

- (xxiv) The Manipur Foodgrains (Movement) Control Second Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1249 dated the 18th October, 1960.
- (xxv) The Madhya Pradesh Foodgrains (Restrictions on Border Movement) Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1272 dated the 29th October, 1960.
- (xxvi) The Rice (Punjab) Second Price Control Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1276 dated the 27th October, 1960.
- (xxvii) The Rice (Madhya Pradesh) Second Price Control Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1277 dated the 27th October, 1960.
- (xxviii) Notification No. G.S.R. 1308 dated the 5th November, 1960.
- (xxix) The Delhi Rice (Export Control) Second Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1336 dated the 12th November, 1960.
- (xxx) The Delhi Wheat and Wheat Products (Export Control) Third Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1337 dated the 12th November, 1960.
- (xxxi) The Rice (Southern Zone) Movement Control Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1338 dated the 12th November, 1960.
- (xxxii) The Rajasthan Foodgrains (Restrictions on Border Movement) Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1339 dated the 12th November, 1960.
- (xxxiii) The Madhya Pradesh Foodgrains (Restrictions on Border Movement) Amendment Order, 1960 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1340 dated the 12th November, 1960. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-2455/60].
- (2) A copy of each of the following Notifications under sub-section (6) of Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, making certain further amendments to the Sugar (Movement Control) Order, 1959:—
- (i) G.S.R. 1080 dated the 17th September, 1960.
  - (ii) G.S.R. 1155 dated the 23rd September, 1960.
  - (iii) G.S.R. 1219 dated the 15th October, 1960.
  - (iv) G.S.R. 1344 dated the 9th November, 1960. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-2456/60].
- 
- 12.02½ hrs.
- COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**
- SEVENTY-SECOND REPORT**
- Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda):** I beg to present the Seventy-second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.
- 
- 12.03 hrs.
- MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—Contd.**
- Mr. Speaker:** The House will now resume further consideration of the following motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister on the 22nd November, 1960, namely:
- “That the international situation, with particular reference to the matters that have come up before the United Nations General Assembly in its current session, be taken into consideration.”

[Mr. Speaker]

Out of 9 hours allotted, the time taken is 4 hours 20 minutes. So, 4 hours 40 minutes remain. That is, we will have to conclude by 4:40. We can carry on till 5, May I know how much time the hon. Prime Minister will require for reply?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** About 45 minutes; not more than an hour.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will call him at 4 o'clock. Shri Siva Raj, who was in possession of the House, may continue.

There are as many as 29 hon. Members who have sent their names. So, I would request hon. Members to confine their remarks to 10 minutes each. In exceptional cases, I will allow one or two more minutes.

**Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved—Sch. Castes):** Yesterday I was speaking of colonialism. Colonialism is of different kinds. There is the colonialism of the British; there is the colonialism of the American type; there is the colonialism of the Russian type. Somebody said there is the colonialism of the Indian type too; I suppose it does not exist.

What is happening in Congo is colonialism of the Belgium type. Even though the big powers or the colonialists go away from these areas, they continue to have economic stronghold over these areas.

I want to refer to matters nearer home. Mention has been made of the threat to India from China and also from other quarters. When this is happening, I want to mention that the internal affairs of India are in a mess and they are far more disturbing than the threat of incursions from outside, because we find that from Punjab in the West to Assam in the East, the conditions are so unstable on account of communalism, parochialism, linguism and also on account of the new dissension in the

ruling party in U.P. The conditions in the Indo-Gangetic plain are very unstable and they are far more disturbing than the threat to India from outside. In fact, the conditions are such as to attract the attention of our neighbours like China, because these conditions would encourage them to attack us. Far from conserving the strength and resources to see that the unity of India is not disrupted, our people are dissipating these resources in their local quarrels. My submission is, while being concerned about the foreign situation, the Government of India should be very much concerned about the local affairs also, because both go together for the security of India.

Talking about China, my view is—I suppose it will be accepted by most of the hon. Members of this House—that China obviously fears that India is competing with her in the race, if one might say so, for the leadership of what we call the Afro-Asian group and also the leadership of the Asian nations. Their object seems to be not so much actually to invade India or take up our territory as to make India concentrate her attention and spend most of her money upon the defence equipment and the defence forces, instead of utilising them for the industrial development of India. There is a sort of fear in China that on account of the execution of our Plans, India has been able to secure its industrialisation and economic progress through what is called the democratic method. So, the intention of China is to obstruct our industrial and economic development; that is the reason for China to be constantly knocking at our frontiers and threatening to occupy our territory, thereby distracting our attention and energy from the real problems that we have got before us.

Yesterday the Prime Minister has not made mention of this subject in his motion. Certainly the object of the motion is not necessarily to sing a praise of the United Nations. It

should also include other matters like the safety and security of India. But in this particular motion, he has not made any reference to China for the simple reason perhaps that there are certain talks going on between India and China at the official level. Even so, the country is very much worried about the way things take place in the treatment of the Chinese question. People all over India are under the impression that day after day, in spite of the talk of Panchsheel and peaceful negotiations, probably exactly because we talk of Panchsheel and peaceful negotiations, the danger is coming nearer and nearer home. That is the feeling of the people. I do not know what the Prime Minister and the Government of India are doing in trying to dispel this notion from the minds of the people. If people get into that psychology, then everything will fall to the ground at the time of crisis. I do not know why we should not exert such influence as we can command upon the Prime Minister, both individually and as the head of the Government and also, I should say, as the most popular politician in India to pay his entire attention to internal affairs and see that the unity of India is strengthened for the purpose of meeting any aggression.

I find there is a tendency in the ruling party to discard any suggestion that may be made from any quarter from this side of the House. They take it for granted.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid, his time is up.

**Shri Siva Raj:** I require a few more minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** I find that he had taken 8 minutes yesterday and 10 minutes today.

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** He is speaking extremely cogently.

**Mr. Speaker:** But if all the hon. Members want to speak, what can I do?

**Shri Siva Raj:** I merely wanted to appeal to the Prime Minister, and more so to the members of the ruling party to understand our viewpoint. They seem to misrepresent us everywhere and thereby they mislead the country. Whenever we say that people of India are worried over this foreign aggression they say that the country is united and the Prime Minister will take care of it. I wonder whether this is a correct stand.

Then I want to refer to one other matter which is somewhat personal. It is unfortunate that Shri Dwivedy, when he spoke yesterday, made mention of Shri Krishna Menon, not as Defence Minister but as the leader of the Indian Delegation. I claim to know Shri Krishna Menon very well. He was my class-mate years ago and he comes from the same college. Having known him and having also known his services to the country and the great sacrifice that he has made, one should not attribute to him any motive of disloyalty to our country. There is no doubt that he has got his own individual personality; probably, he has got an aggressive personality, not an enviable one, unlike that of our Prime Minister. But that does not warrant the remarks that were made against him. It is unfair, apart from the fact that it is uncalled for. I still feel that Shri Krishna Menon can do his best to serve the interests of the country very well.

With these words, I once more wish to emphasize that our Prime Minister and his Government should attach more importance to the internal affairs of our country and see that the unity of our country, instead of being threatened, is strengthened.

**Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi):** Sir, we have been given to understand through what has appeared in the press of the present meeting of the United Nations General Assembly, where the heads of several States were present, that they it was a colourful, spectacular, dramatic and at times it was a farcial session; but the Prime Minister's description of it

[Acharya Kripalani]

yesterday was, I am sorry to say, very prosiac. It seems that nothing was done for disarmament, for phased disarmament, for no party having an advantage by it over another party, or for controls. So, once again, the hopes of the world were defeated as when the Summit talks were not allowed to be held in Paris.

I am glad that about Congo our Prime Minister has got a plan that if the Parliament is called everything will be all right. But Parliaments cannot function when armies are functioning and unless these armies are, by some method or other, suppressed and those who want to play dictators are taken away, no Parliament can function.

In spite of what the Prime Minister said yesterday, Sir, it is my firm opinion that only on rare occasions must the heads of States meet and they must not meet in such big numbers as they met last time. As a Matter of fact, I hold that it would make for better understanding between nations if the heads are not involved in controversies. Diplomacy is carried on behind closed doors and in privacy. Usually, this privacy is destroyed when the heads of States appear on the scene. Then attention is drawn away from the business in hand to the heads of States. Having generally to act in public, they develop sometimes an attitude of posture, a dramatic attitude, which has a tendency to become farcial, as on the last occasion. Diplomats carry on their work away from the public gaze and from the press and publicity, as they have often to exchange harsh words with each other. But such hard exchanges do not appear in the press. They feel that harsh words at the negotiating table are part of the game and they have not to be too sensitive. But if uncomplimentary remarks or impolite and insulting remarks are made about the heads of the States, the whole nation feels that it has been insulted. For instance nothing would have been more damaging to the cause of good understanding than the un-

complimentary and impolite language used by the Prime Minister of Russia about the head of the State of America. It injured the feelings of the whole nation. So also the restrictions imposed by America on the movement of the Russian Prime Minister and the demonstrations that were staged in America must have injured the feelings of the whole nation of Russia.

Here I must take this opportunity to express my admiration for the small kingdom of Nepal, whose representative did not shirk the duty of protesting against the unparliamentary and abusive language of Shri Khrushchev at the United Nations Organisation. I am sorry that for this the Soviet Prime Minister directed his anger and his scorn against Nepal and made the remark that he did not know whether Nepal had a Parliament and he would have to consult Russian geography books. This, I am afraid, will be a vain search, for geography books contain no information on comparative politics. I am sorry that India did not raise its voice in support of Nepal, though we hear so much about India's stand on tolerance and dignified behaviour not only in this Parliament but also in international Assemblies. It is, I believe, best to avoid occasions for the coming together of the heads of States unless ground has been prepared already by the diplomats and they come to sign what has got to be signed by them.

Equally undersirable are frequent visits of heads of Governments to other States. Their welcome can be spoiled by a party or a group that is against the Government. This would be regarded not only as an insult to the high dignitary but also to the nation he happens to represent for the time being. Americans greatly resented the cancellation of the invitation to their President because of hostile demonstrations. Recently, Mr. Khrushchev was asked why he did not go to Hungary. He replied that he did not like to be placed in the

position in which Mr. Eisenhower had been placed by the Japanese.

Further, the welcome that every head of Government receives in foreign countries is just like what was given on former occasions to kings and princes. Not only a red Carpet but a golden carpet is spread for their reception. The guests are treated as gods though some of them are only fallen angels. It is against all democratic principles to exalt individuals so that they may consider themselves as superior beings. When heads of Governments receive such extravagant, pompous and undemocratic receptions in foreign countries, their people at home for whom they have done nothing, come to have a false idea of their worth and value. The heads of States may often have suppressed their people and denied them the freedom of citizens but they receive such ovations outside and are praised so much that it gives to the common people an exaggerated and false idea of their rulers. This newly acquired habit of the heads of States wandering about the four corners of the world, in their year of office, is something which is not very desirable. It leads to no results at all. Their tours in foreign countries are generally guided and they do not come in contact with the common people, nor do they know their difficulties and their troubles. They go from one feast to another and then disappear with an agreed communique which is full only of platitudes.

There is little doubt that the U.N. Organisation's structure does need a change. Its different executive bodies, as the Security, Political and other Councils, need to be remodelled to represent the changed condition in that organisation now that it consists of Asia-African nations who have recently achieved their independence from imperial rule. But this can only be done in a calm atmosphere and not the one which was recently witnessed in New York. In such an over-charged atmosphere no useful work can be done. It is only after these great men

left the U.N.O. that the U.N.O could normally function and do its everyday business. Every effort, therefore, should be made to enhance the prestige of the U.N.O. I am afraid this was not done last time when the heads of States met.

The Russian Prime Minister began by denouncing the chief executive, the Secretary-General, who under very difficult circumstances has been trying to carry out the duties entrusted to him by the U.N.O. in Congo. Mr. Khrushchev called the Secretary-General a fool. And yet, this man appointed Shri Rajeshwar Dayal whose report had been commended even by the Communists here.

One great change necessary in the U.N.O. is that there should be no veto. If there are no special representatives in the U.N.O. who have more power than others, I think it will be possible for people to consent to the inclusion of Communist China in that organisation. I think, these changes are necessary, but they can only be brought about in an atmosphere of peace and goodwill and not when unparliamentary and abusive language is used.

The disadvantages of the heads of States coming together and directly participating in the U.N.O. were clear from the fate of the five-neutral power resolution. The resolution was good. It was well-intentioned. It wanted to ease tension between two individuals and, through them, two great countries of the world. The way its purpose was sought to be defeated was very unseemly. But the fate of the resolution was sealed by the authors of the resolution themselves. They had consulted in this matter nobody, excepting themselves. They were also, it would appear, in a hurry to run away home. It is not thus that the marriage of two adults is to be brought about in this sputnik age. And to suppose that the marriage of not adults but old people, the heads of two powerful States, could be brought about by a resolution passed in the U.N. Assembly and that having united them they will remain happy ever

[Acharya Kripalani]

afterwards was a very queer thing. If, suppose, not heads of States but the ordinary diplomats had brought about such a resolution, the first thing that they would have done would have been to consult the parties concerned or at least they would have consulted their friends. Both parties had put conditions that were unacceptable to each other. Under such circumstances, to expect that the resolution would be passed was a little too much. I also feel that if the resolution had been passed it would have put one party or the other and maybe both parties in an awkward position. Such awkward positions between heads of States must be avoided.

One good thing done at the present session is the resolution passed against imperialism. However, I am sorry that our representatives did not work in consonance with the policy laid down by the hon. Prime Minister himself, namely, that wherever there is injustice and tyranny India's voice will be raised against it. If there is a trans-oceanic imperialism, there is another kind of imperialism which just creeps in and occupies neighbouring countries. It nibbles at them and enslaves them. But our Prime Minister unfortunately makes a distinction between one imperialism and another though the essence of both is the same—political dominance and also economic exploitation. If we are to be non-aligned, we must keep the balance true between the two kinds of domination, the old and the new. In our Prime Minister's words, we must not remain neutral. When justice is threatened, freedom menaced and aggression takes place anywhere in the world, whether in the East or in the West.

This brings me to our conflict with China. India suffered the most by the disappearance of the buffer State of Tibet. When we argue against China in our correspondence as given in the White Papers, we say that Tibet was free not only internally, but inter-

nationally. It was free to sign international treaties and did sign them. But, when it comes to a question of recognising Tibet's sovereignty, we talk of the suzerainty of China. After all, on very rare occasions, if at all, did China exercise effective suzerainty over Tibet. Supposing it did, effective suzerainty is imperialism. We have been saying from house tops that we are against all imperialism. Yet, we are so nervous of Communist China that we dare not bring the case of Tibet before the U.N.O. When some smaller powers dare to bring it, we do not support them. We do so by saying that it would be against the best interests of the Tibetans. We seem to know their interests better than they themselves know as even the British did when they were here. I am sure the same argument applies when we advocate the cause of Indians and other Asiatics and the Negroes against race discrimination in South Africa. I am afraid, with all our idealism we have failed in this respect. We seem to be oblivious even of the fact of the denial of human rights which, unmistakably, has happened in the case of Tibet.

So far as the invasion of India is concerned, I am afraid the Prime Minister is less aware of its nature than would appear from the despatches addressed to China by his own department. The latest White Paper clearly spotlights the recent incursions in our territory, the violating of our air space, interference with our border trade and interference with pilgrims. All these have been done after the issue of the joint declaration last April in Delhi that pending enquiry, peaceful atmosphere should be maintained. The White Paper points out that recent Chinese action on our borders 'is a serious matter' which might 'finally lead to very unfortunate consequences' to the peace of the two countries, and I suppose, to the world. However, our Prime Minister called these unfriendly acts as merely 'petty' and 'minor' which have "nothing to do with the wider question of India's relationship with China." In every ship there

is a small needle in a frame hanging. If this needle is damaged or if it disappears, the ship would flounder. Small things are not small when they are significant of what has been done before and what is likely to be done. Small acts of aggression are not small when they show clearly the intention of the aggressor.

About the invasion of our air space 52 times, while the White Paper says that "it is difficult to believe that the planes which violated our air space were based anywhere other than on Chinese territory", what does our Prime Minister say? He says that it is not possible to identify planes flying at great heights. I wonder why then the statement issued by the department should have been here. Evidently the Prime Minister sees no contradiction between what his department says and what he himself says.

I am afraid that as in the past, so also now, our Prime Minister's utterances about Chinese aggression have not only been taken advantage of by our enemies inside and outside the country, but have also put our friends in confusion. Last year, when there was a complaint in Parliament against Chinese aggression, our Prime Minister said that in the territories occupied, "not a blade of grass grows and nobody lived". When I was recently in America, I was asked in a public meeting why we were bothered about Chinese aggression in a region where not a blade of grass grows, nor a man lives. What could I reply? But, I asked my questioner, what would be the attitude of America and its people if Russia occupied parts of Alaska, covered with snow and where not a blade of grass and not a man lives. To this, of course, the American friends had no answer to give.

Recently in America, our Prime Minister called the invasion of India not even as aggression, not even as a conflict but only as a theoretical controversy. This has been done after the warning we got last April from Chou En-lai. When he reached Kathmandu from Delhi, he complained that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in his talks with him

had not even mentioned the word aggression, but as soon as he had turned his back, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had accused China of aggression. We must remember that to minimise evil is to excuse it and partly to justify it. It is no use minimising the character of Chinese aggression against India whereby we have lost as many square-miles of our territory as would make a small kingdom in Europe.

Apart from what we have lost, we have to see the moral effect of the defeatist manner in which we are handling the situation and the demoralising effect it has on Sikkim and Bhutan and other Himalayan regions. The pro-Chinese propaganda by the communists in these areas would be of no effect if our policy and its execution had shown enough determination to hold what is rightly our own. Yesterday, the Prime Minister said that there would be special legislation necessary to check the activities of our internal enemies who favour Russia as against us.

**Some Hon. Members:** China

**Acharya Kripalani:** There is confusion. Yes, China.

**Some Hon. Members:** All the same.

**Acharya Kripalani:** It would appear that in spite of the Defence of India Act or what it called the Security Act, we have not got enough power to tackle people who indulge in activities that are against the best interests of our country and against even the integrity of the country.

Our Prime Minister once described our foreign policy as one of "building bridges and creating links between opposing groups and nations". He added, "so we have something like a solution for the trouble, passions and conflicts some powers are involved in". I am sure it will benefit us and the world better if we really had "something like a solution" for at least our own troubles. None of our international problems seems to be near any solution,—neither our dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir, nor the position of Indians in Ceylon or South Africa, nor Goa, nor the greatest pro-

[Acharya Kripalani]

blem that confronts us today with our new arrogant and power-intoxicated Communist neighbour, China. If we are not careful against China, we will, I am sure, come to trouble because China does not believe in peaceful co-existence in spite of its eternal talk about *Panch Sheel*. It believes in the inevitability of war with all nations which are not communist. Even Russia is not extreme enough for it. Russia is charged with being rightist, what they call right revisionist. Russia is right because it believes in co-existence and China believes in the inevitability of war. China's appetite has been growing on what it has been allowed to swallow. We have to be careful of our enemies inside and outside India if we value our freedom and our way of life.

My friends of the P.S.P. said something about our Defence Minister. I am reminded of what an old friend of mine told me: the more you talk of him, the more determined will be the Prime Minister to keep him, so leave him alone.

**The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon):** The Prime Minister desired me to intervene in this debate largely to give an account of the present position in regard to the disarmament problem in the United Nations. As a result of the decision of Government, I have the privilege of being chairman of the delegation of India in the United Nations. Certain observations have been made in regard to matters the facts as stated are, however, somewhat in error. Perhaps I should refer to them, but before I do so, I think it is appropriate for me to mention the co-operation and the team spirit that prevailed among the members of the delegation, some of whom are Members of this House and the other. This has largely contributed to our position and such useful efforts as we are able to make.

Reference was made, first of all, to the resolution moved on behalf of five

countries by the Prime Minister in early October, how disastrous it was, how untimely it was, and how ill-managed it was. Naturally, so far as the management and the general preparation for the resolution are concerned, the delegation must assume responsibility, even apart from the Prime Minister's own responsibility as the head of the Government. I would like to say if all resolutions must be passed, if all motions must find acceptance in an assembly, it is very difficult to understand the role of the Opposition in this House!

This resolution that was moved must be considered in the context of events in New York at the time. It was necessary for some one to take the initiative to set in motion currents in a direction reverse to the antagonisms and the acrimony that prevailed. The House will bear with me, and perhaps accept, if I say that irrespective of the voting results, the feeling in the Assembly, I would not say universally, but overwhelmingly, was one of relief and thankfulness that it was moved. It was touch and go whether it voted pass or not. Its main purpose was not merely the recording of a vote, and those who are familiar with Assembly procedures will realise that the mere passing of a resolution or its being lost is not the total significance as might be the case in other Assemblies, because the decisions of the United Nations are not like the decisions of this House, binding upon anybody. They are only recommendations—recommendations to whom, nobody knows! They are more expressions of world opinion, and while a number of countries either abstained or in some cases voted against, it was known that their sympathies were with the resolution; even more, it paved the way for the progress that was made afterwards. In all resistance, one has to keep on taking step after step, chipping away the resistance before oneself. Naturally the first attempt is likely to encounter the greater part of the resistance, and perhaps result in apparent failure. So, the Assembly as a whole at least those who took the



same view as in the resolution, were glad that this pioneer effort was made at that time.

the Council. Probably some day, it would be extended to this Assembly also.

