the survival of humanity at present rests with them more than with any

other country. That is a fact. They were good enough to reply at length and argue with some reason and logic their respective positions. I think that itself, the very approach and the answer, is something for which I personally am grateful and I think this House should be grateful.

Anyhow, I ventured to draw the attention of this House to what might be considered the grand theme of the history of today. We in this House, in our own way, make the history of India and the history of India is so intimately related, as the history of every country today, to the world history that is taking shape, that we cannot escape responsibility, we cannot take refuge in imaginary approaches to this question. We cannot like Shri Brajeshwar Prasad, either dig deep underground or vanish about in thin air and have little relation to the facts of today, or act like the hon. Member who spoke after him—he is not present here—who lives in a world entirely his own and, on the strength of having wandered about various countries about 30 years ago, tries to understand the world of today. We live today and not in yesterdays, and we are trying to affect the tomorrows of this world. Let us, therefore, have some perspective. Let us forget that many a thing that we do not like, many a thing that affects us intimately is, unfortunately, important as it may be to us, only a part of this big picture, and may be powerfully affected by this big picture. And I want this House to realise not only the clichés that are sometimes used about our policies, but the basic reason that underlies them.

I do not claim that every step that we take is always the correct step, that we do not make mistakes, but I do submit that we have endeavoured during these past ten years, and indeed, if I may say so, more than that, even before we became a Government, to think along certain lines and, in so far as possible, to try to act up to that thinking.

I would further say with all humility that neither our thinking, nor our

action, has been wholly without effect. It has made a difference to events in the world, a difference which it is difficult to measure or calculate, because we try not to shout and we try not to bully—indeed, we cannot bully; how can we bully, we have not got the strength to bully, we have no desire to do so. We have always to appeal, sometimes to criticise. Even when we criticise, it is in a soft language, it is in gentle language, it is in appealing language, because our objective always is to promote a spirit, an atmosphere of conciliation, of people coming together, and not going apart from each other.

That I say is a right attitude. It naturally follows from what might be considered the Indian approach, not every Indian's but the broad Indian approach to problems. But the present stage of the world, I would like to say is one of extreme gravity, not immediately here and now, but broadly speaking, it is one of extreme danger and gravity if present trends continue. We have to take note of them, and we have to consider how we can possibly lessen that tension, or help in reducing those trends, reversing those trends. Hence the time I took over that, and hence my reference to these matters again, because everything else is relatively unimportant compared to that now.

Many hon. Members seem to think that what we have done perhaps has not made much difference, and they cite as examples our own problems: see what has happened to Kashmir, what have you gained by your policy for Kashmir? Well, probably they are right. We may not have gained anything for Kashmir, we may have lost something, but nevertheless, we have followed a policy which has gained us a good deal in the larger perspectives of the world—and I am not talking in terms of gain or loss for our country, but some causes that we hold dear, some methods that we consider important which we followed we try, feebly perhaps, to follow even now. We deal with very grave issues

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and hence it is perhaps not very becoming to treat them with levity.

An Hon. Member asked me, almost challenged me, to deal with the replies we have received, especially from President Eisenhower, and to indicate what I agree with, what I did not agree with. As I said, this is ultimately a question of disarmament, because the whole question revolves round disarmament. I have laid stress in my appeal to Russia and America not on any particular thing, but rather on a *detente*, but certainly I had mentioned as a first step to that end this stoppage of nuclear tests. We have been saying that not today, but for the last two or three years. If the hon. Members will look back, in this very House we have stated our approach to this question of disarmament, step by step, not in very great detail, but, nevertheless, a comprehensive approach. Our approach is much the same. But whatever our approach may be, it is no good my being or our country being hundred per cent in the right in what it says but saying it in a way which produces no effect on current events. I may have a certain satisfaction that I am so right; I may become rather sanctimonious about it. But it has no effect. Therefore, the question is not of saying just what logically you might consider correct, but what in the circumstances of today is helpful towards the objectives that we aim at. Obviously that is the only test, not some kind of individual satisfaction being derived.

Therefore, we have often to tone down; we have often to suggest one step instead of half a dozen that we would like people to adopt; we have often to change the language. As an example of that, I placed before this House that resolution on co-existence which was passed unanimously by the Political Committee of the United Nations two or three days ago. I admit that the passing of a resolution by the United Nations does not bring peace nearer. But I do submit that

it was a very considerable step for the United Nations unanimously to pass that resolution on co-existence embodying those principles about which we have talked as *Panchsheel*. The word '*Panchsheel*' was not there, nor was the word 'co-existence' there. I would have liked those words to be there, but we did not attach value to a particular word. When we found that without those words the substance was there, we put that forward and it was accepted and accepted unanimously.