Then, I would like to refer to one or two other matters. Reference was made yesterday to the Indian delegation opposing proposals made by others for the expansion of the Councils of the United Nations. I do not know what kinds of reports appeared in our newspapers, but it is quite true that the Indian delegation did say they would not support the particular resolution that was before the Committee. That does not mean that they do not support the issue. What is perhaps not realised is that there was an Assembly resolution last year calling upon us to do certain things; that resolution cannot be changed unless that resolution was rescinded by a two-third majority. The proposal before the Committee was that the Committee should pass a resolution on saying the Council should be expanded which it was presumed would exert pressure to the powers. When it is known that this initiative came from that group of countries who are already over-represented, and probably are afraid of losing their over-representation, it should be realised that those who want expansion should adopt such tactics as would expansion really and in fact possible and not merely indulge in cold war tactics.

The facts are these. No change in any organ of the United Nations can take place except under the provisions of the Charter which require its amendment. Amendment of the Charter requires unanimity among the great Powers that are permanent members of the United Nations. Whether we like it or not, whether it is right or not—I am not going into that question now—that is the Charter, and that is the only way it can be managed. There is unanimity in the opinion, as the Prime Minister pointed out yesterday emanating from all sides that there must be reorganisation, there must be expansion of these bodies, especially because, today, the United Nations has 99 members,

Then there are certain statements made mistakes of fact which would embarrass us in our future work. It was said that the purpose of this resolution was, so to say, lock President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev in a room or something of that kind! Very deliberately it had been drafted in a form where it only referred to renewal of contacts. It might well be asked, if it is renewal of contacts, why should it not have been stated to be between the two countries rather than between these two heads of Governments or States? The reason is that the United States and the Soviet Union are still in diplomatic and friendly relations. There has been no breach of them, there have been no caveats, no *demarches* or anything entered in regard to their general relations. The deadlock that had arisen was a result of the failure of the Summit in which these two principal participants were the parties concerned, and that is why the reference was made to them—and also because of the nature and character of the Government, on the one hand, of the United States, and, on the other, of the Soviet Union. These gentlemen represent their Governments, though one is head of the State, and the other the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and therefore, the format of the resolution was not only appropriate, it was necessary, it was proper in the circumstances. It is equally right that when by the tortuous procedures which is probably legitimate in debate, the purpose of a resolution is totally defeated, and when you get something totally contrary to what is intended, the mover of the resolution should withdraw it. In fact, in the Security Council of the United Nations there is a rule that when amendments are moved in such a way, and accepted, as to change the purpose of a resolution, the sponsors are entitled to withdraw it without the permission of

[Shri Krishna Menon]

while at San Francisco it had about 45. Therefore, we had to think, being seriously interested in this matter, of the best way of obtaining some results next year. Last year it had been laid down by resolution that if at this session there was no agreement on this matter, a committee should be appointed. Therefore we suggested we had not yet proposed a resolution, that there should be a committee consisting of these four great Powers and others in order to work out some ways of enabling larger representation in the councils concerned. These are the facts, and we cannot get away from them. These facts have been sufficiently effective in their impact that some of the sponsors of the previous resolution will be withdrawing from it and joining this proposal, which, I hope, will go through before the end of the year.

Then we come to the colonial question. One of the main advances made recently has been—these last two years, and particularly this year—the change, the progress in the thinking of the United Nations in regard to the whole of the colonial empire. Acharya Kripalani, a little while ago said that we had opposed some resolution on the ending of “Imperialism”! Maybe, if you indulge in flights of fancy, you can fly as far and as high as you like! There was no resolution before the Assembly so far as I am aware, and I am aware of most things that happen there, on the ending of Imperialism. What has happened is that there is an item on the agenda called colonialism which has not been reached yet, and preparations are being made to obtain some good results out of that. But in the meanwhile, on all those smaller and single matters that come up, we have made advances. This stands side by side with the fact that while some ten years ago there were four African countries—Egypt, Libya, Sudan and Liberia—as member states, today there are 25 or 26 countries from Africa,—former colonial territories. While in the old days, a few millions were

represented, today out of an estimated population of some 222 millions in Africa, 178 million belong to States that are members of the United Nations. Similarly, last year probably there were about 9 million square miles belonging to the empires of France and Britain and others, while today the area of the colonial territory in the African continent is about 1.35 millions. Out of this over 800,000 square miles are the empire of Portugal. The Prime Minister rightly characterised yesterday, Portugal as the largest imperial Power today.

In regard to Portugal, however having regard to the constitution of the United Nations, its methods of work and its strength, there is no way of wresting her colonies from her. The greatest progress that is possible in regard to this matter, however, was made this year, when concerned Committee of the United Nations, not by unanimous vote, but by vote without Opposition except that of Portugal, decided that she should submit information to the United Nations under the Charter. That is a matter of importance because of the recognition that she is a colonial Power. Until now, Portugal had said that she had no colonies, her territories were not overseas territories, but provinces of Portugal and therefore metropolitan. The only difference which she has probably not noticed is Goa, which is now called “the State of India”. Therefore, this year, when this matter came up, even those who had opposed it in the past agreed to calling for information. It also led to the only other colonial country which was till now in the same position, namely Spain, giving way; and Portugal today stands totally isolated. This is a great advance in the colonial position.

Equally, the territories of South Africa, which are not colonial in the legal sense—but there is a case of a serious violation of the Charter in

regard to South West Africa, in which two countries, Liberia being one of them, have taken South Africa to the world court in regard to certain legal matters—and other appeals are receiving in the Assembly the kind of severe attention that no country has received before, so much so, that the ordinary latitude that is allowed to a Foreign Minister in regard to certain procedures were not forthcoming from the committee. This is the advance on the colonial side.

Equally, in other ways also, there have been some advances of a notable character in the last two years. I have mentioned this not as an apologist of the United Nations, but because always, the quarrels, the acrimony and the scenes receive publicity. In the last two years, the economic issues, particularly, the issues arising from the probable disarmament of the world, the economic consequences of disarmament on the one hand, and the position of the undeveloped countries on the other, have received considerable attention.

Coming to disarmament itself, before I deal with the advance, I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the House to the part that this country has played in the whole of the disarmament problem from the year 1948 onwards. From 1948 and 1951, disarmament was largely concerned with the control of atomic energy and the position in relation to what is called the Baruch Plan. From 1952 onwards, the controversy on disarmament assumed its present state.

With your permission, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a little publication by the Ministry of External Affairs, on which I see no other number but M.E.A. 26; I believe it is one of their internal documents for their own use, but it is not marked secret. It will be one of those things which it would be proper for Members of the House to refer. You will find that year after year proposals are made by India in regard to

disarmament which either will be accepted for consideration, or which, where they are moved in the shape of amendments, became part of the Resolution or at least the thinking of the United Nations. It is interesting to note that the suggestions made seven or eight years ago and rejected at that time come back afterwards and a great many of them are today the crucial issues on which discussions are taking place.

Disarmament is no longer merely one of the items or even one of the more important items. It is probably of total concern with regard to the world itself, the reason being that the quantity of armament, and its character has changed so much that changes the quality of war and the quality of its consequences. This is the main reason.

For the first time in the history of the United Nations, though countries like ours, perhaps for ethical reasons, perhaps for moral reasons, have pressed the position that the mere balanced reduction of arms, which has been the popularly accepted connotation of disarmament is no longer sufficient and on behalf of the Government of India, it was put forward at the Tenth Anniversary meeting at San Francisco, that disarmament was only a step towards a warless world, and what was required was the outlawry of war, where nations would be able to live in a society where war would no longer be an instrument of settling disputes, it was not accepted by the United Nations till last year.

Last year—and I do not say this, because, as some gentleman said, of my bias towards the one side or the other—after Mr. Khrushchev's speech, followed by that of President Eisenhower and others, the United Nations, after a great deal of controversy, accepted a warless world as the goal of disarmament. But this word 'goal' has created difficulties, because, sometimes, a goal is something that is sought not to be achieved, but evaded and fear might perhaps be sought to

[Shri Krishna Menon]

be achieved by some. But there it is. Anyway, in 1959, "Disarmament" moved away from the connotation of 'balanced reduction of armaments, whereby each country will have sufficient arms, either for its own security or for collective defence as such, which could be stepped up, and which would be stepped up in case of international conflict. Now, we have moved away from that conception to what is spoken of as a warless world, and following from that, the abandonment of arms, not in the sense of cutting the size down, but the total abandonment of all equipment, of all forces and defence administrations of military training and things of that character, which was dismissed as being Utopian in the old days.

Nothing will advance this movement for the achievement of this more than the mobilisation of public opinion in the world, because, in spite of all that we say, there is a general fear, particularly in the circles economically and militarily affected by these things, of what is called the 'outbreak of peace', that is to say, that people may be out of work, business may go down and so on and so forth. People have accepted but fear the idea of a warless world in this way. I said a while ago that this is partly because of the changes in armament itself that have taken place, and I propose to refer to those changes in a short time.

In the history of the last ten years, irrespective of whatever may have been said, and done or not done there has been progress made as between the two sides, and the role of India in this matter—the position of the Government of India some years ago—has not been negligible or fruitless. I say this because, yesterday it was mentioned that our position was either interfering where we should not or weighing in on one side as against the other. Speaking on this subject may I point out that we have

said, that, the essence of success in disarmament work is agreement. Therefore, the power of the Assembly to rally behind one view, whether it be the view of the majority or of the minority makes no difference; at the next stage, the negotiations become more difficult. India is always opposed to putting her weight in the Assembly behind disarmaments. And, therefore, whenever there is an attempt merely to carry something by a majority vote in what we call the cold war issue, we have abstained; it is not because we have no views, but because we know very well that majority votes do not mean anything. I think the most outstanding example is the voting on the issue of South Africa, where every year, we mobilise enough votes, and nowadays, all but the vote of South Africa, but the one vote we want for any settlement is the vote of South Africa; and some day, we will get it.

13 hrs.

That has been the position that we have taken up. There are and have been arguments between the two sides, to one of which the Prime Minister referred yesterday as the controversy over whether control comes first or inspection comes first, that is, whether disarmament comes first or last. Anyway, during the last ten years, after the attempt of the United Nations to force the two Powers more or less by persuasion and negotiations, there have been agreements on a number of particulars. But whenever there is nearness to an agreement, one side or the other brings forward something which the other side cannot accept. That is why I say that there is a general fear of disarmament, and I could not express it any better than what has been stated by an American source. The Carnegie Foundation this year in an examination of present proposals published a report in which the following is said—I have not got the whole of it, but this is an extract:—

"Every plan offered by either side has contained a set of proposals calculated to have wide popular appeal. Every such set has included at least one feature that the other side could not possibly accept and thus forcing a rejection. Then the proposing side has been able to claim that the rejector is opposed to the idea of disarmament *in toto*. The objectionable feature may be thought of as the 'joker' in every series of proposals".

They refer to this as what is called 'gamesmanship'. It is not a new thing today. It was there in the old disarmament discussions in the League of Nations. It is our experience that one year, shall we say, there are proposals to which the Russians object in some particular feature; the next year they accept it, but then the Americans or the West object to it and *vice-versa*. In that way, it has gone on backwards and forwards. Then a position was reached in 1952 when there was a complete deadlock. Largely on our initiative the General Assembly gave directives as to what should be done. Today we have reached such a position again the further aspect wherein the nature of armament is such that unless we end war, war will end us, that is to say, the nature of atomic and hydrogen weapons is of such a character that not only the destruction is vast but the emergence of war itself is not just a remote possibility. This, again, is another factor to which even statesmen sometimes do not give serious consideration. It is not as though the possibility of war is remote. We are, in the present circumstance of an atomically armed world, not only on the brink of war, but war can be very easily triggered even by accident or irrational fear. It can happen either by accident or by what is called the process of 'rational irrationality' where they miscalculate the deterrent powers of these weapons and their tactics. It can happen also as what is called catalytic war

where small countries think that they can draw the big ones into war to their advantage. Again if, accidentally one of the 'under-water bases' were used by one country, if from it a weapon was operated and by mistake or accident it fell on its own country, on the country of its origin, it would most certainly lead to war, because it makes the other side think that atomic attack has been launched. The possessing country would say 'Now, our weapons are known; we must start all-out attack or we will be annihilated by the other side/by immediate retaliations. The consequences today are that in the first few hours, the casualties in the war on the attacked country may be 50—60 million. It is said that 263 atomic bombs making a total of about 1470 megatons would destroy 90 per cent of the population of the United States in a few hours; and the same applies to the other side. But those vast figures of death and the appeal to fear will not help to conquer the armament race problem; because armament itself is the result of fear and we could not meet fear by fear.

Therefore, we have to argue the position which is gradually being understood that the purpose of armament is four-fold; firstly, security of the country; secondly, expansion for the acquisition of colonies; thirdly, the question of markets through economic penetration, and fourthly, to assert themselves in an ideological conflict. I will not, in the time that I have, go into the details of these. But I believe we may rule out the last three for the purpose of this debate, because on the colonial side, as I have said, the colonies are getting more or less—shall I say?—disbanded,—the economic issues are of a different character today and economic co-operation between nations is being forced, and the ideological controversy, in spite of Communism and anti-Communism, in its intensity, is not as intense or acute as it was at the time of the Crusades, because, after all, co-existence is, more or less, accepted.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Then there remains the question of security. But in the last two years certainly even this question of security, of what is called the 'fortress Nation' has disappeared, because the quantity of arms, the striking power, is so much that they no longer frighten anybody else; as the weapons can not be used without world war and if used, it would mean total annihilation, so much so that their possession becomes more a danger than otherwise. In arguing the deterrent power of these weapons, that is to argue that atomic weapons of this type, will prevent the opponent from waging war, is to justify their existence it means that you have confidence in your opponent that he will not use his weapons to destroy the world. And the whole disarmament difficulty is argued to arise from the fact that there can be no confidence in the opponent. The two things are contradictory. Therefore, the whole thing has become absurd, since the old idea of one having weapons superior to the other is no longer competent.

The second question is the competition in what is called the armaments race. The arms race is bad enough, when one nation competes against another in having more and more deadly arms; but today that is not the only position. A nation is competing against itself all the time, in the sense that even before a particular weapon is completed, it has become obsolete and the next one has to be made. So it is competing with its own economy, its own technical powers and so on, and has come to a stage now when technologists say that there is nothing that cannot be made, with the result that whatever is made is out of date.

Thirdly, there is the position emerging from space research in which some people think that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union really want any control. We therefore have come to the position that on account of technological advances in space, unless war is outlawed, there is no method of control.

Fourthly, again while there is always argument about insistence upon inspection and control—and our Government has from the very beginning said that there could be no proper disarmament without a proper machinery of inspection and control—it is recognised at least in private conversation that no method of inspection and control is really going to be fool-proof, that is to say, there could be no method of inspection and control which would operate in all cases before the weapon has reached its target. That is, the Russians would deliver the missiles into the United States; the missiles could be there long before the machinery of control can operate. Therefore, the machinery of control has to operate beforehand, and if it is to operate beforehand, then we must have agreement. That is now the basis of all our disarmament discussions.

Therefore, we have proceeded from the conception of a balanced reduction of arms to levels as envisaged in the Charter necessary for the purpose of keeping international security, because it is feared that if nations have war armament, they will grow from small to big ones. Equally, if we were to prohibit atomic weapons—destroy them, dismantle them—and do the same to even the larger high-explosive weapons, it is realised that they will come back in the event of war occurring. Let me put it this way—that if the great countries were reduced in their arms to the level of 1870 or even 200 years before and if still there was an international conflict all these weapons would come back, because the men who made them or the successors of the men who made them are there, the technology is there, the industry is there and the fear and the passion that make for war are also there. Therefore, any kind of disarmament in the sense of taking away weapons is no longer of any value. There is no instance in history where Generals who occupied positions in war when it began concluded the war or the weapons with which the

war began were the weapons which were used at the end. Today we have now reached the position as a result of space research and nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons whereby the disarmament problem has become one which is meaningless in the whole context and a revolutionary outlook has become necessary.

The next factor that has emerged in the last two or three years was when first Great Britain made a little bomb and exploded it off Christmas Islands. Afterwards, when the French insisted on exploding their in the Sahara, it used to be called the fourth-Power problem. Now it is not the fourth or even the fifth-Power problem; it is the N—th Power problem. An American investigation into the subject was made last year by a group of scientists under the chairmanship of a great scientist, Davidon. He submitted a report which pointed out that at that time there were 10 countries including India which had sufficiently advanced in nuclear research and the possession of nuclear fuel to be able to make bombs. This number has now advanced about to 20. To get away from what is merely academic, let me say that it is possible for countries like Germany, China, Japan, Italy and Israel—all these countries—to produce these weapons, with the result that the control of atomic weapons would become impossible.

Therefore, unless at the present stage with the larger countries—the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom—who may be regarded as more responsible in this matter and will, therefore, contribute to disarmament, unless at this stage we bring about elimination of these weapons, there is no hope of eliminating them. That, I understand, is the significance of the Prime Minister's observation yesterday that unless we disarm in the next three or four or five years, there can be no disarmament at all.

Added to that is the change in the character of these weapons. I do not

want to read extracts and take too long a time. There are methods and methods. The older method is revived in Germany whereby these weapons will be produced much cheaper and in much smaller size. The bomb that was dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima is what is spoken of as the 20 kiloton bomb. They now use these 20 kiloton bombs in order to trigger bigger bombs. That is only like a match stick that ignites. That is one of the main difficulties that these big megaton bombs which have such explosive power in one of them as all the explosives used in the world in history; and that and that alone is such a menace. But today they have learnt to make very much smaller weapons. It is known that the 50 ton bomb has been made; and the same scientists say that next year it can be reduced to 10 tons and in the following year to 5 tons. So, the position put forward by our delegation 2 or 3 years ago, which was laughed off at that time as scientific fiction, that atomic weapons may very well become conventional weapons and become portable and be loaded even in smaller arms, that has become true. Now, all this means that unless war is ended, war must end us. That is to say, there is no way of controlling these things today except by abandonment. And this has been gradually and increasingly realised. That is what has taken us to the position in the United Nations this year.

In the United Nations this year before the General Assembly, first of all, there was the deadlock with which we started. Last year's resolution spoke about the abandonment of war and asked the ten powers to negotiate. The ten-power negotiation was outside the United Nations because there was no possibility of getting an agreement for a negotiating committee which appealed to both parties. So, largely on our initiative it was settled that the two countries talk to each other. They then called for this ten-power committee which, although it was uncon-

[Shri Krishna Menon]

titutional or not literally under the United Nations, was a part of the understanding. Anyway, that came to grief in the sense there was no advance made in these negotiations and they got into a deadlock; and the final phase of this unfortunate situation was when the summit meeting broke down in Geneva.

And the Assembly met under these circumstances where the device of direct negotiations through a ten-power committee had met with grief. There was no proposal; there was no advance of any kind and what is more, the resolution to which I made a reference a little while ago, trying to remedy the situation, namely the bringing together of these two people, that had become necessary because they won't talk to each other. There was complete deadlock and some disengagement had to be thought of. Various other methods were tried even before we came to the decision of trying to get negotiating groups and what not; and that still is in the process of development.

But, in the meanwhile, it was suggested by us in general debate, afterwards taken up elsewhere, that we should now come to the position the same as in 1952, when on the balance of reduction of arms there was a total deadlock and no movement would take place. We had then simply come away and said this negotiating committee must do these things, A. B. C. D and E; and a directive was given. That was why, unsuccessful as it may appear at the shortest context, for the last 5 or 6 years, they have gone on. It was wrong for us to think that; while no results have been reached, no single gun has been thrown away, but still great progress has been made in the whole process of disarmament.

We have reached the same situation now when there was a complete deadlock. And so it was mooted that we should give directives to the Assembly, to the negotiating people who were there. We are still far away from the

position where we can find an acceptable negotiating group. The Soviet Union wants a negotiating group in which there are 5 other people, 5 of the West and 5 of the non-committed nations. Now, even if this were possible it is unlikely that neither the non-committed countries nor the Western countries would accept this division of the world being in 3 camps, the two power blocs and the non-committed ones. That ideology they may not accept. But, in practice, some such arrangement would probably emerge and from that, incidentally, an indirect inference may be drawn by those who criticise our policy.

At long last the policy of non-alignment of certain people, people not being committed to those countries taking an objective view—though always we do not vote as logically as we should—but trying to express our objective view has resulted in the position of both the West and the East today looking to the non-committed nations. Perhaps, sometimes directly, sometimes in a sly way and sometimes in an indirect way to bring about the reconciliation that is required. And, so, before the Assembly are various resolutions. There are the usual East and West resolutions coming from the United States, the United Kingdom, Italy and those western powers, from the Soviet Union, Poland and the others and there are one or two others from other people. And, at the present moment while all these have the same status, when I left New York the position was that the proposals made by a number of countries, including ourselves, which have taken a considerable part, which have been the result of a long period of negotiations of 5 or 6 weeks, still holds the field in the sense that while one may not say so in any formal sense the general feeling is that if agreement can be reached on this basis it will be possible to get unanimity. The basis of the resolution is to recall what has been said in the past, lay down these



directives. I do not propose to read them because they have been published.

These directives include the elimination of arms, the elimination of bases, the elimination of training facilities and carrier weapons and so on. It also makes a provision for the maintenance of international and internal security in future by the existence of a police force in the municipal territory which would be placed at the disposal of the United Nations. And this also requires an amendment of the Charter and it is being realised on both sides because the Charter actually provides for military contingents, Air Force and Navy to be placed at the disposal of the United Nations. That also is taken account of.

But, as I said to the Committee, we are not in a position to say that there is unanimity of opinion on this. We hope that it would be so. At the same time, it is interesting for this House to notice that both the representatives of the United States and of the Soviet Union informed the Committee that there are some parts of it with which they were in agreement, one more than the other, but there were certain parts, from their own point of view, which did not represent the balance. Each one says it does not represent the balance. That is a hopeful feature. They thought that after a few days—perhaps referring to our Delegation—someone may be able to assist towards an agreement; and it was for that reason that the discussion of this question has been adjourned.

Normally, when an item comes, that is finished before anything is taken up. As was found more convenient for all these reasons, just to take no notice of that practice, the position is that there will be further consideration given to this problem. There is a realisation everywhere that the nature of armament and the size is such that unless there is agreement in this way arms will spread.

There is also the knowledge that a country like China with vast potentia-

lities—where the economists estimate that in 1970 she will reach the position, economically and industrially of Russia in 1960—with the vast potentialities in that way, and with advanced Japanese technology; and what is more, of the production of conventional arms in the small countries, particularly the achievement of Germany in this field, there is fear all round that we are reaching a stage which would be beyond control. We also welcome that. It is recognised by each side though not in public that there should be space control that the use of outer space for this purpose should be prohibited.

The main trouble in this matter is that the Americans, the Western side thinks that while there is no objection to accepting all this—and it is interesting to note that none of these great countries shrink at least in public from the elimination of fighting forces, military colleges and the Defence Ministries and what not—when it comes to the practicality of it, the Westerners—though it is not accurate, broadly speaking—think let us do something big; let us agree on that and let Russia agree to that big thing; and then we go on to the next. The Russian view and the view of the uncommitted nations will be that the trouble is not going to end in 10 or 12 years; let there be a commitment; there must be a committed commitment by the great powers, the Assembly as a whole, to accept this, and that will lead to total disarmament in the world. Now, in the negotiations we have gone so far as to the position where if some method can be found, the two points of view can be reconciled and to the extent what may be called partial measures can still be discussed and implemented; if the Soviets would accept them as not a bar to the other one, then perhaps progress can be made. But the fear in the Russian side is that if you put emphasis on partial measures, the West will go about talking partial measures and nothing else. Similarly, the Americans would say: if you agree to this objective, then the Russians would

[Shri Krishna Menon]

come and say: 'let us have one treaty and write everything down'. We cannot make progress. That is where—I would not say 'deadlock—difficulty may arise; that is the risk. So, it is largely dependent upon the wisdom of these two sides and the capacity of the other people to find agreements. Then we may make some progress. And the progress is assisted by the fact that there have been some small agreements. Whether these small agreements will become complete or not is one of the factors. In these small agreements are the steps in regard to the suspension of nuclear explosions. You remember, Sir, the Prime Minister made a statement in this House some six or seven years ago, calling for the suspension of nuclear tests and explosions. For many years this was not accepted as part of the disarmament and even now it is not called disarmament; it is called arms control. The official scientists, in the West, as the 18th century Bishops, always have the opinion that suits the Government. They did not lay the same stress on the effects of these things as the others and have spoken about these explosions as if they were merely scientific. Fortunately, there are several publications brought to the attention of the U.N. where those who wanted to inaugurate these explosions themselves had stated that their purposes were not scientific but that they were intended to perfect the atomic weapons. So long as the explosions are permitted, then the engines of war and destruction are not reversed. Why do you want to perfect a weapon unless you are going to use it? That is the idea.

Anyway, these discussions have gone on in Geneva for nearly a year and about two-thirds of the treaty had been agreed. But the one-third which is not agreed to is rather a difficult matter where there is no agreement on the measures of seismographic tests or the committee of inspection.

On the committee of inspection, it would appear, that there may be some

agreement provided there is a move towards total disarmament but at the same time our country would be rather sad to think that both the Russians and the Americans have agreed to maintain underground explosions. Underground explosions were insisted upon by the West and now it has been accepted. Following our general policy that when there is agreement between the Russians and the Americans, we do not try to improve upon it thinking you cannot sacrifice what is good for the best. These underground explosions have been put up before the Assembly as though they were small matters of digging a little hole. Now, it is known that these are very serious and large undertakings in the field of armament. Let us take an example. Each one of these holes would cost about 30 million dollars. The huge salt mines are used for this purpose. The whole process of maintaining them is going to cost about a billion dollars.

I say all this to show the dimensions of this problem. Anyway there is every hope that some progress may take place. If there is no progress, it is feared that there would be the renewal of explosions. If explosions are renewed, not only would they increase ionisation and radiation in the world—the birth of deformed children had gone up from 4 to 5 per cent. in the U.S. alone—but also they would lead to more and more countries adopting them because if tests were banned it partly stops the Nth power problem.

Apart from this, there is the problem of smaller weapons. De Gaulle of France has come forward with what is called the doctrine of atomic isolation. That is to say, he wants to develop his own weapon in his own way and does not want to come into any of these compacts at the present time. If that happens, then particularly the undeveloped countries and the ex-colonial countries fear that atomic weapons may be used in colonial wars because neither Russia nor the United States is going to involve themselves in a world war in order to punish some-

body for some deprecation somewhere. So, it is feared that if these weapons get to smaller size and become more distributed in the development of what is called the Nih power problem, you would have a situation beyond control. That is why disarmament is today, rightly, the one problem that should concern all of us because our economic development, in fact the survival of the world, is at stake and it is necessary for us to realise that all this talk about world destruction and so on is not academic. A U.S. scientist has given the chance of atomic war in the close proximity of 4 to 1. That is to say, it is not as though it is a very distant possibility; it is a great danger. I think we should be happy to feel that in spite of our limited resources, limited knowledge and our limited influence in the world, we have over the years been able to make some contribution.

**Mr. Speaker:** Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

**Shri B. Das Gupta (Purulia):** Sir, the time may be extended by an hour. More than an hour has been taken up from our share and in all fairness we should be compensated for that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let us see.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):** The current session of the U.N. General Assembly was a historic session and it became so due mostly to the effort of Mr. Khrushchev, the Soviet Prime Minister because he alone carried most of the heads of the States to New York. I quite agree that the meeting together of the heads of Governments produces good results and it will be a welcome sign for the peace of the world if something good comes out of the General Assembly's session of the U.N. The visit of our Prime Minister was also good and he contributed a lot by making a great speech there. But I feel that after that he should have avoided entering into the details of the routine business of the U.N. regarding its structure. It is necessary that the U.N. Charter should

be changed. About Congo, Shri Rajeshwar Dayal has said that there are only two authorities: the President and the Parliament and I think that Congo should have been able to send its delegates there. The proper delegates of Congo should be enabled to participate in the discussions in the U.N. Regarding colonial questions, I think that we should take initiative in this regard and this will be possible only if we take some concrete steps regarding Goa. Regarding Algeria also, the initiative has gone on to the other man's side and if we do not effectively contribute in this direction, I think that our lead in regard to the colonial question may not be so effective. Regarding China's admission to the U.N., I think the policy is all right but our Delegation need not have asked for censuring the General Committee of the U.N. which took certain decisions in regard to China.

13:28 hrs.

[SHRI MULCHAND DUBE in the Chair]

I do admit that we should vote for admission of China but it was useless for us to demand a censure for the Joint Committee.... (An Hon. Member: Censure?). Yes. It was stated there by our Delegation:

"The real culprit in this matter is the General Committee, that is, the Steering Committee and I think we ought really to pass a vote of censure on that."

**An Hon. Member:** Who said it?

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** It was said on behalf of India. Regarding disarmament, I quite share the views of the Government and the whole world that world peace is dependent upon disarmament. If it is not accepted by the big powers of the world, the entire universe will perish. But it should be the main concern of the powers who possess armaments; it should not be the prime concern of any poor country, particularly a country like India.

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

which possesses nothing. If any nation indulges in secret flights over the territory of any other nation that should be the business of the nation whose territory is being violated. In that respect, Sir, I wholly approve the action taken by Soviet Russia where it brought down the plane belonging to United States.

So disarmament also depends on the intention of the individuals. Unless and until the selfish intention of particular individuals is controlled there can never be any disarmament. The intention of nations must also be controlled. If there is any nation which wants to indulge in imperialism, be it of western type or of eastern type, there can never be any disarmament. So along with disarmament, there should be some curb on the imperialistic intention of everybody, whoever it may be.

I like the speech made regarding disarmament. But it should have been delivered—I do not want to criticise it, it was all quite well—according to me, in the Parliaments of the United States or the Soviet Union. Here it is unnecessary. I quite agree that we should also contribute. We have contributed a lot and we must go on contributing towards creating an atmosphere in the world for disarmament. But we must not labour so hard on that with the result that we lose sight of our own interests.

Sir, in the situation obtaining today, where every day somebody is entering into our country, where every day somebody is violating our air space, where every day somebody is violating our borders, is it necessary that the Defence Minister of the country should spend an hour over disarmament here? I would respectfully suggest, Sir, that along with disarmament we must be told how to face the invasion which is occurring daily into our territory.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):**  
That he does not know.

**Shri M. R. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved-Sch. Castes):** When he speaks as Defence Minister he may say that.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Sir, after the talks between the two Prime Ministers in April there have been three ostensible aggressions. The first one occurred on 3rd June at Taktsang in the Kameng area of NEFA. Then the intruders, 25 armed people came seven miles into our territory and they went according to their convenience. The second time they came here on 22nd September. They came over a pitch road, a first-class road connecting Nathula and Jalepla. Then ten soldiers led by an officer came into Sikkim territory. They also went back. The third one happened on 13th October. Two persons on horse back came to patrol an area two miles from the place where the corpses of our police personnel were delivered to our people.

Then, after having perused this White Paper I find that it contains documents which are very shocking and very humiliating. After the departure of Mr. Chou En-lai about 52 air space violations have taken place. Chinese aeroplanes have come as far into our territory as Imphal. One can imagine from this that they came about 200 miles into our territory. They have violated the air space of all the five administrative divisions of NEFA—Kameng, Subansiri, Siang, Lohit and Tirap. They have also violated the air space in Uttar Pradesh and Ladakh. They are in virtual possession of 12,000 square miles of Ladakh.

Again, according to our 1954 treaty, they should have even enabled our traders and pilgrims to visit China. But they have insulted our traders. They have forfeited all the property which they owned. They have not allowed them to bring even their animals. They have also maimed some of our pilgrims. None of our trade agencies in Tibet has been allowed to

function as it should. Even some curb has been put on the movement of our diplomatic personnel who are in Peking.

I am saying all this, Sir, with a view to emphasising my point that nothing is now happening which might be said to honour the treaty of 1954, and I think it is meaningless to have any relationship. What is the meaning of having any relationship if our people are humiliated? There is something said here about Mrs. Kapur of our Gyantse trade agency. In this White Paper it is said that some words were used which should not have been used. Eight men and two women went to search or to find out something, according to the Chinese version, in the room of the maid servant, I think it is very insulting for our trade agents. Our trade agents, not only last year but even this year, were not allowed to visit the markets or Kailash or Manasarovar. The same has been the case with our pilgrims. Our pilgrims also have not been given the facilities according to the 1954 treaty.

About Ladakhi Muslims, Sir, the Chinese Embassy has complained about the arrest of Mr. Ma of Kalimpong and it has been cited as a clear violation of the 1954 treaty. It is also said that even food and other things are not being allowed to be given to that gentleman in the jail and the Chinese agents are also not allowed to see him. But what is the actual position there? All the Ladakhi and Kashmiri Muslims were ordered to participate in a mass meeting in Tibet and when they went there their leaders were arrested, they were tried and sentences were passed against them. On another occasion, they were beaten. Mr. Ibrahim and some other persons were beaten mercilessly. They were beaten continuously for five or six hours and they started bleeding. Tibetans were used to beat them. This is the kind of humanitarian feelings which the Chinese want to create.

I think, Sir, it is very necessary that we should know something about it. This Parliament also owes some explanation to the country, to our people. If these things are allowed to happen today, the next generation will automatically begin to think what the representatives of the people were doing and why they were not paying proper attention towards these problems. With a view to safeguarding this interest I think that something should be done.

Shri Mukerjee yesterday said that firing took place in the Punjab, shootings were restored in Assam etc. He also said something about the Naga land, about the Naga people and about the shooting of our plane in the Naga area. I would say that the army people were virtually near the place where the plane was brought down. I do not know why the operation was stopped after the release of five persons, because those five persons were ordinary people who were used to drop food packets etc., from the plane. The real crew has not been released.

13.40 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

So, I think that efforts should be taken in this regard, because somebody was sent to talk to them and he took some time. I do not know what happened. I would like to know the truth about it. Time should not be lost in taking action against the persons who brought down the plane.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee referred to Punjab and other things. I do not know whether he knows what is happening in Tibet and other places. He mentioned about Punjab shooting. I do not say that Punjab shooting is justified. Wherever any firing is resorted to, that should be condemned if it is unjustified. But while referring to Punjab and other things, Shri H. N. Mukerjee should have simultaneously said something about the killings in Tibet. He should go and witness what is happening in his own

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

Kalimpong and Darjeeling: how many people are coming, how many ladies whose husbands have been killed and whose sons have been tortured and whose arms cut, are coming. (*Interruption*). He only mentioned about Punjab and the firings in Assam which I condemn if they are not justified. Then, he used four words—quarrel, conflict, dispute or controversy—in regard to China, and said that if our territory is violated the Communists will be in the forefront. Such words like 'if' were used, and these words are not in the interests of the nation. Whoever uses such words,—“if it is violated” etc.,—if any persons is not in the know of the facts, I think he should cease to be the representative at least of this House, because any Member of Parliament must be positive about the facts, and more so, the Government. I say so because, for instance, the day before yesterday, in regard to the violation of our air space, the Defence Minister said, “I can neither reject nor accept that our air space has been violated”.

**An Hon. Member:** He never accepted it.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Similar replies were given on some other occasions also. But when we read the White Paper, we find that all those replies, given in the past, or at least most of them, do not stand, because now they are given in a different form here.

Therefore, I first suggest that we should take concrete steps to make our trade agencies function effectively in Tibet. If they are not being enabled to function effectively, then, you had better close them. It is no good keeping the paraphernalia there. Let the world know that the Chinese are not allowing Indians to function there. Let us close every relationship with them.

Secondly, I suggest that if any curb has been put on our representatives in Peking, you must put a reciprocal

curb here on the Chinese representatives. Thirdly, I refer to the right of the people. We as a nation and we as the Congress are respected by the world, at least by the under-privileged people of the world, because of the fact that we have been advocating the cause of the underdogs, whoever may be the underdogs, and everybody knows it. I do not want that anybody should be discriminated. Therefore, I say that on the stand taken by the Government of India in regard to Tibet—that China can exercise only a suzerainty—India must say what type of suzerainty China should have over Tibet and we must stand behind the Tibetans to get as much right that can be achieved according to that declaration. Otherwise, it is meaningless to say something and not act upon that.

श्री अ० मु० तारिफ (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, अकवाम मुतहदा का जनरल असेम्बली का मौजूदा इजलास जो अभी जारी है, इस लिहाज से निहायत तारीखी और अहम है कि इस में दुनिया के बड़े बड़े रहनमायों ने शिरकत की। उस में हमारे वजीर आजम भी शरीक हुए और इसलिये कि दुनिया में अमन पैदा हो, उन्होंने इतने मुताबिके उमूर का, ऐसे मसायल का वहां हल ढूँढा। उन्होंने कांगो के बारे में, अल्जीरिया के बारे में और दूसरे मुल्कों के बारे में जो नुकात पेश रखे वह सिर्फ इसी लिये कि हम दुनिया में अमन चाहते हैं। हम नहीं चाहते, हमारी यह पालिसी नहीं है कि दुनिया मौजूदा अमन की पालिसी को छोड़ कर जंग की पालिसी अख्तियार करे। अकवाम मुतहदा के बारे में कल यहां चन्द बुजुगों ने इशारा किया और यह कहा कि मि० क्रश्चेव का जो रवैया था वह काबिल एतराज था। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि उन्होंने बहुत सी बातें ऐसी कहीं जिन में अपनी रवायत के मुताबिक हम शरीक नहीं हो

सकते। लेकिन हमें यह भी देखना चाहिये कि खुद अकवाम मुतहद्दा में दूसरे मुल्कों के नुमाइन्दों के साथ, जो कि अपने यहां के जायज नमाइन्दे थे, क्या मुलूक हुआ। हमारे सामने मिसाल है क्यूबा के डा० कैस्ट्रो की। उन को होटल से निकलना पड़ा। उन को निकाल दिया गया और उन को तौहीन की गई। मेरे दोस्त श्री वाजपेयी ने जब कल तकरीर की तो उन्होंने मि० क्रुश्चेव के बारे में भी कहा। लेकिन श्री क्रुश्चेव के साथ वहां पर जो नाजेबा मुलूक किया गया, उसका उन्होंने कोई जिक्र नहीं किया।

**श्री बज रज सिंह :** क्या उन को घुंसा दिखलाना चाहिये था ?

**श्री अ० म० तारिका :** जी हां, अगर कोई जरूरत पेश आ जाये। हमारा महाद्वारा है, हमारा मकूल है कि अगर बातों से कोई फंसला न हो तो उस का दूसरा इलाज करना चाहिये। हमारा मकूल है कि लातों के भूत बातों से नहीं मानते। अगर ऐसी कोई सूरत पेश हो तो यकीनन दुनियां के लोगों को यह भी करना चाहिये। यह ठीक है कि उन की ऐसी हरकतों में, उन के ऐसे तरीकेकार में हम शरीक नहीं हो सकते, लेकिन हम को दूसरी बातों की तरफ भी ध्यान देना चाहिये। जब हमारे वजीर आजम वहां गये तो वहां उन्होंने तकरीरें की। उस तकरीर से अमरीका के लोगों में, अमरीका के सयासत-दानों में, एक किस्म की परेशानी हुई, अफरा तफरी हुई। वह इस हद तक चले गये कि जब हमारे वजीर आजम ने डा० कैस्ट्रो को दावत में बुलाया तो अमरीका के सयासतदानों को नागवार गुजरा। उन्होंने अपने दोस्तों के जरिये हमारे वजीर आजम को अपनी नाराजगी का पैगाम भिजवाया। मैं नहीं समझता कि अमरीका के सयासत-दानों के या वहां के हुक्कामों को क्या हक पहुंचता है कि वह हमारे वजीर आजम पर

इस किस्म की पाबन्दियां आयद करें। यही नहीं बल्कि वहां के रहनमाओं ने प्राइवेट मीटिंग्स में यह भी कहा कि हम नेहरू को उस के कद के मुताबिक काट देंगे और उस स्पीच पर इमिडिएटली यू०ऒटेड नशन्स में इस किस्म की बातें हुई कि उन के फौरन बाद जनरल अय्यब ने स्टेटमेंट दिया जिस में उन्होंने घमकी दी कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों पर हमारी फौजें हैं। इस एवान के मेम्बरान को शायद यह नहीं भूला होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान के वजीर आजम मुहब्बत और अमन का पैगाम ले कर पाकिस्तान गये थे। अभी वह पाकिस्तान से लौटे ही थे कि वह यू०ऒटेड नेशन्स असेम्बली में गये। उस के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के किसी रहनुमा ने, कांग्रेस पार्टी के किसी रहनुमा ने, दूसरी जमातों के किसी रहनुमा ने, यहां तक कि हिन्दू महा-सभा के किसी रहनुमा ने, कोई ऐसी इश्याल-अंगेज तकरीर नहीं की जिस का जवाब फील्ड मार्शल अय्यब यह देते कि काश्मीर का मसला पाकिस्तान की फौज हल करेगी। असल में यह वह शरारत थी जो न्यूयार्क में हमारे वजीर आजम को परेशानी में डालना चाहती थी, और उस परेशानी का इजहार कराची से किया गया, उस साजिश का इजहार कराची से किया गया। मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जो चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान से हमारी दोस्ती हो। हम पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती रखना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम फौजी घमकियों से डरना नहीं चाहते, हम फौजी घमकियों से मरऊब होने वाले नहीं हैं।

यह हमारे हिन्दुस्तान की फौज की शान है, यह हमारे वजीर आजम और दूसरे रहनमाओं की सखावत है कि आज मुजफ्फरा-बाद और काश्मीर के दूसरे इलाके पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में हैं। जब हमारी फौजें बढ़ रही थीं, हम ने अपनी शराफत का सबूत दिया और हम ने उन को बढ़ने से रोक दिया, बर्ना खुद पाकिस्तान के अफसर यह हकीकत

[ श्री अ० मु० तारिक ]

जानते हैं कि आज रावलपिंडी शायद पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में न होता, बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा होता। इस में हमें सिर्फ यह देखना है कि जो धमकियां आती हैं, उन का असली मकसद क्या है। उन का मकसद यह है कि जिस वक्त आप कश्मीर की तारीख देखें, जब आप उन को वाक्यात की जंजीर में जोड़े तो पता चलेगा कि जिस वक्त हम चाहते हैं कि मशरिफ और मगरिब के लोगों में अमन का फंसला हो, किसी फंसले पर वह पहुंचें तो पाकिस्तान से या कहीं और से हम को फौजी धमकियां दी जाती हैं; मैं जानता हूं। मैं पाकिस्तान के अन्दरूनी हालात से बखबी वाकिफ हूं। मैं जानता हूं कि पाकिस्तान में जो जनरल हैं। मैं हिन्दुस्तान के जनरल को भी जानता हूं। जनरल अय्यब खां को इस बात को फरामोश नहीं करना चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान में भी फौज है और निहायत अजीमुशान फौज है और उस में उन से बेहतर जनरल हैं। यह ठीक है कि हमारे यहां कोई नाम निहाद फील्ड मारशल नहीं है, लेकिन हम बखबी जानते हैं कि क्या पिद्दी और क्या पिद्दी का शोरबा। जब जंग का वक्त आयेगा तो यकीनन हिन्दुस्तानी सेना इस बात को साबित कर देगी।

मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक चीन का सवाल है, हम चीन के साथ इस झगड़े का निहायत अमन के साथ और निहायत दोस्ताना तरीके से तै करना चाहते हैं।

एक सान्निध्य सबद्व : किस झगड़ को ?