That was a very considerable achievement for the sponsors of that resolution. Apart from India, as you know, there were Yugoslavia and Sweden. Others, could, of course, have sponsored it too. But deliberately, we did not want any sponsoring of that from any country which was associated with the various military alliances on both sides. So, they went out. They supported the resolution certainly, but we wanted it to be the unallied countries, as they are called.

Now, that resolution that was passed, although it does not perhaps suddenly change the atmosphere of the world, certainly does tend to clarify it, certainly gives a direction to people's thinkings, and even if the governments in their fear or apprehension or in their thinking along certain grooves or lines of thought may not be much affected, the broad masses of public opinion in the world are affected by it. People are made to think that way, and in all countries today, whether you call them democratic or not, the opinion of large numbers of human beings counts; certainly, in democratic societies, it ultimately counts; it may not immediately; it makes a difference.

At the present moment, which is rather a psychological moment in world affairs, such a resolution, I think, has played a very considerable part, because public opinion in every country—and I would not exclude any

country except countries which have no public opinion and no thinking done, if there are such—is greatly agitated as to how to find a way out of this impasse. They are afraid of war, afraid not in a personal sense, but afraid of this tremendous holocaust that a possible war might bring. They see all these tendencies in one direction.

I referred this morning to aircraft carrying about hydrogen bombs, hundreds of aircraft all the time, during their patrols. Think of that. Think of two things. The first is the state of mind which thinks that something may happen and it has to be countered then and there with the hydrogen bomb. Otherwise, how can they send? If something happens, how can they send them from their country? No, there will be no time to save them. That is the way the mind goes. So, it must be there and then it could be dropped. And who is going to decide the dropping of that hydrogen bomb? Naturally who else but the captain or the commander of the aircraft? So it is a tremendous responsibility on the poor man.

The second thing is that obviously this kind of thing is not the prerogative of one side. There is a competition in doing the same, in doing the same thing that the other party does, so that one may not be left behind.

Some little time ago, I think the Government of Poland issued some kind of, call it notice, call it warning, call it what you like, that if this is going to be done in Western Europe, they consider themselves entitled to have aircraft flying about with nuclear bombs too. You see how the evil spreads. They can justify it, 'why should we not', as the Western side can justify it. They can say: 'We are doing what somebody else is doing'.

So step by step they go along to ultimate danger, copying each other so as not to be outbid or outdone by the other party. It is a position of extreme gravity. That is why we have to give thought to it, and we

have to give thought not in a long-range way that gradually something may happen, and let us—as Shri Brajeshwar Prasad said—get nuclear bombs ourselves! I do not know what conception he has of a nuclear bomb. He does not want industry to grow, but he only wants nuclear bombs. I do submit that a little more intelligence be exercised in considering these grave problems. I do submit that it is not fair to this House to be treated to these light-hearted jests without any meaning, without any logical sequence, just repeating some idea when we are considering a matter of extreme gravity.

So this is the position. There are three or four positions that India can occupy. One is, of course, line-up with this party or that. No doubt, if India so chose, it could possibly be among the candidates for receiving nuclear bombs. What we will do with the nuclear bombs, I do not know. I take it there is hardly anyone in this House who approves of that type of line-up. They may criticise our policy here and there, but so far as I know, no one here would approve of our lining up in this way in these military blocs and military alliances.

If we do not line up, what do we do? An hon. Member on the other side—I believe belonging to the Socialist Party—said that our policy is ridiculous; we should stand for a Third Force. He said something to that effect. A Third Force is being talked about for some time. What the Third Force means, I have been wholly unable to understand. I think any idea, any conception of putting forward a Third Force has absolutely no relation to reality. It has no meaning not only no meaning, but if it does have some meaning, it would be a wrong meaning. It would be a wrong step. It would in fact be ourselves coming into the arena of power politics and possibly with that so called Third Force trying sometimes to join this group and sometimes the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

other, obviously, or sometimes keeping apart.

Today how is force measured? By armed strength, nuclear strength, ballastic strength, money strength—call it what you like. India has none of these; nor has any country, which is likely to be a member of the so-called Third Force, any pretensions to armed might or financial power. I do not know what exactly this collection of countries together would do, apart from the fact that they will not collect together—they think differently, they think in different directions.

So let us give up these rather fanciful ideas which have no particular meaning or sense. We have to deal with a situation in which there are two giant powers with enormous military might, afraid of each other—let us be clear about it—afraid of each other's might, afraid of what the other would do, and at the same time more afraid of the other party getting a certain lead and, therefore, trying passionately to catch up to the lead or going ahead; sometimes one is a little ahead, sometimes the other is a little ahead. As I said, it really matters very little now who has got the lead because both have passed that mark which gives them enough power to destroy. If they have passed that mark it does not really make too much difference whether the world is destroyed completely once or twice over. If you are dead you are dead. It is no good trying to make you 'deadir'. Dead are dead so that there is no escape from it when these policies are going on.

We have suggested a stoppage of nuclear tests. The stoppage of nuclear tests is a very very small thing in the present context. But, it is a good thing, a right thing and a dramatic thing. And the moment one does that, one is compelled by circumstances to take up other matters. But I want a comprehensive disarmament agreement, not only stoppage of nuclear tests. I realise that it is not enough. I do submit that stop-

page of tests does not mean stoppage; it does not change the balance of power. If you will, I won't use the word stoppage; I will use the word "suspension" so that you may consider the question, the other aspects of the question in the course of the next six months, or next year, and evolve something more. If you do not, if the world wants to go to perdition, it will go to perdition in spite of everything. But, anyhow, let us make an effort to stop it going down that way. That is our proposal.

President Eisenhower in the course of his reply to me which he was gracious enough to send refers to this matter and then says.

"To stop these tests at this time, in the absence of knowledge that we can go on and achieve effective limitations on nuclear weapons production and on other elements of armed strength as well as a measure of assurance against surprise attack, is a sacrifice which we could not in prudence accept.

To do so would increase rather than diminish the threat of aggression and war.

I believe that bolder and more far-reaching measures are required. Specifically, I believe that any Government which declares its desire to agree not to use nuclear weapons should, if it is sincere, be prepared to agree to bring an end to their production.

Agreement to devote all future production of fissionable material to peaceful uses is, as I see it, of utmost importance."

You see the fear is a surprise attack. The fear is that there is no assurance that something might not happen unawares. I quite recognise that fear and it is for that reason that it has been suggested all along that there should be all kinds of control and inspection and all that. Nevertheless, before control comes in.

there might be a surprise attack. Personally, I do not see how a surprise attack becomes more likely by the stoppage of nuclear tests. I do not see myself the connection. But, for my part I am in entire agreement, if I may say so with all respect, with President Eisenhower that this is not enough; other things should be done also. There should be a bolder and more far-reaching measure, and that production of nuclear weapons should stop. I entirely and respectfully agree with him. I go still further, in many ways, but, it will serve little purpose. So I say let us go as far as possible.

But my immediate appeal is that one step should be taken, to be followed by the next. If we wait for the whole thing to come, the whole agreement to emerge in this atmosphere of tremendous fear and suspicion, it does not come although people want it. That is the unfortunate part. Therefore, we have to go as far as stopping the tests.

I personally believe, and I think most people who have studied this problem believe, that no country and no country's people want war at the present moment or in the foreseeable future. And, I say this because most eminent people say that of the hostile country—leave out their own country; everybody will say that in respect of themselves. If that is so, then any possible element of risk from surprise attack is presumably absent within that period apart from what I just mentioned that the surprise attack can take place, test or no test. Stopping of tests does not stop the possibility of surprise attack. Therefore, I would submit that the time has come when this matter should be dealt with—I cannot deal with it; I can only appeal—by the countries and deal with directly speaking to each other and not at each other, as they have got into the habit of doing.

We have arrived at a stage where you cannot solve the problems in the

world by armed might. It has often been said that bread is important but we do not achieve human progress by bread alone. You may well say now that armed might is not enough; it has in fact become a tremendous danger. If I may repeat some pregnant words to which I referred this morning—I think they were from President Eisenhower's speech—victory for any party is out of the question. A solution should be found in which there is no defeat and no victory. It has reminded me of the words of a great son of India, Buddha, who said that true victory is that in which no one is defeated.

It that is the approach to this question, there may be no difficulty in finding a solution or hundred solutions. But if the approach is to injure and humiliate the other party, then of course the other reacts with the same suspicion, to injure and humiliate, and nothing is done. Because we have got outside the range of one party solving the problem by defeating the other party, if you are outside that range, the only alternative to complete destruction of everything is finding solutions, if not quickly, step by step.