श्री अ० मु० तारिक : जो हमारे और चीन के दरम्यान है। इस फंसले को हमारी दोनों हुकूमतें तै करेंगी। ये फंसले अफरान और सियसी जमावतों के मशवरे पर तैयार नहीं हंगे। ये फंसले यकीनन

हम अपने मुल्क के हाल, माजी और मस्तकबिल को मदनजर रख कर तै करेंगे।

चीन के बारे में शोर किया गया कि साहब उन के हवाई जहाज आय हैं। यकीनन आये हैं। हम उन का तदारख करेंगे। लेकिन इस चीज को नजरन्दाज नहीं करना चाहिये कि चीनी हुकूमत ने खुद हमारे सामने यह बात रख दी है कि अगर आप हमारा हवाई जहाज देखें तो उसे गिरा ल। उन्होंने ने कहा है कि और भी हमारे हमसाये मुल्क हैं जहां से हवाई जहाज आ सकते हैं। उस का एक सवूत हमारे सामने है। वह अमरीकी हवाई जहाज जिस को रूस ने गिराया उस के बारे में यह साफ साबित हुआ कि वह अमरीकी हवाई जहाज पाकिस्तान से उड़ा था। हमारे पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान में गैर मुल्की हवाई अड्डे हैं इस को हमें नजरन्दाज नहीं करना चाहिये। जनाब वाला मैं इस सिलसिले में अमरीकी सेर्विय पलीट के रियर एडमिरल एंड्र जैक्सन का एक बयान ऐवान के सामने रखना चाहता हूं जोकि उन्होंने ने ६ अक्टूबर को चिटगांग में दिया था। इस बयान में उन्होंने ने तीन चार मोटी बातें कही हैं जिन को मैं मेम्बराने ऐवान के सामने रखना चाहता हूं और मैं उन से तवक्को रखता हूं और हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत से तवक्को रखता हूं कि वह इस बयान पर गौर करेगी। उन्होंने ने कहा है :

"The U. S. Seventh Fleet in the Pacific was ever ready to go to the Bay of Bengal and Chittagong at any moment of threat."

उन्होंने ने मजीद कहा है :

"East Pakistan was a major and a very important sector from the free World's defence point of view."

उन्होंने ने आग यह भी कहा है :

"It was highly desirable to build a strong naval force in Chittagong Fort."



यह एक नेवल कमांडर हैं अमरीका से सेविथ फ्लीट के। यह जानते हुए कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के ताल्लुकात बहतर नहीं हैं, हमें इस किस्म की धमकियां दी जाती हैं कि चिटागांग का एक बहुत बड़ा सनुन्दरी अड्डा बनेगा, और सेविथ फ्लीट थोड़े से नोटिस पर बं ब्राफ बंगाल में आ सकता है। यह कहना हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी पर हमला है। हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत को इस हमले को मंजूर करना होगा। वह सभी मुल्क जो जाबिर हैं जो हमलावर हैं उन को जाबिर और हमलावर मानना होगा, चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो और चाहे वह चीन हो। उसे हिन्दुस्तान के इलाके को खाली करना पड़ेगा।

चीन ने हमारी सरहदो पर हमला किया है और हम उस का बहुत बावैला करते हैं। लेकिन हमें पाकिस्तान के उस हमले को भी नहीं भूलना चाहिये जोकि दस साल से चला आ रहा है और जिस की वजह से लाखों आदमियों का कत्ल हुआ। मैं अपने दोस्तों से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उन को यह बात छोड़ कर कि हमारी सियासी जमाअतें क्या कहती हैं, एक हिन्दुस्तानी की हैसियत से यह देखना चाहिये कि आज उन बेगुनाह काश्मीरियों की क्या हालत है जो कई साल से पाकिस्तान के गुलाम हैं। आप उन की हालत को देखें, उन की औरतों और उन के बच्चों की हालत को देखें कि रोजमर्रा पाकिस्तान उन के साथ क्या करता है। आप यह देखें कि कितनी बार पाकिस्तान ने हमारी सरहद पर पून्छ में हमले किये हैं, कितने हमारे फौजी मारे गये। इस के बावजूद भी आप देखें कि हम ने हमेशा कोशिश की हर वक्त पाकिस्तान के साथ अपने ताल्लुकात को बेहतर बनाने की।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** क्या मेम्बर साहब को पता है कि स्पीकर साहब ने दस मिनट की हद मुकरंर की है।

**श्री अ० मु० तारिक :** मैं ने अभी शायद आठ मिनट ही लिये हैं।

तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता था कि अपनी तकरीर में मिस्टर खुर्रुश्चेव ने युनाइटेड नेशन्स में जो कहा उस की तशरीह करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने ने कहा कि अकवाम मुत्तहिदा चन्द लोगों की मनापली बन चकी है। मैं एक हिन्दुस्तानी और एक काश्मीरी की हैसियत से . . . .

**श्री ब्रजराज सिंह :** क्या काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान से अलग है।

**श्री अ० मु० तारिक :** जनाब वाला काश्मीर पूरी तरह हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है, वह हिन्दुस्तान का एक सूबा है जैसेकि और सूबे हैं।

**श्री ब्रजराज सिंह :** तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान कहना ही काफी था।

**श्री अ० मु० तारिक :** जनाब वाला, मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि किस तरह अकवाम मुत्तहिदा में हमारी जायज शिकायत को पावर पालिटिक्स की वजह से अभी तक तै नहीं किया गया। यह जानते हुए भी कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है, और यह जानते हुए कि काश्मीर पर पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया है, पावर पालिटिक्स का गठ होने की वजह से आज तक उस का फैसला नहीं किया गया। सिर्फ पावर पालिटिक्स की वजह से काश्मीर के मसले को दस साल तक लटकाये रखा गया है। यह अकवाम मुत्तहिदा में उन लोगों की साजिश से हो रहा है जिन की वहां अक्सरियत है।

हम ने यह भी देखा कि कांगो में आज क्या हो रहा है। वहां के लोगों के नमायन्दों के लिये वहां की पार्लियामेंट के दरवाजों पर फौजी पहरा बिठा दिया गया है बिल्कुल उसी तरह जिस तरह कि पाकिस्तान में हुआ। वहां की पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को जेल में

## [श्री अ० मु० तारिक]

दूस दिया गया और एक ऐसे शस्त्र को सिर्फ जिस का वह वजूद है, उस के पीछे वहां की अराम की शस्त्रियत नहीं है, कोई अराम की राय नहीं है, तमाम महज्जिब मल्कों के प्रोटस्ट के बावजूद, वहां के लोगों पर दूसरा जा रहा है। वैस्टर्न ब्लाक की हमेशा यह स्वाहिश रही है कि जब एक अजीम फर्द हो तो उस के मकाबले पर अपनी मंशा और मकसद के मुताबिक दूसरा आदमी पैदा करें। हिन्दुस्तान में भी इस किस्म की कोशिश की गई लेकिन हिन्दुस्तानी लोगों के इस अटल फंसले की वजह से कि हमारी लीडरशिप श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के हाथ में मजबूत है, वह इस में कामयाब नहीं होने पाय।

हमारे मुल्क में बहुत सी फिरकावाराना जमाअतें काम कर रही हैं जिन के पीछे बाहरी मुल्कों का हाथ है। आप को शायद यह इल्म न होगा कि अभी दिल्ली में जमाअत इस्लामी का एक जल्सा हुआ। यह जमात खालिस फिरका परस्त जमात है और इस के पीछे यकीनन गैरमुल्की ताकत हैं। जिस शान शौकत से उस का जल्सा हुआ उस से साबित होता है कि गैर मल्की ताकतें उस के पीछे हैं और हमारे मुल्क को परेशानी में बालना चाहती हैं।

मैं हुकमत हिन्द से दरखास्त कर्ंगा, मैं दरखास्त कर्ंगा वजीर आजम से और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से कि हमारी सरहदों की बाकायदा हिफाजत होनी चाहिये, चाहे वह चीन की तरफ से हो या पाकिस्तान की तरफ से हो। हमें इस चीज को नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि हमारी सरहदों पर दुश्मन बैठा हुआ है। हमारी सरहद पर हमारे हमसाथे मुल्कों में बाहरी ताकतों के फौजी अड्डे हैं। हमें इस तरफ भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये।

जनाब डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब पर बहुत से एतराजात किये गये। वाजपेयी साहब

ने किये और लोगों ने भी किये। लेकिन कोई मजबूत चीज हवाई बातों से गिर नहीं सकती। मैं इस सिलसिले में लन्दन के मशहूर अखबार ईवनिंग स्टैंडर्ड के चन्द अल्फाज इस ऐवान के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। जब उन्होंने ने देखा कि हमारा हिन्दुस्तानी डेलीगेशन, उस के मेम्बर और उस के लीडर किस तरह अफ्रीकी और एशियायी मुल्कों की आवाज की वहां नमायन्दगी करते हैं तो उन्होंने ने कहा कि कृष्ण मेनन अल्फाज के घनी हैं। श्री कृष्ण मेनन एशियायी, अफ्रीकी मल्कों के मकबूल लीडर हैं और उन की नमायन्दगी करते हैं। मैं इस बारे में अपने डेलीगेशन और उस के लीडर को मबारकबाद देता हूँ।

(شہری اے - ایم - طارق) (جسوں اور کشمیر): جلاب ڈپٹی اسپیکر صاحب - اقوام متصدا کا جس اسمبلی کا موجودہ اجلاس جو ابھی جاری ہے - اس لحاظ سے نہایت تاریخی اور اہم ہے کہ اس میں دنیا کے بڑے بڑے رہنماؤں نے شرکت کی - اس میں صدر وزیر اعظم بھی شریک ہوئے اور اس لئے کہ دنیا میں امن پیدا ہو - انہوں نے اگلے مقررہ امور کا - ایسے مثالی کام حل تھوڑے دنوں میں - انہوں نے کانگو کے بارے میں جو نکات پیش کئے - وہ صرف اس لئے کہ ہم دنیا میں امن چاہتے ہیں - ہم نہیں چاہتے ہماری یہ پالیسی نہیں ہے کہ دنیا موجودہ امن کی پالیسی کو چھوڑ کر جنگ کی پالیسی اختیار کرے - اقوام متصدا کے بارے میں کل

یہاں چند بزرگوں نے اشارہ کیا اور یہ کہا کہ مسٹر کروشچیو کا جو رویہ تھا وہ قابل اعتراض تھا۔ اس میں کوئی شک نہیں کہ انہوں نے بہت سی باتیں ایسی کہیں جن میں لہلی روایت کے مطابق ہم شریک نہیں ہو سکتے۔ لیکن ہمیں یہ بھی دیکھنا چاہئے کہ خود اقوام متحدہ میں دوسرے ملکوں کے نمائندوں کے ساتھ۔ جو کہ اپنے یہاں کے جائز نمائندے تھے۔ کہا سلوک ہوا۔ ہمارے سامنے مثال ہے کیوبا کے ڈاکٹر کیسترو کی۔ ان کو ہوٹل سے نکالنا پڑا۔ ان کو نکال دیا گیا اور ان کی توہین کی گئی۔ میرے دوست شری واجپئی نے جب کل تقریر کی تو انہوں نے مسٹر کروشچیو کے بارے میں بھی کہا۔ لیکن شری کروشچیو کے ساتھ وہاں پر جو نازیبا سلوک کیا گیا اس کا انہوں نے کوئی ذکر نہیں کیا۔

شری برج راج سنگھ : کیا ان کو گھونسا دیکھانا چاہئے تھا۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق : جی ہاں۔ اگر کوئی ضرورت پیش آجائے۔ ہمارا سکاؤرہ ہے۔ ہمارا مقولہ ہے کہ اگر باتوں سے کوئی فیصلہ نہ ہو تو اس کا دوسرا علاج کرنا چاہئے۔ ہمارا مقولہ ہے کہ لاتوں کے بھوت باتوں سے نہیں مانتے۔ اگر ایسی کوئی صورت پیش ہو تو یقیناً دنیا کے لوگوں کو یہ بھی کرنا چاہئے۔ یہ تھیک ہے کہ ان

کی ایسی حرکتوں میں ان کے ایسے طریقہ کار میں ہم شریک نہیں ہو سکتے۔ لیکن ہم کو دوسری باتوں کی طرف بھی دھیان دینا چاہئے۔ جب ہمارے وزیر اعظم وہاں گئے تو وہاں انہوں نے تقریر کی۔ اس تقریر سے امریکہ کے لوگوں میں۔ امریکہ کے سیاستدانوں میں۔ ایک قسم کی پریشانی ہوئی۔ افوا تفری ہوئی۔ وہ اس حد تک چلے گئے کہ جب ہمارے وزیر اعظم نے ڈاکٹر کیسترو کو دعوت میں بلایا تو امریکہ کے سیاستدانوں کو لگاوار گزرا۔ انہوں نے اپنے دوستوں کے ذریعہ ہمارے وزیر اعظم کو اپنی ناراضگی پیغام بھیجوا یا۔ میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ امریکہ کے سیاستدانوں کو یا وہاں کے حکام کو کیا حق نہلچتا ہے کہ وہ ہمارے وزیر اعظم پر اس قسم کی پابندیاں نافذ کریں یہی نہیں بلکہ وہاں کے دھماوں نے پرلہیت سینٹکس میں یہ بھی کہا کہ ہم نیہرو کو اس کے قد کے مطابق کات دیں گے اور اس اسٹیج پر اسٹیٹہٹلی یونائیٹڈ نیشن میں اس قسم کی باتیں ہونیں کہ ان کے فوراً بعد جنرل ایوب نے اسٹیٹہٹمنٹ دیا جس میں انہوں نے دھمکی دی کہ ہندوستان کی سرحدوں پر ہماری فوجیں ہوں۔ اس ابوان کے ممبران کو شائد یہہ ہوا نہیں ہوا کہ ہندوستان کے وزیر اعظم محبت اور اس کا پیغام آئے کر پاکس ان گئے تھے۔ ابھی وہ پاکستان

[شری اے۔ ایم طارق]

سے لوتے ہی تھے کہ وہ یونائیٹڈ نیشنل اسمبلی میں گئے۔ اس کے بعد ہندوستان کے کسی رہنما نے۔ کانگریس پارٹی کے کسی رہنما نے۔ دوسری جماعتوں کے کسی رہنما نے۔ یہاں تک کہ ہندو مہاسبھا کے کسی رہنما نے۔ کوئی ایسی اشتعال انگیز تقریر نہیں کی جس کا وہ جواب فیلڈ مارشل ایوب یہ دیتے کہ کشمیر کا مسئلہ پاکستان کی فوج حل کرے گی۔ اصل میں یہ وہ شہادت نہیں جو نیویارک میں ہمارے وزیر اعظم کو پریشانی میں ڈالنا چاہتی تھی۔ اور اس پریشانی کا اظہار کراچی سے کیا گیا۔ اس سازش کا اظہار کراچی سے کیا گیا۔ میں ان لوگوں میں سے ہوں۔ جو چاہتے ہیں کہ پاکستان سے ہماری دوستی ہو۔ ہم پاکستان سے دوستی رکھنا چاہتے ہیں۔ لیکن ہم فوجی دھمکیوں سے قرنا نہیں چاہتے۔ ہم فوجی دھمکیوں سے مرغوب ہونے والے نہیں ہیں

یہ ہمارے ہندوستان کی فوج کی شان ہے۔ یہ ہمارے وزیر اعظم اور دوسرے رہنماؤں کی سفارشات ہے کہ آج مرزہ آباد اور کشمیر کے دوسرے علاقے پاکستان کے قبضے میں ہیں۔ جب ہماری فوجیں بڑھ رہی تھیں۔ ہم نے اپنی شرافت کا ثبوت دیا اور ہم نے ان کو بڑھنے سے روک دیا۔

ورنہ خود پاکستان کے افسر یہ حقیقت جانتے ہیں کہ آج راولپنڈی شائد پاکستان کے قبضے میں نہ ہوتا۔ بلکہ ہندوستان کا حصہ ہوتا۔ اس میں ہمیں صرف یہ دیکھنا ہے کہ جو دھمکیاں آتی ہیں۔ ان کا اصلی مقصد کیا ہے۔ ان کا مقصد یہ ہے کہ جس وقت آپ کشمیر کی تاریخ دیکھیں۔ جب آپ ان کو واقعات کی زنجیر میں جوڑیں۔ تو پتہ چلے گا کہ جس وقت ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ مشرق اور مغرب کے لوگوں میں امن کا فیصلہ ہو۔ کسی فیصلے پر وہ پہنچیں نو پاکستان سے یا کہیں اور سے ہم کو فوجی دھمکیاں دی جاتی ہیں میں جانتا ہوں۔ میں پاکستان کے اندرونی حالات سے بخوبی واقف ہوں۔ میں جانتا ہوں کہ پاکستان میں جو جنرل ہیں۔ میں ہندوستان کے جنرلز کو بھی جانتا ہوں۔ جنرل ایوب خاں کو اس بات کو فراموش نہیں کرنا چاہئے کہ ہندوستان میں بھی فوج ہے۔ اور نہایت عظیم الشان فوج ہے۔ اور اس میں ان سے بہتر جنرل ہیں۔ یہہ تھیک ہے کہ یہاں کوئی نام نہاد فیلڈ مارشل نہیں ہے۔ لیکن ہم بخوبی جانتے ہیں کہ کیا پندی اور کیا پندی کا شورہا۔ جب جنگ کا وقت آئے گا تو یقیناً ہندوستانی سہلا اس بات کو ثابت کر دے گی۔

میں یہ بھی عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جہاں تک چھن کا سوال ہے - ہم چھن کے ساتھ اس جھگڑے کو نہایت امن کے ساتھ اور دوستانہ طریقہ سے طے کرنا چاہتے ہیں -

ایک مانٹریہ سدسیہ - کس جھگڑے کو -

شری اے - اہم طارڈ، - جو ہمارے اور چھن کے درمیان ہے - اس فیصلے کو ہماری دونوں حکومتوں طے کریں گی - یہ فیصلے افراد اور سہاسی جماعتوں کے ملشور پر طے نہیں ہوں گے - یہ فیصلے عقیداً ہم اپنے ملک کے حلال - ماضی اور مستقبل کو مد نظر رکھ کر طے کریں گے -

چھن کے بارے میں شور کیا گیا کہ صاحب ان کے ہوائی جہاز آئے ہیں - عقیداً آئے ہیں - ہم ان کا تدارخ کریں گے - لیکن اس چھڑ کو نظر انداز نہیں کرنا چاہئے کہ چھنی حکومت نے خود ہمارے سامنے یہ باس رکھ دی ہے کہ اگر آپ ہمارا ہوائی جہاز دیکھیں تو اسے گرائیں - انہوں نے کہا ہے کہ اور بھی ہمارے ہمسائے ملک، انہیں جہاں سے ہوائی جہاز آ سکتے ہیں - اس کا ایک ثبوت ہمارے سامنے ہے - وہ امریکن ہوائی جہاز جس کو روس نے گرایا - اس کے بارے میں یہ صاف ثابت ہوا کہ وہ امریکی ہوائی جہاز پاکستان سے آرا تھا - ہمارے پیڑوسی پاکستان میں بھر ملکی ہوائی آڈے ہیں -

اس کو ہمیں نظر انداز نہیں کرنا چاہئے - جناب والا - میں اس سلسلہ میں امریکی سہولتہ فلہٹ کے ریپر ایڈمرل افنورجیہکسن کا ایک بیان ایولن کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں جو کہ انہوں نے ۶ اکتوبر کو چٹاگانگ میں دیا تھا - اس بیان میں انہوں نے تین چار موٹی موٹی باتیں کہی ہیں - جنکو میں مہمبران ایولن کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں - اور میں ان سے توقع رکھتا ہوں اور ہلدوستان کی حکومت سے توقع رکھتا ہوں کہ وہ اس بیان پر غور کریں گی - انہوں نے کہا ہے -

"The U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Pacific was ever ready to go to the Bay of Bengal and Chittagong at any moment of threat."

انہوں نے یہ کہہ کہا ہے -

"East Pakistan was a major and a very important sector from the free World's defence point of view."

انہوں نے آگے یہ بھی کہا ہے -

"It was highly desirable to build a strong naval force in Chittagong Port."

یہ ایک ٹیول کمانڈر ہیں امریکہ کے سیونٹھ فلہٹ کے - یہ جانتے ہوئے کہ ہلدوستان اور پاکستان کے تعلقات بہتر نہیں ہیں - ہمیں اس قسم کی دھمکیاں دی جاتی ہیں کہ چٹاگانگ کا ایک بڑا سمندری آڈا بنے گا - اور سیونٹھ فلہٹ تھوڑے سے نوٹس پر بے

[شری اے۔ ایم طارق]

آف بلگال میں آ سکتا ہے۔ یہ کہنا ہلدوستان کی آزادی پر حملہ ہے۔ ہلدوستان کی حکومت کو اس حملے کو منظور کرنا ہوگا۔ وہ سبھی ملک جو جابر ہیں۔ جو حملہ آور ہیں ان کو جابر اور حملہ آور ماننا ہوگا۔ چاہے وہ پاک۔ تان ہو اور چاہے وہ چین ہو۔ اسے ہلدوستان کے علاقہ کو خالی کرنا پڑے گا۔

چین نے ہماری سرحدوں پر حملہ کیا ہے۔ اور ہم اس کا بہت باؤلہ کرتے ہیں۔ لیکن ہمیں پاکستان کے اس حملے کو بھی نہیں بھولنا چاہئے جو کہ دس سال سے چلا آ رہا ہے۔ اور جس کی وجہ سے لاکھوں آدمیوں کا قتل ہوا۔ میں آپ دوستوں سے یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ان کو یہ بات چھوڑ کر کہ ہماری سیاسی جماعتوں کیا کہتی ہیں۔ ایک ہلدوستانی کی حیثیت سے یہ ذیکھنا چاہئے کہ آج ان بے گناہ کشمیریوں کی کیا حالت ہے جو کئی سال سے پاکستان کے قلم ہیں۔ آپ ان کی حالت دیکھیں۔ ان کی صورتوں اور ان کے بچوں کی حالت کو دیکھیں کہ روزمرہ پاکستان ان کے ساتھ کیا کرتا ہے۔ آپ یہ دیکھیں کہ کتنی بار پاکستان نے ہماری سرحدوں پر پونچھ : میں حملے کئے ہیں۔ کتنے ہمارے فوجی مارے گئے۔ اس کے باوجود بھی آپ دیکھیں کہ ہم نے ہمسہہ کوشی

کی ہر وقت پاکستان کے ساتھ اپنے تعلقات کو بہتر بنانے کی۔

آباد ہکھے مہودے۔ کیا ممبر صاحب کو پتہ ہے کہ اسپیکر صاحب نے دس منٹ کی حد مقرر کی ہے۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق۔ میں نے ابھی شاید آٹھ منٹ ہی لئے ہیں۔

تو میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا تھا کہ تقریر میں منسٹر کھرشچو نے یونائیٹڈ نیشن میں جو کہا اس کی تشریح کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ انہوں نے کہا کہ اقوام متحدہ چند لوگوں کی ملایلی بن چکی ہے۔ میں ایک ہلدوستانی اور ایک کشمیری کی حیثیت سے۔۔۔

شری برج راج سنگھ۔ کیا کشمیر ہلدوستان سے الگ ہے۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق۔ جلاب والا کشمیر پوری طرح ہلدوستان کا حصہ ہے۔ وہ ہلدوستان کا ایک صوبہ ہے جسے کہ اور صوبے ہیں۔

شری برج راج سنگھ۔ تو پھر ہلدوستان کہنا ہی کافی تھا۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق۔ جلاب والا کشمیر میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کس طرح اقوام متحدہ میں ہماری جائز شکایت کو پاور پالکس کی وجہ سے

ابھی تک طے نہیں کیا گیا۔ یہ جانتے ہوئے بھی کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے اور یہ جانتے ہوئے بھی کہ کشمیر پر پاکستان نے حملہ کیا ہے پاور پائلٹس کا ٹھٹھہ ہونے کی وجہ سے آج تک اس کا فیصلہ نہیں کیا گیا۔ صرف پاور پائلٹس کی وجہ سے کشمیر کے مسئلے کو دس سال تک لٹکائے رکھا گیا۔ یہ اقوام متحدہ میں ان لوگوں کی سازش سے ہو رہا ہے جن کی وہاں اکثریت ہے۔

ہم نے یہ بھی دیکھا کہ کانگو میں آج کہا ہو رہا ہے۔ وطن لوگوں کے نمائندوں کے لئے وہاں کی پارلیمنٹ کے دروازوں پر پہرا بٹھا دیا گیا ہے۔ بلکل اسی طرح جس طرح کہ پاکستان میں ہوا وہاں کی پارلیمنٹ کے ممبروں کو جیل میں ٹھونس دیا گیا اور ایک ایسے شخص کو صرف جس کا وہاں وجود ہے۔ اس کے پیچھے وہاں کے عوام کی شخصیت نہیں ہے۔ کوئی عوام کی رائے نہیں ہے۔ تمام مہذب ملکوں کے پرائیویٹ کے باوجود۔ وہاں نے لوگوں پر ٹھونسا جا رہا ہے۔ ویسٹرن بلاک کی ہمیشہ یہ خواہش رہی ہے کہ جب ایک عظیم فرد ہو تو اس کے مقابلہ پر اپنی ملشا اور مقصد کے مطابق دوسرا آدمی پیدیا کریں۔ ہندوستان میں بھی اس قسم کی کوشش کی گئی۔ لیکن ہندوستانی لوگوں کے اس اٹل ٹھیلے

کی وجہ سے کہ ہداری لیڈرشپ شری جواہر لال نہرو کے ہاتھ میں مضبوط ہے وہ اس میں کامیاب ہونے نہیں پائے۔

ہمارے ملک میں بہت سی فرقہ دراوتہ جماعتیں کام کر رہی ہیں۔ جن کے پیچھے باہری ملکوں کا ہاتھ ہے۔ آپ کو شاید یہ علم نہ ہوگا کہ ابھی دہلی میں جماعت اسلامی کا ایک حملہ ہوا۔ یہ جماعت خالص فرقہ پرست جماعت ہے اور اس کے پیچھے یقیناً غیر ملکی طاقتیں ہیں۔ جس شان شوکت سے اس کا جلسہ ہوا۔ اس سے ثابت ہوتا ہے کہ غیر ملکی طاقتیں اس کے پیچھے ہیں۔ اور ہمارے ملک کو پریشانی میں ڈالنا چاہتی ہیں۔

میں حکومت ہند سے درخواست کروں گا۔ میں درخواست کروں گا وزیر اعظم سے اور ڈیفنس منسٹر صاحب سے کہ ہداری سرحدوں کی باقاعدہ حفاظت ہونی چاہئے۔ چاہے وہ چین کی طرف سے ہو یا پاکستان کی طرف سے ہو۔ ہمیں اس چہرے کو نہیں بھولنا چاہئے کہ ہداری سرحدوں پر دشمن بھٹھا ہوا ہے ہداری سرحد پر ہمارے ہمسائے ملکوں میں باہری طاقتوں کے فوجی اڈے

[شری اے - ایم طارق]

ہیں - ہمیں اس طرف بھی دیکھنا  
رکھنا چاہئے -

جناب قیپینس منسٹر صاحب پر  
بہت سے اعتراضات کئے گئے - باجھٹی  
صاحب نے کئے اور لوگوں نے بھی کئے -  
لیکن کوئی مضبوط چیز ہوئی باتوں  
سے کر نہیں سکتی - میں اس سلسلہ  
میں لندن کے مشہور اخبار ایوننگ  
اسٹینڈرڈ کے چند الفاظ ایوان کے سامنے  
رکھنا چاہتا ہوں - جب انہوں نے  
دیکھا کہ ہمارا ہلدوسٹری قیپینگھشن -  
اس کے منبر اور اس نے لیڈر کس طرح  
افریکی اور ایشیائی ملکوں کی آواز کی  
وہاں نمائندگی کرتے ہیں تو انہوں نے  
کہا کہ - کرشنا مینن الفاظ کے دہلی  
ہیں - کرشنا مینن ایشیائی - افریقی  
ملکوں کے مقبول لیڈر ہیں اور ان کی  
نمائندگی کرتے ہیں - میں اس بارے  
میں اپنے قیپینگھشن اور اس کے لیڈر کو  
مبارکباد دیتا ہوں -

14 hrs.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya):  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the Russian proposal that there should be three Secretaries-General, is more in our interest than in the interest of the Russians. It is more in the interest of America than of Russia, if it is true that America is interested only in combating the growth of Communism throughout

the Afro-Asian land mass. The Russian proposal is an indication of an abandonment of the goal of world Communism. Russia has realised that in the conflict for supremacy over the Afro-Asian land mass, China stands a better chance of success than her. Chinese hegemony cannot be established if the Afro-Asian Secretary-General is vested with the power to safeguard democracy. The aim of Russia is to checkmate China. Communism can be combated only by transforming the United Nations Organisation into a world government. The aim of the United Nations Mission in Congo is to prevent the establishment of Russian hegemony.

The function of the Communist Secretary-General will be to strengthen the hands of the Afro-Asian Secretary-General. The aim of Russia is to checkmate America. Russia wants to strengthen the United Nations Organisation.

It is unrealistic to think that the institution of three Secretaries-General will be powerless to deal with emergency problems. The Swiss system of Government and the cabinet form of Government throughout the Commonwealth nations are functioning very satisfactorily. There used to be two emperors at a time in ancient Rome. The problem of Congo would not have become as serious as it has become now had there been three Secretaries-General.

Today the United Nations Organisation is interfering in the internal affairs of Congo as it ought to. The charter has become obsolete. The United Nations Organisation will have to interfere more and more into the affairs of the Afro-Asian land mass if the threat of the establishment of Communist hegemony by the methods of subversion, infiltration and sabotage is to be effectively combated. The vesting of power into the hands of the United Nations Organisation to interfere in the internal affairs of the



nation States means that control over defence and foreign affairs has passed from the latter to the former. If the United Nations Organisation is going to interfere in the internal affairs of nation-States, it is folly to permit an agent of the Western powers to function as the sole Secretary-General.

Either Belgian or Russian hegemony would have been established over Congo by now had the non-aligned nations not interfered in Congo. The impending blood bath in Congo will be averted and the Parliament will start functioning if Col. Mobutu and Mr. Tshombe are arrested and the Belgians are driven out by the United Nations organisation.

There will be a war between Russia and America if the Russians start entering into Cuba in the same manner in which the Belgians are entering Congo. Some, if not all, of the Western powers stand solidly behind Belgium. Their game is to teach a lesson in international politics to the Afro-Asian leaders who have started functioning in Congo on behalf of the United Nations Organisation. The Western powers will try to liquidate the United Nations Organisation if they fail to keep it under their control.

What constitutes an internal affair is not always clear. The United Nations Organisation must have the right to interfere in all problems, internal or external, that constitute a threat to peace, for the purpose of the United Nations Organisation is to maintain peace. The Polish Government in 1939 regarded German interference on the question of Danzig as interference in the internal affairs of Poland. The Germans took an opposite view. The result was war.

The three Secretaries-General, if appointed, will deal with the problems of their respective areas. As long as there is cold war between Russia and America, the Afro-Asian Secretary-General will wield more powers than the other two. He will hold the balance

of power. One of his main functions will be to see that Russia and America do not come together.

I do not agree with the view of Rajaji that President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev would have met had the five power resolution been not moved. The five powers deserve congratulations if Rajaji's analysis is correct. The Russian proposal aims at the establishment of a world government. A world government must be established if the goal of disarmament is to be achieved.

There must be a cabinet form of government if a world government is to be achieved. The institution of three Secretaries-General is tantamount to the establishment of a cabinet form of Government. To disarm sovereign nation States and to foist the authority of one Secretary-General over them is nothing but pure imperialism. It will mean the establishment of a world government on the basis of white hegemony. Any inspection commission to supervise the task of disarmament will be a world government for all practical purposes.

A world government on the basis of democracy will be established if the two Russian proposals that there should be three Secretaries-General and that in future only heads of Government or States should attend the meeting of the United Nations Organisation are accepted. These two proposals form part of an integral whole. If the Russian proposals are accepted, the members of the Security Council and the three Secretaries-General would have to be heads of States or Governments.

Our Prime Minister, Sir, has done well in calling upon Mr. Castro in New York. The condition precedent to our acceptance of the Monroe doctrine is the liquidation of the NATO, SEATO, CENTO and the American bases in the old world. There is absolutely no difference between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon on the question of Cuba. They want to do in

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

Cuba what the Russians and the Chinese have done in Eastern Europe and Tibet. America cannot stay in the old world if her hegemony over the new world is weakened. Therefore, I support Cuba. The condition precedent to the integration of the old world into one political unit is the withdrawal of America from the old world. If the United States of America is free to export goods and weapons to the countries of the old world, there is no reason why Cuba cannot get what she wants from Russia or from China. If America cannot tolerate Communism in the new world, Russia would be fully justified in saying that she will not accept or tolerate the American version of democracy round about her peripheral regions.

If it is the mission of the United State of America to liberate the captive nations of Eastern Europe from the bonds of Russian slavery, it is equally the mission of Russia to liberate the captive nations of Latin America from the bonds of American slavery. Is self-determination meant to be practised only by the Chinese and the Russians in Tibet and Eastern Europe and not by America in Cuba? If America has got the divine right to interfere in the affairs of the old world on the bogus plea of defending democracy, Russia has also got the same right to interfere in the affairs of the new world for the purpose of establishing a classless society.

On all issues of conflict between Russia and America pertaining to the problems of Europe and the New world, we should unhesitatingly support Russia. If America is sincere about democracy, sovereignty and nationalism, it should vest control over her defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation. We will really round her banner if it does so. The mad craze for possessing absolute sovereignty will lead either to the total destruction of sovereignty throughout the world or to global destruction.

We can enjoy partial sovereignty if we vest a little of it into the hands of the United Nations Organisation. The United Nations Organisation is we ourselves purged and purified of all our evils. Have the Indian States lost anything by acceding to the Indian Union?

Now I come to the problems of colonialism. We should send volunteers and arms to Algeria. Other nations are helping Algeria in many ways. Our power position will be weakened if we lag behind. There cannot be any solidarity amongst us if we do not give any concrete help to the brave people of Algeria in their hour of trial. We should not lag behind Russia and China in winning the friendship of the Arab world and Africa. Friendship with the Arab world and Africa is much more vital than friendship with the western powers. The power vacuum in Africa and western Asia should not be allowed to be filled by the establishment of hegemony.

A permanent organisation on the lines of the organisation of the American States should be established by the non-aligned nations in collaboration with China and Russia to chalk out a political-cum-military plan to drive out the western powers from the Afro-Asian landmass. No foreign hegemony can be established over the Afro-Asian landmass if India participates in the struggle for the liberation of the colonies. All possibilities of a political settlement between Russia and America or Russia and China or China and America will be liquidated if India along with China and Russia participate in the struggle for the liberation of the colonies. Eash of these three possibilities constitute a threat to the non-aligned nations.

If the problem is looked at from this point of view, it will become crystal clear that colonialism constitutes the most urgent problem for us. Colonialism must be liquidated and the

control over defence and foreign affairs must pass into the hands of the United Nations Organisation if the Afro-Asian landmass is to be integrated into one political unit. Today the United Nations Organisation is an instrument into the hands of the white powers. The United Nations Organisation will become an organisation of all the peoples of the world in the real sense of the term the day control over defence and foreign affairs passes into its hands.

The Afro-Eurasian landmass has to be integrated into one political unit on the basis of democracy if the three-fold dangers of war or hegemony or the emergence of a multi-polar world in which all sovereign nation states will be thermonuclear powers are to be averted. These dangers can be averted only by vesting control over defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation. Russia, China and America will have to vest control over defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation if the non-aligned nations take the first step in that direction. I prefer hegemony to a multipolar world. Hegemony will lead to the integration of the world into one political unit on the basis of dictatorship. The multipolar world, on the other hand, will lead to the destruction of all animal, human and plant life on the globe. The alternative to a world government is either war or hegemony. The United Nations Organisation will become a world government if control over defence and foreign affairs passes into its hands. We should not stand for any other change in the structure of the United Nations Organisation. The virus of power politics should not be allowed to spread in our ranks. The mere expansion of the Security Council and other organisations of the United Nations Organisation will break our solidarity.

One word more and I have finished. China will never join the United Nations Organisation unless Formosa is integrated with the mainland.

There is no reality in the concept of two Chinas. The non-aligned nations should introduce a resolution in the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation with the object of liberating Formosa from the American yoke. The occupation of Formosa does not confer any military advantage in this age of the inter-continental ballistic missiles and other thermonuclear weapons. The Government of India has made its stand crystal clear on the question of Formosa. The liberation of Hong Kong, Formosa, Okinawa and other places in the Afro-Asian landmass will facilitate the withdrawal of China from the Aksai-chin area. China will cool down if her special interests in the Pacific are recognised.

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बहस का स्वागत करता हूँ। इस बहस से दुनिया में विश्व सरकार बनाने के प्रयत्नों को ब मिलागा, राष्ट्र संघ को भी बल मिलेगा और हिन्दुस्तान में उस के प्रति आदर पैदा होगा। लेकिन मुझे दुःख है कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रतिनिधिमंडल का जो रोल राष्ट्र संघ में रहा उस की पूर्ण रूप से प्रशंसा नहीं की जा सकती। राष्ट्र संघ में और कल से जो यहाँ भाषण हुए हैं उन में प्रधान मंत्री महोदय और रक्षा मंत्री महोदय के जो भाषण हुए हैं उन से साफ प्रकट होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान का ज्यादा जोर निश्शस्त्रीकरण पर है, उपनिवेशवाद के खात्मे पर उतना नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि निश्शस्त्रीकरण हिन्दुस्तान की आत्मा में है, निश्शस्त्रीकरण हम चाहते हैं। उस से कोई इन्कार नहीं करता है। वह दुनिया के भले के लिये है, इस से भी इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है। लेकिन निश्शस्त्रीकरण और उपनिवेशवाद के खात्मे में से अगर किसी को चुनना हो तो हिन्दुस्तान की जनता सब से पहले उपनिवेशवाद के खात्मे को चुनेगी यह बात स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये। मुझे लगता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने इस तरह का दृष्टिकोण नहीं अपनाया है जिस में वह यह

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

कहती कि हम सब से पहले उपनिवेशवाद का खात्मा चाहते हैं और फिर उस के बाद निश्शस्त्रीकरण की बात होगी। जो प्रधानमंत्री जी का राष्ट्र संघ में भाषण हुआ उस से पता चलता है कि वह उपनिवेशवाद का खात्मा तो चाहते हैं, वह चाहते हैं कि वह खत्म होना चाहिये लेकिन उपनिवेशवाद से भी जरूरी वह निश्शस्त्रीकरण समझते हैं। इस तरह के उन के शब्द थे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि निश्शस्त्रीकरण का महत्व दुनिया की उस ६० करोड़ जनता के लिये है जिस के पास कुछ है और दुनिया की १६० करोड़ उस जनता के लिये उतना नहीं है, जिस के पास कुछ नहीं है। इसलिये १६० करोड़ जनता के लिये उपनिवेशवाद का खात्मा और निर्धनता का खात्मा, यही दो महत्वपूर्ण मसले हैं जिन पर सब से पहले ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये।

जब मैं उपनिवेशवाद की बात कहता हूँ तो मुझे अल्जीरिया के फरहत अब्बास का ही नाम याद नहीं आता, मुझे केनिया के जोमो केनियाटा की भी याद आती है जो, अफ्रीकन राष्ट्रवाद के एक आदर्श बन चुके हैं। मुझ दुःख है कि केनिया को आजाद कराने में, वहां से उपनिवेशवाद का खात्मा कराने में, टांगनीका से उपनिवेशवाद का खात्मा कराने में हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार कोई पहल नहीं ले रही है और उसने यह पहल क्यूबा के डा० कास्ट्रो और रूस के श्री ख्रूशचेव के हाथ में देकर दुनिया की जनता के सामने यह साबित कर दिया है कि कम्युनिज्म शायद जनतन्त्र से अच्छा हो सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान क्योंकि उपनिवेशवाद के अन्तर्गत रह चुका है, हिन्दुस्तान बे खतरे मोल ले चका है जो आजाद होने के लिये लिये जाते हैं, इसलिये यहां की सरकार और उसका प्रतिनिधि मंडल सब से रहा होता जिसने सब से ज्यादा जोर इस बात पर दिया होता कि एक टाइम लिमिट

निश्चित कर देनी चाहिये, सीमा निर्धारित कर देनी चाहिये जिसके बाद कि दुनिया का कोई भी मुल्क गुलाम नहीं रहेगा।

दुनिया में गुलामी का खात्मा तीन सालों के अन्दर जरूर हो जायेगा। इस वास्ते मैं स्वागत करता हूँ प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की इस आशंका का कि अगर तीन चार साल के अन्दर दुनिया से शस्त्रों का खात्मा नहीं होता, निश्शस्त्रीकरण पूरी तरह से कामयाब नहीं होता है तो दुनिया का खात्मा हो जायेगा। इसी तरह से निश्चित रूप से इस प्रकार की घोषणा की जानी चाहिये थी कि दुनिया से गुलामी का खात्मा, उपनिवेशवाद का खात्मा अगले तीन चार सालों के अन्दर हो जाना चाहिये। जो मुल्क आज भी दुनिया में गुलाम हैं, उनकी आजादी में देरी होने पर भी, हम अपनी शुभकामनायें भेजते हैं और आशा करते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट आशा करती है कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके वे उतनी जल्दी आजाद हों, और हम अपने प्रतिनिधि मंडल से आशा करेंगे कि जब कभी इस तरह के प्रश्न राष्ट्रसंघ में आयें तो उसको अधिक से अधिक जोर दे कर यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि दुनियां से जल्दी से जल्दी गुलामी का खात्मा हो।