Now, I shall refer briefly to one or two matters that have been raised. The hon. Member, Shri Chaudhuri, spoke with emotion about the conditions in Goa. Other Members also talked about Goa. Some have asked me if I do not feel concerned about this. Some ask me why I do not allow the people to act in Goa. Others have made other proposals about Goa. Shri Mahanty has said that I show great concern about Algeria but not much about Goa.

I do not think, if I may say so, that hon. Member has been quite just if he thinks that I did not feel concerned about the difficulties in Goa or the problem in Goa. I did not say much about Goa because I did not have much to say and it is no good my repeating what I have said. Goa is

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

a matter not only of grave concern—not in the larger sense of a world event—but it is a matter of deep concern, deep national concern and human concern. Well, the problem of Goa is something that hurts us all the time. The problem of 300 or 400 prisoners remaining there all this time in these horrible conditions which have been described by the hon. Member who himself has suffered this kind of imprisonment and prison life there is a continuous pain and an affront to us. I honestly do not see my way to do anything dramatic to put an end to it and I do not wish to do anything which merely is brave talk without bringing relief to them or going near towards the solution of the problem.

18 hrs.

Shri Dange said: "Why not allow the people to act?" Well, the answer is that we cannot allow the people to act without being in the picture ourselves. I cannot understand how an organised State can function, if we sit tight and allow our people to be shot down and butchered there. It cannot happen. We do not want our people to be butchered in this way. Either we should be prepared to follow it up with our army—that is a different matter—and if we are not prepared to do that, then we cannot allow our people to act. It is bad enough, what has happened, all this suffering of brave people who have gone there for the sake of freeing Goa, and we do not feel that it would be right to encourage more sacrifices of this kind of our brave young men and young women. I do not know about the future. A time may come when some other steps may be taken; that is a different matter, I am merely talking about the present.

Unfortunately, all these things are tied up. We cannot take a step in Goa, a military step or a like step, without upsetting all our approaches in other places, all our policies, all our assurances and pledges, and all that goes down without really our

helping ourselves in Goa very much. I am sure the Goa problem will be solved, and solved to the advantage of the people of Goa and our advantage, because there is no other way. But I confess that it would be wrong for me to say that I expect something to happen very suddenly or quickly.

Several Members referred to our publicity. Before that, may I first refer to what Shri Dange said about African people? I was rather surprised to hear what he said, because our policy in regard to Indians in Africa, or indeed in any part of the world, has been repeatedly stated and clearly stated. We have to be naturally, and we are, interested, deeply interested, in the Indians abroad being able to live their lives there with self-respect and with decency. Certainly, we do not like any country in the wide world to ill-treat Indian citizens, Indian nationals, or to give them a place which is lower than that of others.

We know what is happening in South Africa where they are so ill-treated. And, they are not Indian nationals, remember. They are not Indian nationals but they are people of Indian descent. Not only we, not only countries in Africa and Asia, but most other countries too have declared themselves in the United Nations and elsewhere, against South Africa's racial policy. But the fact remains that in spite of their declaration there has been no change there; in fact, things are a little worse.

Now, hon. Members may well ask us: "Well, what are you going to do?" Frankly, I am not doing anything at present. I cannot do anything. I cannot declare war on South Africa. And, I simply have to carry on such work in the United Nations and other countries as we can and build up our own strength. What else can I do?

But, generally our policy has been clearly stated, that Indians abroad—I am not talking of South Africa, but of people who go to East Africa or other places—should always consider the interest of the people of that country as first; they should never allow themselves to be placed in a position where they are exploiting the people of that country; they should be friendly to the people of those countries, co-operate with them and help them, maintaining their own dignity and self-respect. That is not only a policy which I consider the right one, but the only practical policy, because if Indians do not do that abroad they will be ground between the two milestones of the local population there and the foreign element from Europe and elsewhere there because their interests come into conflict with the foreign settlers' interests. Because, normally, the Indians are the only persons in some of those countries who work more or less on the level of foreign settlers—I mean, trade, commerce, etc., the local inhabitants not having, generally speaking, reached that standard. So, they are constantly coming into conflict with foreign settlers. Now, if we come into conflict with the local people too, where are they? They simply get crushed and pushed out. So, from the purely opportunist point of view, that is the only policy they can pursue.

But it is not for opportunism alone that we said it, because we think in the long run or in the short run, that is the only right policy for them, to associate themselves as closely as possible with the interests of the people of that country and never to make it appear or to function in a way that they become an exploiting agency there. In fact, we have gone thus far, and said, "if you cannot be and if you are not friendly to those people, in that country, come back to India and not spoil the fair name of India elsewhere."

Then our publicity has been criticised by various Members. I am not satisfied with our publicity apparatus and we are constantly trying to improve it. But I do think that the type of criticism one gets is not, if I may say so with all respect, very informed. Hon. Members seem to imagine that we have merely to state India's case, and everybody says, "How right you are?" Well, that is not so in the wide world. Peoples, first of all, in most countries are just not interested in what India's case is or anybody else's case is. They are far too involved in their own local problems and otherwise to take the trouble to study it. People who make policies sit in chancelleries, in foreign offices, and the like or, if you like, the newspapers and others. These are the main organs in those countries.

Now, it so happens that our broad policy, not in regard to any particular subject but our broad world policy, is a policy which though it is often approved by the peoples of the world is not often approved by the chancelleries of the world, by the foreign offices, because we do not often fall in line—and that is apart from the content of that policy—and because of the fact that we presume to have our say when we should remain quite. We presume to express our view-points or sometimes Asia's view-point with some force and energy and this rather upsets those who are so used always to consider the matter from the point of view of Europe, as if Europe was the centre of things.

The fact that Asia has emerged in world affairs is sometimes mentioned, but it is not fully realised that for hundreds of years Europe was the centre of international affairs. Europe disposed of large tracts of Asia, Africa, etc., If there was a war, the war was between two European countries to divide the soils. So, Asia and Africa were looked upon as an area which was to be considered disposed of by Europe. Later, the United States came in; in effect, in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]  
 this country. And the United States of America, being a great country has of course, a very big say in matters.

Now, when I say Europe, I am including in that term Russia and those countries too because they were very much more Europe in the past than now. So, these countries have got into the habit of thinking that they are the protectors, deciders, of the future of Asia and Africa. I do not say that they have not at all changed their opinion; they have, they are gradually changing it. But still they have not changed it adequately. When the people in a part of Asia express their opinions rather strongly and they are not in line with European or American or Russian thinking, there is a feeling created that here is an outsider coming in. It is a nuisance; he makes a nuisance of himself. He should remain quiet and behave as the low orders are supposed to behave before their superiors and present a memorial or representation. That is a basic thing. I am perhaps exaggerating my language but I am trying to put it to you dramatically. That is the feeling and it is this. By a certain course of events, it has so happened that India has played a more direct role in this matter than some other Asian countries.

Then, this Asian-African group of nations in the United Nations was formed. It is not a formal group; it is an informal group. That was resented by the countries of Europe, America and other places. Of course, they said, here again is a group trying to come out of its proper position and trying to lecture to us as to what we should do. It may be that the Asian-African group is all wrong. It may make a wrong decision. I do not say that countries of Asia and Africa are always right. They are often wrong and they often put forward things without thinking. That is not the point. But the point is that Asia and Africa certainly represent an entity or entities which

do not take orders from others as a rule. And, India having played some important part in this process, the chancelleries of the great powers do not look with favour on this upstart behaving in this way. That is a fact. That is the basic thing.

You talk about policies and all that. All your propaganda and all your propagandists will not help unless your propaganda and your propagandists fall into line with their policy. That is the basic issue. If you fall in line, you do not require all this propaganda. What do you want all this propaganda for? So, I would submit that this matter should be kept in mind.

Mr. Anthony referred to what you call the marathon speeches of our colleague, Mr. Krishna Menon, in the Security Council, in regard to Kashmir. I do not know if he has taken the trouble, because it is not an easy matter, to read through all those speeches. But I would commend him to read them through, because it became important for us to place before the Security Council—and the Security Council is not the American public or the world public; it is the public which is interested, the individuals who are interested. It became important that we should place our case there fully in detail, step by step, so that nothing should be lacking in our placing of that case and the record should be full. Not only the record, but the members of the Security Council and the chancelleries and foreign offices who do read these things should know exactly where we stand about it; they should have no doubt.

If I may say so, it was because we placed an unanswerable case that there was anger against us, and in the subsequent steps taken, no attempt was made to answer that case; not the slightest attempt. The whole thing was swept away by saying, "Oh! These people are going back. We are in the year 1956 or 1957 and not five or six years ago. Why go back?" Not a single attempt was

made to meet a single point, valid point, raised on behalf of India, because there was no answer to that. People criticised these so-called marathon speeches, because they did not like that. They had no answer for it. What they would like is for India or our representative to have slurred over those basic points and having slurred over them, to make an appeal to all, that "for the sake of peace and goodwill, help us and we shall help you" and then patronisingly they might say. "We had been helped. All right; we will see that your interests are not injured" and so on and so forth. We have taken up that attitude long enough and it was time we placed our case firmly and clearly before the world. That was done and there we stand in regard to it.