इसी के साथ-साथ जुड़ा हुआ जो मसला है वह गोआ का है। कहा गया कि दुनियां के जिन हिस्सों पर पुर्तगाल के उपनिवेश कायम हैं उनको वह अपने सूबे बतलाता है। आज की दुनिया में यह कितने आश्चर्य की बात है। इस तरह से गोवा भी पुर्तगाल का हो सकता है अंगोला हो सकता है मोजम्बिक हो सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान का प्रतिनिधि मंडल राष्ट्रसंघ में जोर दे इस बात के लिये कि इस तरह की बात कहने का हक पुर्तगाल को नहीं होना चाहिये। मुझे खुशी है कि पुर्तगाल दुनिया में अकेला पड़ता जा रहा है और भविष्य में और भी अकेला

पड़ता जायेगा, और वे उपनिवेश भी जो आज पुर्तगाल के कब्जे में हैं, जल्दी आजाद होंगे, और गोआ भी जो कि हिन्दुस्तान का अभिन्न अंग है, वास्तव में हिन्दुस्तान का अभिन्न अंग बना लिया जायेगा ।

जब दादर और नगरहवेली की बात आती है तो मुझे अफसोस होता है कि किस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार इस बारे में अपने विचार रखती है । दादर और नगरहवेली की जनता ने ऐसे साहस और वीरता से अपनी आजादी हासिल की, विदेशियों को मार भगाया, उसके बाद जब नगरहवेली और दादर की जनता हिन्दुस्तान से अपने को मिलाना चाहती है, वास्तव में एक होना चाहती है, तो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार इस तरह की बातें हमारे सामने रखती है कि कुछ वास्तविकतायें इस तरह की हैं, कुछ कठिनाइयां इस तरह की हैं जिनसे हम ऐसा नहीं कर सकते । यह बड़े अफसोस की बात है । जल्दी ही हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को ऐसे कदम उठाना चाहिये जिनसे कि दादर और नगरहवेली हिन्दुस्तान का अभिन्न अंग बन सके ।

जब विदेशी मामलों पर बहस हो रही है तो हमें बरबस याद आती है उन चीजों की जो हमारी सीमाओं पर हो रही हैं । अभी हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच में नहरी पानी का समझौता हुआ है । मैं नहीं कहता कि पाकिस्तान से समझौता नहीं होना चाहिये । आवश्यक है कि हमारे जितने पड़ोसी हैं उनसे समझौता हो, उनसे हम घनी दोस्ती कायम कर सकें, लेकिन समझौते से पहले हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट को विश्वास में ले कर यह प्रयत्न करना चाहिये था कि हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट और पाकिस्तान के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जाने कि किन बातों, शर्तों पर हम समझौता करने जा रहे हैं । मैं चाहूंगा कि भारतवर्ष की सरकार इस बात का ख्याल रखे कि जब भी कोई इस तरह

का महत्वपूर्ण काम हो तो हिन्दुस्तान को पार्लियामेंट को विश्वास में लिया जाये । और उसके जरिये हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को विश्वास में लिया जाये । आज हमने एक बात अखबारों में देखी, पता नहीं वह कहां तक सत्य है, कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में रेल समझौता हो रहा है । पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान से पूर्वी पाकिस्तान को जाने के लिये कुछ रेल के डिब्बे पाकिस्तान के लगेंगे और उन में माल और सवारियां दोनों ही पाकिस्तान के एक हिस्से से दूसरे हिस्से को जायेंगे । इसी तरह से पश्चिमी बंगाल से मणिपुर और त्रिपुरा को हमारा माल और सवारियां जायेंगी । क्या उसकी शर्तें हों, इस तरह का कोई समझौता होता है तो उससे पहले उस पर पूरी तरह से सोच विचार करना चाहिये । यह ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि हमें पाकिस्तान की जनता से मुहब्बत है, हम कल तक भाई-भाई की तरह रहे हैं, हमारा उन का खून एक है, लेकिन आज दुनिया की जो स्थिति है उस में पाकिस्तान कुछ दूसरी ताकतों के चक्कर में आ कर कुछ ऐसे काम करना चाहता है जो कभी हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ भी हो सकते हैं । इस लिये ऐसे समझौते होने से पहले हमें उन पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये और अगर इस तरह का कोई खतरा हो तो सम्भवतः इस तरह के समझौते होने की आवश्यकता नहीं ।

हमारी जो उत्तरी सीमा है, उस पर भी बहुत कुछ हुआ है, पिछली दफा जो बहस हुई, उस के बाद । मुझे अफसोस है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी भी अपना भाषण दे चुके, रक्षा मंत्री भी अपना भाषण दे चुके, जिन पर जिम्मेदारी है देश की एक एक इंच भूमि की रक्षा करने की, लेकिन उनमें से किसी ने इस पर कोई चर्चा नहीं की कि उत्तरी सीमा की रक्षा करने के लिये वे क्या कर रहे हैं । हो सकता है कि यह बहाना बनाया जाये कि चूंकि यूनाइटेड नेशनल असेम्बली की

[श्री बजराल सिंह]

बात हो रही है और इस पर चर्चा चल रही है, इस लिये हमने कुछ नहीं कहा। लेकिन चूँकि विदेशी मामलों की बहस के बाद और कोई मौका इस अधिवेशन में नहीं मिलेगा इस के लिये, इस लिये आवश्यक था कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार देश की जनता को आश्वस्त करती कि बावजूद इस के कि चीन की तरफ से हमारी एअर स्पेस का वायो-लेशन हो रहा है और दूसरी कार्रवाइयाँ हो रही हैं, हमारे नागरिकों की बेइज्जती की जा रही है तिब्बत में, हम सशक्त हैं और हम कोई ऐसा कदम छोड़ नहीं रखेंगे जिससे देश के ऊपर कभी कोई खतरा आ सके, और जो भूमि उन्होंने अनधिकृत रूप से अपने कब्जे में करली है, उसे जल्दी वापस लेंगे। मुझे अफसोस है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की तरफ से इस तरह का कोई आश्वासन नहीं दिया गया है, इस तरह की कोई बात नहीं कही गई है। इस लिये और अफसोस होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान के रक्षा मंत्री एक या पौन घंटे तक भाषण देते हैं, जैसे कि किसी यूनिवर्सिटी में दे रहे हों, या यूनाइटेड नेशन्स असेम्बली में दे रहे हों, न कि हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट में, कि यह एक टेकनिकल चीज है पर वास्तविकता से इसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। हमें याद रखना चाहिये.....

श्री अन्सार हरवानी (फतेहपुर) : आप भी पढ़े लिखे हैं।

श्री बजराल सिंह : मैं जानता हूँ कि श्री अन्सार हरवानी क्या कहना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जो बात वे कहना चाहते हैं वह अगर डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से ही कह लें तो अच्छा होगा। मैं पढ़ा लिखा हूँ, आप पढ़े लिखे हैं, इसका सवाल नहीं है। हम देश की रक्षा करने के लिये यहां बैठे हैं, हम देश का राज काज चलाने के लिये यहां बैठे हैं, हमें सिर्फ यह नहीं देखना है कि यहां कौन पढ़ा लिखा है और कौन नहीं। हम टेकनिकल माम-

लों पर कोई बहस नहीं कर रहे हैं, वह टेकनिकल एक्सपर्ट ही कर सकते हैं। हमें नीतियों को निर्धारित करना है। मुझे अफसोस है कि हमारे देश के रक्षा मंत्री शायद उस पर इतना ध्यान नहीं दे रहे हैं, जितना कि उन को देना चाहिये, मैं आशा करूँगा कि देश की सरकार उस पर और अधिक ध्यान देगी।

अब मैं फिर यूनाइटेड नेशन्स असेम्बली की तरफ आता हूँ। उसका यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण अधिवेशन चल रहा है। लेकिन अफसोस की बात यह है कि हालाँकि उसके इस अधिवेशन से पहले पार्लियामेंट का पिछला अधिवेशन चल रहा था और हमने प्रधान मंत्री से यह जानने की कोशिश की एक सवाल द्वारा, किन्तु दुर्भाग्यवश उसका जवाब नहीं दिया गया कि क्या वे यूनाइटेड नेशन्स असेम्बली में जाना चाहते हैं। उस समय तो कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया, लेकिन पार्लियामेंट का अधिवेशन खत्म होने के बाद उन्होंने एलन किया कि वे जाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन आखिर बात क्या थी? वे देख रहे थे कि दुनिया के देशों के और अधिपतियों की तरफ, क्यूश्चेव की तरफ, मैकमिलन साहब की तरफ, कि वे जाना चाहते हैं या नहीं, फलाने साहब जाना चाहते हैं या नहीं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें पिछलगू नीति को छोड़ देना चाहिये। मैकमिलन साहब क्या करेंगे, हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री को उसकी कोई नकल नहीं करनी चाहिये। चूँकि वहां पर मैकमिलन साहब आ गये, दूसरे लोग आ गये, इस लिये इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री भी गये। बड़ी खुशी की बात है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का वहां जाना, जिस तरह से कि श्री क्यूश्चेव ने वहां कहा था, और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री भी शायद सहमत हों, मैं भी सहमत हूँ, कि, इस तरह की दुनिया की असेम्बलियों का इजलास हर साल हो, और हर साल

उसमें दुनिया के अधिनायक, प्रधान मंत्री या राष्ट्रपति, जो हेड हों, वह उन में जरूर जायें क्योंकि इस से दुनिया में टेंशन (तनाव) कम हो सकता है और दुनिया की समस्याओं को हल करने में हम उनसे सहायता ले सकेंगे। लेकिन हमें अफसोस है कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री से, हिन्दुस्तान की पृष्ठभूमि को देखते हुये, हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास और उस की परम्पराओं को देखते हुये, जो आशा की जाती थी, वह पूरी नहीं हुई। दुर्भाग्य से हम ने इनिशिएटिव रुइचेव और कैस्ट्रो के हाथ में दे दिया, उस इनिशिएटिव की वजह से शायद अफ्रीकी राष्ट्र और दुनिया के दूसरे पददलित राष्ट्र, जिन के सामने सब से बड़ी समस्या भूख की है, घर बार की है, दवाओं की है, कपड़े की है, वे यह समझने लगे हैं कि कम्यूनिस्ट राष्ट्र उन के सेवियर (रक्षक) हो कर आयेंगे। इस तरह की भावना दुनिया में पैदा होने देना ठीक नहीं है। हम कम्यूनिज्म के असली माने को भूल जाते हैं क्योंकि कम्यूनिज्म से इस तरह की आशा कभी हो नहीं सकती। अगर हम चाहते हैं कि दुनिया में कम्यूनिज्म का फैलाव न हो तो जो काम हमें करना चाहिये था उस की लीड हमें रुइचेव और कैस्ट्रो के हाथों में नहीं दे देनी चाहिये थी। मुझे दुःख है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने वहां पर लीड नहीं ली जो कि वे ले सकते थे। उन्होंने इस पर जोर दिया है कि अल्जीरिया के प्रश्न को उठा कर हम जो बात कहते हैं उस से कौन नाराज होता है। आज वक्त आ गया है कि देश की सरकार को यह सोचना चाहिये कि अल्जीरिया में छः सालों से लड़ाई हो रही है, लाखों राष्ट्रवादी वहां मारे जा चुके हैं। लेकिन चूँकि फ्रांस नाराज होता है इस लिये हम फरहत अब्बास की सरकार को मान्यता न दें, रिकग्निशन न दें, यह हिन्दुस्तान की परम्पराओं के विरुद्ध जाता है। मैं देश की सरकार से कहूँगा कि अब वक्त आ गया है जब अल्जीरिया में जो कुछ हो रहा है उसे देखते हुए फरहत अब्बास की सरकार को हमें मान्यता देनी चाहिये।

इसी तरह से अफ्रीका के दूसरे राष्ट्रों में, जहाँ उपनिवेशवाद कायम है, उसे खत्म होना चाहिये और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रतिनिधि मंडल को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स असेम्बली में इस के लिये सब से पहले लीड लेनी चाहिये थी, लेकिन उस ने ऐसा नहीं किया। आखिर वह तो थियोरेटिकल बातों में जाना चाहते हैं, और आज सम्भवतः इसी लिए कहा जाता है कि चीन और हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा पर जो विवाद है वह थियोरेटिकल कंट्रोवर्सी है। यह हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री या रक्षा मंत्री कहें यह सुन्दर बात नहीं। यह हिन्दुस्तान के लिए दुर्भाग्य की बात है। जब हिन्दुस्तान की जनता यह कहती है कि हमारे हजारों वर्गमील क्षेत्र पर विदेशी ने कब्जा कर रखा है, तब इस तरह की बात कहना कहां तक ठीक है। है। आप विदेशी को न हटा पाएं या किसी नीति के कारण न हटाना चाहें, यह अलग बात है, लेकिन यह कहना कि यह एक कंट्रोवर्सी है, यह उचित बात नहीं है। यह हिन्दुस्तान के सम्मान को धक्का पहुंचाना है, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की भावनाओं का निरादर करना है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार, हिन्दुस्तान का प्रतिनिधिमंडल देश में या विदेश में कभी भी इस तरह की बात आगे नहीं कहेगा।

डिसआर्ममेंट पर जोर दिया जाता है। हम चाहते हैं कि निःशस्त्रीकरण हो। लेकिन हमको सोचना चाहिए कि इससे किसकी हानि और नुकसान होने वाला है। हमारे पास तो कुछ है नहीं। हमें तो सैकिड हैंड राइफलें और रिजेक्टेड हथियार खरीदने के लिए दूसरे देशों के सामने जाना पड़ता है। लेकिन हम निःशस्त्रीकरण पर बहुत जोर दे रहे हैं। हमारी तो परम्परा और पृष्ठभूमि ही इस तरह की है कि हम निःशस्त्रीकरण चाहते हैं। लेकिन इस तरह निःशस्त्रीकरण की समस्या पर जोर देकर हम दुनिया की जो मुख्य समस्याएं हैं उनसे दुनिया का ध्यान हटाते हैं, और यही गेम है जो रूस और अमरीका खेलना चाहते

## [श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

हैं। वे दुनिया की मुख्य समस्याओं को हल नहीं करना चाहते। श्री ख्रुश्चेव ने जनरल असेम्बली में कहा कि अफ्रीका पूरी तरह आजाद होना चाहिए। यह खुशी की बात है लेकिन ऐसा करके हमारे हाथ से इस मामले में उन्होंने लीड ले ली और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री इस बात को न कह सके। यह बड़े दुःख की बात है। हम यह मानते हैं कि निःशस्त्रीकरण एक जरूरी समस्या है, लेकिन आप देखें कि आज दुनिया की ६० करोड़ जनता ही ऐसी है जिसके पास कुछ है, दुनिया की दो तिहाई जनता ऐसी है जिसके पास कुछ नहीं है। उसके पास खाना नहीं है, कपड़ा नहीं है, मकान नहीं है, शिक्षा नहीं है। ऐसी जनता के लिए जिन चीजों की सब से पहले जरूरत है उनकी पूर्ति न करके जब हम दूसरे झगड़ों में फंस जाते हैं तो दुनिया की मुख्य समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती।

हम निःशस्त्रीकरण की बात करते हैं, लेकिन अगर दुनिया में उपनिवेशवाद बना रहा तो निःशस्त्रीकरण की बात करने के मानी यह होंगे कि अल्जीरिया में राष्ट्रवादी जो संघर्ष कर रहे हैं हम उसका समर्थन नहीं करते, या कीनिया में, टेंगेनिका में, अंगोला में, मुजम्बिक में या दूसरे उपनिवेशों में जो हो रहा है उसका हम समर्थन नहीं करते। जब तक दुनिया से उपनिवेशवाद का खातमा नहीं होता तब तक निःशस्त्रीकरण की बात करने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि सबसे जरूरी चीज है दुनिया से उपनिवेशवाद का खातमा करना। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रतिनिधियंडल को संयुक्तराष्ट्र संघ में सबसे अधिक जोर इस बात पर देना चाहिए था कि दुनिया से उपनिवेशवाद को खत्म किया जाए। उसके बाद निःशस्त्रीकरण की बात आती है।

निःशस्त्रीकरण की बात बहुत कही जाती है। अभी रक्षा मंत्री ने पौन घंटे निःशस्त्री-

करण पर बहुत सुन्दर भाषण दे दिया। कौन नहीं चाहता कि निःशस्त्रीकरण हो। लेकिन हमारे कहने मात्र से क्या हो सकता है। जब तक हम अपने को शक्तिशाली नहीं बनाते तब तक हमारी बात को कौन सुनने वाला है। वह हमारी बात को सुन कर सोचेंगे और जब उनकी मर्जी होगी और जो चीज उनके हित में होगी उसको वह मान लेंगे। और हम खुश हो जायेंगे कि हमारी बात मान ली गयी और हमारी प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ रही है। लेकिन इस तरह की शक्तिहीन प्रतिष्ठा से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। हमें पहले शक्ति अर्जित करनी होगी और तभी हमारी बात को आदर से सुना जा सकता है। मुझे दुःख है कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स जनरल असेम्बली में जो कुछ कहा गया उससे हमारी प्रतिष्ठा में कोई वृद्धि नहीं हुई।

यूनाइटेड नेशन्स जनरल असेम्बली के सामने जो मुख्य समस्याएं हैं, उनके बारे में मैं आपकी अनुमति से कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। उसके सामने यह समस्या है कि उसका पुनर्गठन होना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि उसका पुनर्गठन हो। यह बात इतना महत्व नहीं रखती कि तीन सेक्रेटरी जनरल हों, या एक सेक्रेटरी जनरल हो और दो असिस्टेंट सेक्रेटरी जनरल हों और एक ज्वाइंट सेक्रेटरी हो। लेकिन असल सवाल तो यह है कि आज यूनाइटेड नेशन्स जनरल असेम्बली दुनिया की जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व करे। उसमें दुनिया की समस्यायें प्रतिबिम्बित हों, दुनिया की जनता सोच सके कि हम अपनी समस्याओं को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के द्वारा हल करा सकते हैं। आज यूनाइटेड नेशन्स को ऐसा नहीं समझा जाता। आज वह पावर ब्लाक्स के चक्कर में फंसी हुई है। हंगरी का सवाल आता है तो रूस यह मान लेता है कि हम यूनाइटेड नेशन्स तो तोड़ देंगे। तिब्बत के सवाल पर भी इसी तरह



सोचा जा सकता है। इसी तरह से जब कांगो का सवाल आता है तो दूसरा ब्लाक उठ सकता है उसको तोड़ने के लिए। आज जो दोनों पावर ब्लाक्स हैं वे यह कोशिश करते रहते हैं कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स मजबूत न होने पाए और उनके हित में काम करता रहे। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब तक यूनाइटेड नेशन्स आरगेंनाइजेशन का पुनर्गठन नहीं होता और वह इस तरह से पावर ब्लाक्स में फँसा रहता है, तब तक उसका लक्ष्य पूरा नहीं हो सकता। वह लक्ष्य तभी पूरा हो सकता है जब कि वह सही मानों में दुनिया की जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व करे। और जब दुनिया की जनता के प्रतिनिधित्व की बात आती है तो हिंदुस्तान की सरकार कहती है कि हम कोई थर्ड फोर्स नहीं चाहते। थर्ड फोर्स कोई लड़ाई करने के लिये नहीं होगी। वह किसी पर हमला करने के लिये नहीं होगी। वह तो दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रखने के लिये होगी। और ये जो पावर ब्लाक हैं उनकी ताकत को कम करने के लिये लड़ेगी। इस तरह की थर्ड फोर्स एशिया और अफ्रीका के राष्ट्रों द्वारा बहुत आसानी से बनायी जा सकती है। उसका मुख्य उद्देश्य यह होगा कि दुनिया में लड़ाई न होने दे और शान्ति की बात करे, और जो पावर ब्लाक लड़ाई की बात करेगा उसका वह फोर्स समर्थन नहीं करेगी। मैं चाहूँगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार अपनी वर्तमान नीति पर पुनर्विचार करे और थर्ड फोर्स की बात को मान कर एशिया और अफ्रीका के राष्ट्रों को मिला कर थर्ड फोर्स कायम करने की कोशिश करे।

और जहाँ तक संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के पुनर्गठन का सवाल है उसकी बड़ी आवश्यकता है। तभी वह सही मानों में दुनिया का प्रतिनिधित्व कर सकेगा और विश्व सरकार की ओर बढ़ सकेगा। जब तक दुनिया में कोई ऐसी सरकार नहीं बनती जो कि विभिन्न राष्ट्रों की रक्षा की गारण्टी कर सके, तब तक दुनिया में चाहे जितना निःशस्त्रीकरण हो, शान्ति कायम नहीं हो सकती। जब तक दुनिया में ऐसी विश्व सरकार नहीं बनती जो

कि विभिन्न राष्ट्रों को आर्थिक सहायता और टेकनिकल सहायता अपने जरिये देने का प्रबन्ध करती है तब तक दुनिया में शान्ति कायम नहीं हो सकेगी। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि विश्व असेम्बली इस तरह की बने कि जिसमें दुनिया के राष्ट्रों को आबादी के आधार पर प्रतिनिधित्व मिले और जिन देशों की कम आबादी है उनको व्हेटेज मिले। अगर हम इस तरह की यूनाइटेड नेशन्स असेम्बली बना सकते हैं तो दुनिया से हमेशा के लिये लड़ाई का खात्मा हो सकता है, निःशस्त्रीकरण सफल हो सकता है और दुनिया में हमेशा शान्ति बगी रह सकती है। साथ ही साथ जो दुनिया के अनडेवेलप्ड और अण्डर डेवेलप्ड राष्ट्र हैं उनके लिए इकानमिक एड का चैनलिंग इसी संस्था के द्वारा हो तभी दुनिया का पूरा विकास हो सकेगा।

**Shri Basappa (Tiptur):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have heard the various speeches of some hon. Member on this side and also the other. Of course, I do not claim to contribute very much with any new ideas in this debate. But having heard some of the Statements, I feel it my duty to any a few words.

On this side of the House I heard with some attention the speech of my hon. friend Mr. Ram Subagh Singh. He was referring to the long speech of the Defence Minister and was saying that he was labouring on a point which was not very very necessary. He particularly wanted the Defence Minister to devote more of his time to the defence problems of this country. I agree to a certain extent with Mr. Ram Subagh Singh that he (Mr. Singh) is paying very great attention and is taking very great care to see that the defence of this country is put on proper lines.

But, Sir, it is very important to remember the scope of the motion which is before the House. The Speaker in his generosity has allowed us to speak on certain other subjects also. But if the Defence Minister Mr. Krishna

[Shri Basappa]

Menon or the Prime Minister were to devote more of their time to a particular aspect, it is not fair to say that they are labouring on certain points.

I have great respect to our great leader Acharya Kriplani. I am too small a man to comment on the big speech he has made today in this House. But I did not relish the last portion of his speech where he said that the Prime Minister is more and more attached to the Defence Minister. Even yesterday one of the Members of the P.S.P. Party attributed certain motives to the actions of the Defence Minister. This also is not fair. When we are faced with great dangers on all sides, remarks such as these that the Defence Minister's activities either in the United Nations or here are not up to the mark, are to be avoided.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I avoided it. I did not say he should not be there. I said let him be there, leave him alone.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** From the hon. Member's avoidance also, he has understood certain things.

**Shri Basappa:** Yes, Sir.

Our fundamental policy is also attacked by a member of the Swatantra Party from my own State. I refer to Shri Mohammed Imam. I am sorry—I am glad he is here.

**Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug):** You are sorry I am here?

**Shri Basappa:** I corrected myself.

He seems to think that the non-alignment policy, even though it has been explained at length by our Prime Minister, is not correct. His idea seems to be that we should side with America or the western bloc, that we are making a mistake, that we are not really neutral or something like that. It means he has not correctly

understood the policy of the Government.

Again, he was trying to interpret our action in the U.N. in a slightly different way. When we were saying that the U.N. should be reconstructed on different lines taking into consideration the new developments, he was imagining we were working for the disintegration of the U.N. or something like that. That is also not correct.

Our attitude towards the U.N. is the most important thing in this debate. There are some who ask whether we have done the right thing in sending our Prime Minister there.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** Nobody has sent him. He went by himself.

**Shri Basappa:** I feel it delicate to confess that I was wondering why heads of States should go about from country to country in this fashion. I was wondering whether our Prime Minister had done a wrong thing in going as head of State and taking part.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** He is not head of the State.

**Shri Basappa:** I correct myself. It was not the President who was going, but the Prime Minister. I thought Acharya Kripalani might be right in that, but now I am convinced that our Prime Minister going there and taking part is the correct thing, and I do not think Acharya Kripalani will object to that. The Prime Minister explained to us yesterday the advantages, how he was able to notice the various things that were happening there, the various contacts he made, his participation in the debates etc.

We may criticise the U.N., but we have to recognise, as all others have done, the importance of this organisation.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Let us all go there. We should also know.

**Shri Basappa:** Does it mean that the problems of the world can be solved by people remaining in different parts of the world? Should not important people meet there and discuss the common problems of the world? It does not mean every one of us should go there.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Otherwise, how shall we know?

**Shri Basappa:** It may not be to the liking of certain people, but its importance cannot be minimised. The smaller nations coming together and putting certain things before the bigger Powers is itself a great achievement. One day the smaller nations will also become bigger nations. So, our participation, and effective participation if I may put it that way, is essential. We have listened to Shri Krishna Menon today. After all, we have not played a very small role there. The results may not be as glamorous as we want them to be, but our approach has to be commended whether it be in the field of disarmament, in sponsoring the five nation resolution or in other debates.

There are friends here who say that we have not gained much by our policy of non-alignment. I do not know what is meant by gain. The very fact that with very little resources we have been able to draw the attention of the world to us is itself a great achievement. We cannot minimise that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member has two minutes more.

**Shri Basappa:** You will please allow me a few minutes more.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Ten minutes was fixed by the hon. Speaker. He will have two minutes more.

**Shri Basappa:** You know, Sir, I am one of those who speak very rarely.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then, he ought to have raised objection when the Speaker fixed that time.

**Shri Basappa:** I will abide by your decision.

In what terms can we measure this gain? The very fact that heads of nations come here means that India has made an impression on them. The Queen is coming probably in January. That shows in what respect India is held among the great nations. Even the success of the new American President, Senator Kennedy, is, in a way, a success of the policy we have been pursuing, and the great aid we may hope to receive is a thing to be counted.

But this policy of non-alignment has been misinterpreted knowingly or unknowingly. The Prime Minister has told us that it is not a weak policy. It does not mean that we are not committed to any principle or policy. We are committed to certain policies and principles like disarmament.

An hon. friend said that we were not fighting colonialism to the extent necessary. I must differ from him. Yesterday the Prime Minister devoted most of his speech to this question of colonialism, and I listened to him with rapt attention. Having heard all that, to be asked today to what extent we are fighting colonialism only reminds me of the person who having heard the story of the Ramayana, asked the next morning the relationship between Rama and Sita. After hearing the able advocacy by our Prime Minister of the Congo situation, to ask if we are fighting colonialism is something I cannot understand.

Some Members have said that our Prime Minister and our Defence Minister are very complacent about Chinese aggression. I do not agree. They are very much worried, but they are also taking steps to solve this problem in the proper manner. We cannot do anything in a foolhardy manner. We have to take measures, defend our borders, see that Chinese aggression is put an end to, but how should we proceed? Having taken a

[Shri Basappa]

certain line in regard to world problems, can we go against the spirit of it? What is the best method of winning our object? Of course, there are incursions which are very bad; there are these air violations, and they must be put an end to. And we shall gather and give all support to our Defence Minister to see that such things do not happen. But, at the same time, can we go away from our basic policy?

I do not want to take more of the time of the House. I thank you for having given me this opportunity. I have rarely taken part in the debates on foreign affairs, but still, having heard some of the statements of our friends like Dr. Ram Subhag Singh and Acharya Kripalani, I was tempted to make a few observations.

**Shri Ansar Harvani:** Yesterday, I was amazed at the speech delivered by the spokesman of the Swatantra Party, the party of big finance in this country, when he criticised our non-alignment policy. He should know that during the last ten years, we have fought two elections on the basis of the non-alignment policy enunciated by our great Prime Minister and come out with a thumping victory, and I can assure him that in the next elections also, when we shall go to our countrymen to endorse the foreign policy of our Prime Minister, we shall have again a better victory than we had during the last two elections.

I take this opportunity of congratulating the Prime Minister and the Indian delegation headed by Shri Krishna Menon on the way in which they conducted the world affairs at the world assembly. We know it very well that it was their great influence which helped the newly liberated countries of Africa and Asia to come to their own. We know it very well that it is their great influence which has given courage and confidence to the various Afro-Asian countries that have entered the U.N.O.

Many things have been talked about Congo. No country other than India can appreciate the situation there. My thoughts go back to those early days of India's freedom, when India was liberated, and an interim Government was formed in this country. We remember it very well that in spite of the fact that the retreating imperialism and the retreating imperial power had conceded freedom to this country, it made it impossible for our country, and it tried to sabotage the newly won freedom of this country. We know it very well that our great Prime Minister, after assuming power, visited the North West Frontier Provinces in undivided India. We remember very well the way in which the British political agents functioned there and excited the tribesmen, in spite of the fact that in the North West Frontier Provinces, there was a popularly elected Government of Congress, headed by the late lamented Dr. Khan Sahib. We know it very well that they tried to create a vile atmosphere.

The story of Kashmir is also before us. We know it very well that after creating the Partition of this country, they tried to create trouble in this country. We know it very well that when we tried to stand on our own, the tribesmen came and invaded as raiders our valley of Kashmir. And who were the people who trained them? We know it very well that those tribesmen were recruited by the political agents in the North West Frontier Provinces, many of whom were Britishers. We know it very well that they were trained by the British Army. So, we can very well realise what is happening in Congo.

In spite of the fact that the force of circumstances and the forces of history have forced Belgium to quit Congo, still, they have been trying to excite the various tribal people and the tribal chiefs and sabotage the freedom of that country. Therefore, the stand of this country that the duly elected Parliament of Congo should

meet should be fully supported. Of course, I would not say that we should make the choice of their various leaders; it is for the people of Congo to choose their leaders. But it is for us to see that only that leader is accepted by the world as the real spokesman of the Congolese people, who has the support of the Congo Parliament, and, therefore, the stand that India has taken is being endorsed not only by the Afro-Asian countries but by all the freedom-loving people of the world.

The UNO has been one of the greatest organisations, that has been conceived by the human mind. It is one of the most representative organisations. But it is the misfortune of not only the Indian-born people in South Africa, but it is the misfortune of people all over the world that there is a Power in South Africa which does not fully accept the Charter of the United Nations. It is often said by the people who are opposed to the entry of China into the United Nations that they do not accept the Charter fully. But I hope and trust that they will shout as loudly against South Africa as they have been shouting against the entry of China into the United Nations. Year after year, delegation after delegation has been pleading and getting the momentum of the support of the United Nations, as we do, in regard to the problem of South Africa. We trust and we pray that our delegation will continue their efforts. With the emergence of other Afro-Asian countries, and with the liberation of more and more countries in Africa, I hope and trust that the day is not far off when the Indian-born people and the Indian-blooded people in South Africa will enjoy the same strength, the same power and the same political liberties as other people in that country are enjoying.

Something has been said about the composition of the United Nations as it is. We know it very well that the United Nations was born after the last great war. In that great war, only a

few Powers had played a very important role, and they constituted the permanent membership of the Security Council. We know that much water has flowed since that day. At that time, Kuomintang China was admitted as a full-fledged member of the Security Council, that is, as a permanent member. But, today, what is Kuomintang China? It is worse than what Baroda used to be under British regime; it is worse than what Gwalior used to be under British regime. Therefore, today, to give that position to Kuomintang China seems to be preposterous. At that time, Asia was represented by only one free country, namely China. But, today, in Asia, there are many independent countries. In fact, the entire Asia has been liberated. In fact, the entire Africa is coming to its own. And the composition of the various Powers who were the participants in the last Great War has also changed.

Therefore, it is time that the leaders of the world should sit together and devise ways and means to see that the United Nations becomes a modern organisation, in tune with the modern conditions, as a true representative of Afro-Asian countries.

Not much has been said about the role that our delegation has played in regard to Algeria. The heart of the Indian people bleeds for the people of Algeria who are just being bled by the imperialist French. We should see that the solution of the Algerian problem comes as soon as possible. If a nation is bled to its very death, I do not know how long it will survive. It is for the men and women of this country to go to the rescue of Algeria and see that the problem of Algeria is solved. The world knows, and the Algerian people know it very well that in spite of the fact that due to certain circumstances, we have not been able to recognise the Government of Ferhat Abbas, we have fully supported it. You will recall that when he came to this country, he was given a rousing reception by the Indian people. I think that should demonstrate to the French people that

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

although there need not be a *de jure* recognition of that Government, still, there is a *de facto* recognition of the provisional Government of Algeria, which is already there.

The Kashmir affair has been hanging for long before the UNO. We know it very well that the Western Powers have been blocking the decision on that issue. One-third of Kashmir is still occupied by a foreign Power. Our heart bleeds to think of the people who are groaning under the iron heels of military regime in Pakistan. Let us say clearly that we cannot tolerate any more their indecision, and that the affair of Kashmir should be decided as soon as possible. Every inch of Kashmir belongs to India, and India stands by those people who are groaning under the iron heels of military rule in Pakistan in occupied Kashmir.

Once again, I congratulate our Prime Minister and the Indian delegation on the work that they have done at the UNO.

15 hrs.

**Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar):** We are discussing the international situation when the United Nations Organisation, an organisation formed after the last war, is passing through a severe crisis, and nations like us who profess to conduct a non-alignment policy in the international sphere, who are so delicately balanced—almost balanced on a razor's edge—are finding themselves extremely difficult to operate in the conflicting forces that have, particularly since recent happenings in the Congo, come to the forefront.

In the last Assembly, the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. Khrushchev, made significant proposals regarding the reorganisation of UNO. One may disagree with the manner in which they were put forward—and I do disagree with it. But it is wrong to presume

that if one carries on an argument with shoe in hand, as was done, one can convince one's opponent or compel him to disarm. At the same time, it must be recognised that he has spoken on that aspect very clearly that the present structure of the United Nations, the Security Council and other important organs of that body need immediate change to face the world situation; otherwise, that organisation will not be able to cope with the problems facing the world, problems like the Congo problem.

After the last world war, the victorious Powers, particularly their leaders, Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill, when they met in Tehran, thought that they would be able to divide the world into spheres of influence and the Big Powers should constitute the Security Council and become the guardians of peace and welfare of the world. But they never imagined that during these 15 years many forces of liberation, many new forces, would come forward and the so-called Charter and the Organisation based on that Charter would prove meaningless in the present context of the situation. Somebody ought to have said it, and it is good that Mr. Khrushchev has come forward with specific proposals which some people find difficult to accept. But I may for their information say that in substance they were acceptable to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. To quote a well-known American commentator, Walter Lippmann, in substance he said: 'I thoroughly disagree with the manner; it was crude, it was rather violent, out of tune, but certainly what he said is worth consideration and the big Powers and small nations must apply their mind to it'.

The reason why I say this is that today in the new world that is emerging after liberation of the old colonial world in Africa, the strength and weakness of the United Nations are being tested. The question, as the Prime Minister asked, is as to who is

to fill the power vacuum and whether the Soviet Bloc or the so-called free world or the United Nations should play its full and effective role. If the United Nations fails on this occasion to play its role in the newly-liberated colonial world like the Congo and other countries, where all manner of attempt will be made to divide, disrupt and penetrate by devious means either by the socialist side or by the capitalist side, it will be a tragedy. Why do I say this? There is evidence of it. When there was a revolt in Iraq, the Soviet Union first hesitated and did not penetrate but kept aloof, but the Chinese were rushing in. Something happened, because there is a conflict within the socialist camp. We must remember it will have far-reaching and wide repercussions. Basically, when you look at this conflict, you will find that Peking on one side and Pentagon, that is, the military high command, or NATO, on the other, have faith in war for resolving the great world conflict. Are we going to be a party to this or can we avoid it, if so, by what method? This is a challenge and I feel sometimes that our Prime Minister who occupies the position of an elderly statesman has failed in some measure, according to me, to take up the challenge and give a lead. He ought to have thought that India could be a bridge-builder in the world conflicts, wherever it is possible.

Why do I say this? Certain issues were posed by Mr. Khrushchev on the UN platform. Take, for instance, colonial liberation. I was surprised to find when in the context of Goa, the Prime Minister said, "The problem of Goan liberation will be determined by what happens in the African colonies in the possession of Portugal".

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Not quite that. I did not say that. What I said was that these things are influencing each other—what we do and what they do influence each other.

**Shri Khadilkar:** I stand corrected.

But I feel the time has come when we must ask ourselves, 'are we not to help these forces of liberation'? When the whole world including America is against colonial possessions, can we not take some effective action to liberate Goa here and now? Nasser never waited when he took possession of the international highway and invited the west for war. There are times in a nation's history when you have got to take a determined stand, and I feel the time has come so far as Goa is concerned when here and now we must liberate that territory. With what clear conscience can we argue with China? They can say: 'We have come, we have occupied some territory, but there is a colonial possession on your soil of your free country; you fail to liberate it'. I am not justifying the Chinese aggression. I am saying that sometimes when the world forces are on your side, on the side of liberation, they would stand by you, they respect you, then listen to your advice and value it. At such a moment, if you fail to take action, you are not helping the cause of colonial liberation as you should have been.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am doubtful whether they will listen to my advice. He is addressing the Chair.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** You can also try, Sir. He is suggesting it.

**Shri Khadilkar:** I refer to this problem for one reason. I feel this problem of colonial liberation and the forces working at present will determine whether in the near future there would be war or peace. What do you find in the Congo? There is a report by a representative selected by the UNO. It is a clear indictment of Belgium. Today the question is whether the U.N. will stand by that report or will be influenced by the United States of America which is not looking at it favourably or since Russia supports more or less that stand, the United Nations or its Secretary-General would hesitate to move in the matter. I am afraid even the Good

[Shri Khadilkar]

Offices Commission is likely to be divided; it cannot function in the present situation.

If the two world powers, the major powers come to an understanding that the liberated territories will be left alone to evolve their own government and the truly nationalist leadership there, whatever its stature, will be given full authority to control the situation, you cannot really disturb peace in Congo or in any other free territory.

It is a sad commentary; but it is true nonetheless that since the end of the Napoleonic wars and the Vienna Treaty, it has been continuously pursued policy, the policy of dividing the national struggle and nations also. It was practised first in Europe. Some sort of settlement came. After the first World War again Eastern Europe was divided. After the Second World War no new division was possible in Europe. So, imperialism is trying to divide all the liberated territories, wherever it is possible.

Therefore, at this juncture, it is more important from our point of view and of those who do not want this conflict, who care more for peace and reconstruction and advance, those who are not interested in manufacturing different kinds of weapons, to look at this problem from this angle. If we look at it from this angle, another problem that comes to the forefront is the basic conflict in the socialist world; and it assumes greater significance.

When we look at our border, we say, China has committed aggression on our border. We were most friendly. I feel there was a time when, if China had made a friendly approach to India and said: 'We are neighbours; and we, as two big nations of Asia are going to live in peace as good neighbours; these are our requirements as regards border; we need certain territory', India would not have said, 'No' for a little exchange of territory on the border to suit the

convenience of our great neighbour. It would have been possible. (Interruptions).

Do not mince matters, I do not want to mince matters. If you want to keep friendly relations such things have got to be done sometimes.

But, today that position is reversed. Why? It has been reversed because of this world conflict; I mean the ideological conflict. And, it is not a question of that conflict affecting the Soviet or the Russian people only. The whole world is divided on that; those who accept co-existence basically and believe in peace and others. These people believe that two dissimilar systems can work together and live together. But, China has taken a different stand, the old orthodox stand that war is inevitable because it is a means to end imperialism.

So, the main issue today in this country and elsewhere is this. We want co-existence; we stand for peace. But the friends on my right here, the communists come forward and plead in one voice that they will stand by us and defend the country. The next day, we find a Bengali voice which has appeared in the *Hindustan Times*, saying, 'No, no, there is a good case for China; we must listen to them.' I am glad that this sort of duplicity or dualism in their approach to the border question will not carry conviction with the Indian people.

There is also some vacillation regarding Government policy, on the diplomatic field. When we read the White Paper we find that many incursions have taken place. But, when a description of those events is to be given to Parliament, I am puzzled that our Prime Minister says, they are petty things.

The Prime Minister of another friendly nation, Burma, came here:



the other day. He said inside the country and outside also that Chou En-lai is very sincere; he wants to have a reasonable settlement. By implication he means that India is unreasonable. I sometimes feel that we are being isolated in a subtle manner so that we shall be compelled to come to terms with our neighbour China.

I am not looking at it from the point of view of war or peace immediately. I know it is a most restricted matter. But, still, China must admit that she has committed aggression. Unless it is vacated, no self-respecting nation can think of demarcating the border on some historical evidence, whatever it is.

So far as the disarmament problem is concerned I will touch and finish.

**Shri Nath Pai:** He has left nothing for others; he has exhausted everything.

**Shri Khadilkar:** So far as the disarmament problem is concerned, we have listened to our Defence Minister. He has given us a very exhaustive background.

**Shri Nath Pai:** A peroration.

**Shri Khadilkar:** The real danger today is that if this present conflict between the Soviet Union and China is not resolved, it will be of grave consequence. The other day, a friend of mine who knew the Chinese mind said in a jocular mood: 'What a fool Khrushchev is; he thinks that the Imperialists will disarm if he argues with vulgar language and tone with a shoe in hand!' This is what he said. It is a fantastic thing; they do not believe in it. They have a faith that we will have to arm ourselves though we need not use those weapons. Ultimately, as I said, whether we have war or peace in the near future will be determined by whether the approach of the Soviet Union or the approach of the Chinese prevails. In

my opinion, the military section in the West would very much appreciate that the Chinese approach should prevail. Then there is no position left for so-called non-aligned nations effectively functioning anywhere.

If at all we are to function effectively in a sort of congenial atmosphere, we have got to rediscover the basis of functioning. We were just functioning on the most delicately balanced situation. That balance is likely to be knocked out. And, in such a situation if we want to have a chase, I feel, the non-aligned nations will have to stand together in every sense, stand together with the forces of liberation, colonial liberation; A civil war is going on for a long time in Algeria for instance—and the provisional national Government has been recognised by China. Even the Soviet Union was given a *de jure* recognition to it. We should also take a step in that direction and show to the people of Africa that we stand with them. That alone will give some new basis for non-aligned nations in the world and their voice will be heard with greater respect in the United Nations.