May I say just one thing more? Reference was made to Pakistan and our troubles with Pakistan. First of all, may I send my good wishes to the new Government of Pakistan that has been formed? Because, let us recognise a basic patent fact—I do not think perhaps everybody does so—that it is to our grave disadvantage if there is any kind of instability in Pakistan, political or economic. It is to our great disadvantage. It is utterly wrong for any person to imagine that we desire instability there. We want a stable Government, a stable economy with which we can co-operate in the measure we can. We are prepared to go far to co-operate with it.

I should like to put to you a thought which I have had in my mind, no doubt, many of you may have had it too, in regard to our relations with Pakistan. People talk about Kashmir. People talk about canal waters and the like. They are important questions no doubt. But, where people go completely wrong, especially foreign people, is in thinking that Kashmir is the cause of the trouble between India and Pakistan, or canal waters is the cause of the trouble. That is not so. Kashmir and canal waters are the result of the trouble

between India and Pakistan, the consequence and not the cause of it. They would not have happened at all if our relations had been reasonably good.

We have inherited since the partition, before that and since the partition especially, ill-feelings, fear, suspicions and all that. It is because of this that we cannot easily settle these problems. I say, if by any chance, the Kashmir problem was completely out of the way, the canal water problem was completely out of the way, yet the trouble will continue till it goes out. It won't continue for ever. That is the basic thing. We are constituted differently, as an hon. Member opposite, I think, reminded us, or someone on this side.

Take the Kashmir problem. It is not a question of a patch of territory, valuable as that territory is to us or to Pakistan, important as it is in a hundred ways. It is not even a question, although it is so, of human beings because it is a human problem of 4 million inhabitants. But, even apart from all these, it is a basic question of the whole structure of our Government, the whole secular democracy that we have sought to build up in India. The Kashmir problem is a challenge to that. Pakistan has built itself up with something which, with all respect to it, I might say, is neither secular nor democratic. So that we come up against these basic difficulties, basic ways of thinking, and out of them other difficulties arise. And, by any kind of Security Council resolution or some kind of balm laid on, if we try to solve this question without that basic thing, that is not a cure of the trouble or the disease. It will erupt somewhere else in some other form. It erupts in East Pakistan. These huge migrations: what are they due to? After all, is it due to Kashmir? Is it due to canal water? It is due to that basic difficulty between India and Pakistan.

You cannot get rid of the basic difficulty if you go on encouraging the wrong kind of thing in Pakistan as

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

some countries have encouraged. The Kashmir issue has been used as a plaything by the Pakistan Government and others there just to hide other issues, other difficulties. That is the basic trouble. But, the fact must always be remembered that there is no way. there is no sensible or even other way as between India and Pakistan except for them to find a way of co-operating and living in a friendly way. Because, geography insists upon it. We cannot run away from each other apart from history, tradition, culture and so many common things, apart from the fact that tens of thousands of families are split up between India and Pakistan. Therefore, in spite of all these difficulties, we have to aim at friendly relations with Pakistan. And we have always to remember that so far as the people of Pakistan and the people of India are concerned, there is, or should be, no trouble between them, no conflict between them. We are of the same stock, we fought for independence, though the leaders of Pakistan did not; if I may say so, they opposed it, or many of them, at any rate.

So, it is this broad approach that we should follow with Pakistan, and it is this broad approach that we should follow in the rest of the world. And in this particular matter which is dominant today, that is, this question of world tension, it has become urgent and important that in the near future some step should be taken towards a detente. As I said in that appeal I made to President Eisenhower and

Mr. Bulganin, our earth has become too small for the weapons of the atomic age, and unless we control them, they will liquidate the lot of us.

And so we come back to what the Buddha said: let us try for a victory in which no one is defeated.

About the amendments, I do not wish to go into each amendment, but if I may say so, I would be happy to accept the amendment moved by Shri Radha Raman, and not the others.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know from the other hon. Members. Shri Jaganatha Rao—does he want to press his amendment?

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): No, Sir.

*The substitute motion was, by leave, withdrawn*

Mr. Speaker: I think I may put amendment No. 5 first. The question is:

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.”

*The motion was adopted*

*All other substitute motions were barred.*

18.16 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday the 15th December, 1957.*