**Shri Achar (Mangalore):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the current Fourteenth Session of the United Nations, as most other Members have also referred to, is a remarkable and a momentous session. In its history of 14 years, whatever other matters were there, probably, this was the only occasion when leaders from several countries attended the session. From one point of view—I think it is the most important point of view—the U.N. has got a high recognition. It looks as if all the nations have now realised that the only hope for the world to avoid war is the U.N.O. The League of Nations was not so effective and several nations did not recognise its importance. I would like to say a word or two why the importance of the U.N. was realised this year. If we consider

[Shri Achar]

the background behind this year's meeting in respect of international situation we shall realise why everybody looked at the U.N. The Summit at Paris failed; there was a debacle at Paris and subsequently there were other events. Russia walked out of the Disarmament Conference. I think Mr. Khrushchev also evidently realised this situation and that is why for the first time in the history of the nations of the eastern bloc, the Prime Minister of the USSR decided to attend the UNO.

**Shri Nath Pai:** It was he who persuaded others to go.

**Shri Achar:** I agree with my hon. friend. Probably, but for Mr. Khrushchev's going to the UN, the others would not have thought of it at all. It looked as if there was considerable propoganda in favour of other leaders going there. Comparisons are not always very apt but when he decided to go to the UN—not by plane but by a steamer—I was reminded of Bapuji who walked to the seaside to begin the salt satyagraha. Probably, he wanted to awaken the country. Perhaps that was the object of Gandhiji; he did not go by motor car; he started walking... (*Interruptions*)

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Do you mean to say that Panditji should have walked all this distance?

**Shri Achar:** That is why I said that comparisons are odious; you cannot carry it to the final end. Now, probably in politics a kind of propoganda is absolutely necessary. Mr. Khrushchev realised the situation. Some way should be found out to start negotiations once again. For that purpose perhaps he decided to go to the UNO. We also saw most of the leaders from the eastern bloc accompanying him. He sent appeals to the other nations also to send their leaders. As a result of all this, we know our Prime Minister also attended the UN session and it is our

pride that in the UN the five powers did their utmost to bring about an atmosphere of peace. The objective of the League or of the UN is somehow to end the war.

Today we heard two very important speeches—one by our respected leader, the ex-leader of the PSP, Acharya Kripalani.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Ex-President of the Congress.

**Shri Achar:** Therefore, we respect him. He raised an important question of China thinking that war was inevitable. It looks as if Russia thinks that co-existence is possible. For ten days this ideological difference was considered at the Moscow Conference and then it was extended by five more days. Now, we heard our respected Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, giving us the picture of the situation and the absolute necessity for disarmament. He mentioned that the bombs that were thrown on Nagasaki and Hiroshima were small, trigger-like, compared to the present bombs that we are having. On the one hand the Chinese communists' view is that war is inevitable. On the other hand, the view of the rest of the world is that any war will mean total destruction. The attempt was made in the UN to bring about an atmosphere of some sort of an understanding between the two great nations. It has been said here that the members of the UN has risen from 60 or 62 previously to 99 at the present moment; of these 14 or 15 nations come from Africa alone. It has even been said that this bloc will be more than one-third out of the present membership. Though they have increased in numbers, one most important aspect we have to realise is this. It is not a question of voting in the UN. Even if the UN votes on all its resolutions, that will not completely solve the problem. After all we have to realise that there are two great blocs and we should admit this. They should come to an

understanding. Only then it would solve the problem of the world. A contribution to that effect was made by the five non-committed nations. In that our Prime Minister sincerely and with his well known ability tried to do his bit, and for that our country is proud of him.

I would just like to say a word, Sir, if you will permit me, about Goa. The previous speaker spoke as if we could simply march our army there. Shri Khadilkar, if I have understood him correctly, said, how can we ask China to vacate if we do not march our army to Goa. That seems to be the trend of his argument. I also feel very much about Goa. I come from an area very near Goa. I would very much like to have Goa integrated with our country. But is that the attitude that we have to take up? Are we to create such a situation? I do concede that the Prime Minister and the Government of India should do their very best to bring political pressure on them as much as possible and try to get Goa integrated with our country, but certainly I am not in agreement with the other action proposed that we must march our army to Goa.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Supakar—I am extremely sorry somehow his name was omitted, but I would request him now to take only ten minutes.

**Shri Supakar (Sambalpur):** Sir, if there is any lesson which we should learn out of the failure in our performance in the United Nations more than any other it is that the neutralist nations must come together to form a more cohesive and more solid bloc in the United Nations.

Sir, we must see why we send our representatives, our delegation to the United Nations. It is not merely to make big speeches and get ourselves publicised in the newspapers, it is to serve a definite purpose. The main purpose for us, for States like us should be to see that the area of

operation of the cold war is restricted as far as possible, and if our purpose is not served by our trying to bring together the big powers we should see that the other States who are at present not involved in cold war, specially those States which are likely to become independent in the near future and those States which are not involved in one or the other of the great power blocs, come together to form a solid public opinion against the warring groups. I think, Sir, if such a group were there all this tangle in the Congo affair would not have arisen. In future also, I think, if such a group is formed and if all the neutralist nations come together a lot of conflict could be avoided and the area of operation of the cold war would be restricted.

It is unfortunate that India avoided or refused to take the lead in this matter—from the speeches made by Pandit Nehru we learn that—but we should not stand in the way of other neutralist nations who want to take the lead. We should rather encourage the formation of such a bloc.

I would further say, Sir, that our performance in the current session of the United Nations, this year, has shown the urgent necessity of maintaining real neutralism and not to lean to either side of the big power blocs.

Sir, the five powers moved the resolution to bring the two heads of States—the President of USA and Mr. Khrushchev—to renew their content. I do not know what purpose was sought to be served by this resolution, unless they tried to bring discredit to either of the party who ultimately refused to renew the contact. It was well known that a few months previously, on 17th May, there was a Summit Conference. We know also why it failed. It failed because Mr. Khrushchev wanted Mr. Eisenhower to apologise for the U.S. U-2 flying and because Mr. Eisenhower was not repentant and he would not apologise. The position had not changed

[Shri Supakar]

when this resolution was sought to be moved on 1st October. We would like to know whether this time either Mr. Khrushchev was more accommodating or Mr. Eisenhower was repentant in the course of the few months. When Pandit Nehru addressed a letter to Mr. Eisenhower about the resolution that was sought to be tabled in the United Nations General Assembly, Mr. Eisenhower was frank enough to say:

"The chief problems in the world today are not due to differences between U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. alone and, therefore are not possible of a solution on a bilateral basis. The questions which are disrupting the world today, at the present time are of immediate vital concern to other nations as well."

Evidently, President Eisenhower was referring to the other summit powers. He would not let down France and the United Kingdom by excluding them from such a conference which was intended by the five powers resolution. He would not agree to do so at a time when the United States was facing a general election. Therefore, unless the five powers wished to have the satisfaction of putting either party in the wrong they knew that not much useful purpose could be served by such a resolution.

Let us see what would have happened if the resolution had been passed. We know that we can take a horse to the side of water but we cannot force it to drink. So it is rather difficult to understand why Pandit Nehru completely lost his temper when Mr. Menzies, the Prime Minister of Australia, sought to bring in an amendment suggesting a four-power meeting. The neutralists wanted a bilateral meeting, probably the Communists wanted a meeting of all the powers and the western powers were in favour of the four-power summit. But when Mr. Menzies moved this amendment I do not

know what was absurd about Mr. Menzies' move. How could it be brushed aside as 'trivial', as a 'cold war approach', or as 'mere jargons of war'? Mr. Menzies was voicing the reaction of President Eisenhower who was sought to be made a party in the renewal of the contact. Mr. Menzies was voicing the reaction of President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan to the five-power resolution.

I believe, Sir, that the move failed because the western powers had some genuine suspicion that this resolution was inspired by Communists as a counter blast to the blemish of failure of the four-power summit conference. In this connection, we must remember that we could have made this failure or converted this failure into a success by a little tact and by a better move in the piloting of this resolution. While we want Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev to renew their contact, at the same time we find that when Mr. Eisenhower is addressing the General Assembly, some of the leaders of our delegations go into diplomatic sleep and not listen to the speeches. Naturally, that creates certain adverse reactions in the minds of the western powers. Besides that, whatever be the motive of Mr. Menzies in moving that amendment, when we lose temper, it creates an adverse reaction. Therefore, I would submit that it must be our look-out to see that this neutralism really succeeds. If it is to succeed, it can bring real peace into this world. But then, in order to see that it succeeds, we must see that we must not only be really neutral, that we must not only try to bring harmony between the two conflicting parties, but that we must seem to end appear to be really not trying to lean towards any side or any party.

I will finish with one comment on the Chinese problem. Whatever be our peace-loving intention, we must not take a very lenient attitude towards

the aggression by the Chinese. When we read the White Paper, we find that the Chinese always respect this *Panch-sheel* and other ideas also, but then, we also find at the same time that Mao Tse-tung says that only arms can solve the problem of the world. Therefore, we must see their real intention and not merely be led away by the words of friendship that they repeat. So, I would submit that we must take a more active step in vacating the aggression, and especially when they throw out a challenge when there is violation of our air space, we must take some active steps to meet such a challenge. Otherwise, when there is a widespread and full aggression we may feel helpless at that time.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap** (Mathura): Sir, to begin with I must thank the entire House for the great sympathy that they expressed towards me the day before yesterday.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That was not external affairs.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** But I must not thank hon. Govind Ballabh Pant and Mr. Datar. I cannot thank them.

Speaking about this motion, I beg to say that certain points are not considered. It was very good that our hon. Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, went to New York. When other top leaders were going there, why not our Prime Minister? It was very good. But our hon. Prime Minister, though he is very honest, very great patriot,.....

**Pandit K. C. Sharma** (Hapur): Very wise.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:**...he lives in some certain ideas which he got in England. He is very much impressed by the Labour Party ideas, and so he always makes mistakes. I beg to submit that we must understand that in the world of today, there is a great struggle going on between America and Soviet Russia. It is this everywhere. For instance, in Laos, what

we see is the struggle of these two; what we see in Algeria also is the struggle of the two; in Germany, there is this struggle of the two; so also in Japan. So, everywhere, the struggle is going on between the United States of America and Soviet Russia. Both are struggling for world control. This is a great mistake of our greatest thinkers, that they think the ideologies are fighting. Nothing of the kind, Sir. There was, there is, and there shall always be racial struggle in the world. Eliminating other small racial groups, there are now new racial groups at the top. England resigned her leadership of Anglo Saxons. America has taken up that leadership of the Anglo-Saxons. Soviet Russia is the leader of the Slav race. These two are at the top. They are struggling for world control. So, the struggle is between the Anglo-Saxons and the Slavs.

In anything that we speak, we should not take sides. But when we speak anything, we take one side or the other. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru spoke about Parliament in Congo. We know what is that Parliament. That Parliament is supporting Lumumba and Lumumba is supporting Russia! So, in fact, if we ask Parliament to come there, we support Soviet Russia! In anything that we talk about, we support one party or the other. For instance, in Algeria, the Algerian race is trying to be independent of France and France is backed by the United States of America, so that everywhere we see the struggle between Soviet Russia and the United States of America.

Under these circumstances, what are we going to do? I suggest that we entirely whitewash our brains first, because we are having in our heads some ideas which have been filled there for decades. We must get rid of those ideas. For example, when we speak of colonialism, we say colonialism is very bad. I also said that colonialism was very bad. But what is that colonialism? We have to see, what it is. Colonies were formed by

[Raja Makendra Pratap]

the flowing human currents. It is not understood yet. Human currents must flow into other racial groups and get united and produce other new races. So, instead of speaking against colonialism which we were doing for the past two or three decades, we should insist that when racial groups flow into other racial groups, they should intermarry intermingling. If, in Algeria, France comes and the French intermingle or intermarry with the Arabs there, it will be very fine. All of them can be very happy there. So, what I say is, we should have another way of thinking about these things.

For instance, the people are fighting about religion. What is religion? I have said that Hinduism is a bunch of ideas. Islam is another bunch of ideas; and so is Sikhism and so is Christianity. All these are bunches of ideas. What is Congress? It is a bunch of ideas. What is Communism? It is another bunch of ideas. We should investigate these ideas and find out how they grew, how they captured our minds and how they are leading us and how they are forcing our minds. Our great President Eisenhower and our great Soviet leader, Mr. Khrushchev, are themselves misled by certain ideas which were filled into their poor brains; they do not do things themselves, ideas do. It is for us to take up this work of showing to the world that "you are going wrong". In every way, they have been going wrong—drinking, horse-races, gambling and all that kind of things.

It is for India, where the great Rama and Krishna were born, where Islam came in and the Sikh religion was born, to take a moral attitude and speak to the world, "You should do this": We should show it by our example. For instance, what are our ambassadors doing? If someone has bought a car for Rs. 20,000, our ambassador wants to buy a car for Rs. 50,000, they waste money. They should be taught to live in Gandhian way. Of course, I do not say they should go

naked, but they should lead a simple life.

The whole attitude has to be changed; the whole way of thinking has to be changed. We should believe there should be one world government, with a world army and world court of justice, so that nations could not fight. All religions should co-operate to fight evil and promote goodness. We should so reorganise our society that not one man remains without bread or without work. This should be the ideal.

In the end, I must say to the hon. Prime Minister, though he did good work in New York. Yet I would request him to see what is happening in Punjab. The Akalis are following Gandhian method, but there is a limit to patience. If something wrong happens in Punjab, you will be unable to control the situation.

**Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am most grateful to you for giving me a few minutes to speak on this motion. I do not wish to say much in answer to the remarks made by the critics of our non-alignment policy. When that policy is being accepted the world over practically, when even those who criticised us for that policy are appreciative of that policy, at such a time to hear criticism of our policy in our own Parliament is rather out of tune and completely out of place, in my opinion.

Our attitude and policy have been having a slow and steady effect upon the thinking of the nations of the world. The Defence Minister pointed out how the influence of the non-committed nations has changed the thinking of the United Nations in several respects. The role of these non-committed nations, the attitude they take, has an effect in formulating public opinion, if I may take the liberty of saying so, it has a kind of educative role. This is done in a quiet and silent manner and not in an

ostentatious or aggressive manner. By putting forth our views clearly and firmly, we are making other people think about these problems. It is most encouraging that in many ways their thinking has been influenced by the attitude and policies that have been stated by our representatives in the United Nations.

The acceptance of the objective of total disarmament and outlawry of war is an outstanding example of that type. This has been described already this morning and I would not say much about it. So also the outlook on colonialism. With due respect to Raja Saheb, I do not think anybody can today support colonialism. Colonialism, as we understand it, is a method of exploiting one nation by another nation. Therefore, we object to it.

The most outstanding change in this respect has come in Britain, which was in direct contact with us in our freedom struggle. Other countries have also changed their attitude towards colonialism, and you would not find anybody today who will openly stand up on any world platform and support colonialism. There are exceptions like Portugal. But they also do not like to admit that they are adhering to colonialism, but their actions are such that there is no escape for them but to accept that charge. Even Spain has agreed to abide by the Charter of the United Nations. Portugal seems to be the solitary example still sticking to the old ways of thinking.

France in Algeria and Belgium in its dealings in Congo are surreptitiously trying to promote the colonial interests, although outwardly they dare not support the policy of colonialism.

Another outstanding example of the influence that our attitude and policy have had on the thinking of the United Nations has been on the subject of racial discrimination in South Africa. I remember a few years ago, the ne- of the world were not prepared to stand up and speak clearly and openly against this policy of racialism. Today

they are all united on this issue and as the Defence Minister pointed out, there is the lonely voice of South Africa in support of that policy. Otherwise, everybody is agreed and there are no apologists left for this policy of racial superiority.

It proves that the force of ideas is superior to the force of arms and armaments. All these nations whose thinking has undergone a change—at least most of them—are superior to us in so far as arms and armaments are concerned. But if we stand up and state our view clearly without fear and without any other consideration, it is bound to have an effect on world opinion. It is in this respect that I feel deeply grieved that our Government has failed to stand up and speak clearly and openly in defence of our next door neighbour, Tibet. We stand up and plead the case of Algeria, we are outraged at injustice done in any part of the world, but we come out as apologists for the action of China in Tibet, by saying that China has exercised suzerainty over Tibet for 200 years. Is suzerainty such a sacrosanct thing? Is it a thing that gives a right to a nation to rule over another nation for all times to come? Were we not under the suzerainty of the British for two centuries? We have come out of that suzerainty as a free nation. Sir, on the floor of this House, our hon. Prime Minister stated that Mr. Chou En-lai told him that China has suzerainty over Tibet but that does not mean that Tibet is China. Today, Tibet is shown in the maps in our own country as part of China. When Mr. Chou En-lai has himself stated that Tibet is not China, we have made Tibet part of China. One of the leading officers of our Government one day told me, "Tibet is finished for all times to come." Well, if Tibet is finished for all times, I am afraid, the very basis of the security of our borders along the Himalayas is also finished. I understand that an argument is advanced that our sympathy is with Tibet, but what can we do about it? What

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

could we do about Suez? We raised our voice against the powers of the Western bloc on the Suez crisis. What are we doing in Algeria? We are raising our voice on the Algerian issue. Similarly, if we raise our voice clearly and call a spade a spade, call the Chinese, who have been aggressors in Tibet, aggressors—they are aggressors in our own country—I believe that it will have a profound effect upon educating public opinion, creating public opinion so that ultimately peaceful solutions are found.

16 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I do not agree with those who might think of armed conflict or that we should go to war. I believe the days of war are over. After all, arms and armaments have become so terrific that going to war means annihilation of the world. I am sure that ultimately the conflict between India and China will be solved, will have to be solved in a peaceful manner. But China must be made to realise that the policies that she is following are unacceptable to the whole world, and for that purpose their presence in the United Nations will be most helpful. I am glad our Government is supporting that policy. The United Nations have come to play a much greater role than ever before. They have to think today in terms of maintaining peace, maintaining law and order, as they are doing in Congo. They were not fitted for that role when the United Nations Organisation was formed. The concept then was quite different.

Therefore, I am in whole-hearted agreement with the view that there is urgent need for changing the charter of the United Nations. As has already been stated, there is general acceptance of the view that there should be no war, and war should be outlawed by all the nations of the world. This has come about because of the necessity created by these terrific arms and armaments. Under those

circumstances, the spread of the nuclear weapons and the spread of the so-called suicidal club or the nuclear club is the most dangerous thing. To stop that, again, the United Nations have got to be strengthened, the Charter of the United Nations has got to be altered and the facilities at the disposal of the United Nations to play a positive role have got to be increased. It would not be a bad idea if we suggested to the United Nations that they should take up the control and administration of the outer space and the Antarctic area, whatever control is possible and necessary. This will give them some experience in administration so that they can play their due role and one day take the place of the world government, which Raja Mahendra Pratap has been advocating so long. This objective I find myself in agreement with, a world government which does not deny the sovereignty of any nation the freedom and independence of any nation but which makes each nation secure and makes it impossible for any other nation to be able to interfere with the independence and freedom of any nation, as has been done in the case of Tibet by the Chinese and also in the case of our own northern borders.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to hon. Members who have spoken in this debate and who have thrown a good deal of light on various aspects of this question. May I, however, right at the beginning, refer to what the hon. Raja Mahendra Pratap said? He accused me of having imbibed some ideas. I plead guilty to that charge. I think it is better to have ideas than to have an empty head. I am always trying to imbibe more ideas to refresh ideas, to change them where necessary; whether, I succeed or not, it is for others to judge, but that is my attempt. Sometimes it happens that people keep all the avenues to their minds closed or they never open them and so repeat the same phrase or word endlessly without any relevance to the



occasion or to developing world. The fact of the matter is we are living in a world which is changing, changing in every way; the minds of men are changing, the minds of nations are changing, social habits of nations are changing, revolutions are coming in the way they live, all these things are happening, apart from the political plane which we often discuss. The political plane is important, of course, because it governs other things. But there are other planes, more important, social changes, economic changes for which we try in our country and other countries are trying also. So we live in this world and it makes a great deal of difference in the ultimate analysis—what is in the minds of men.

As I said, I think the other day, the preamble of the constitution of the UNESCO says: "Wars begin in the minds of men", which is, I think, completely true. Therefore, it has some relevance and some importance to what we have in our minds, how we admit ideas in our minds, how we understand what is happening, or else we shall go on talking of a world which has ceased to exist and which is changing so much that it has no relevance to what we say or what we think.

Now I do submit in all modesty and in all humility that the attitude that India has taken during these past dozen years or more, the attitude in regard to major world problems, the way we have dealt with them, has been both an idealistic way and a realistic way, idealistic in the sense of aiming at certain ideals and realistic in the sense of applying them to the existing circumstances—because, unfortunately, we cannot always achieve the ideals; it is difficult—we have tried to adjust ourselves to the circumstances. Now, because of all this, I do venture to say that we have affected the thinking of the United Nations and of the world, and it is no small matter. It is no small matter even if it is in a small degree. I do not claim big things. Big things come

from changing events, not from what I say or anybody else says. Events force people to think ultimately. Even those who refuse to think are forced to think when the bludgeon of the hammer of events hits them on the head. But I do submit that the policy we have pursued, the way we have put it forward, not in an aggressive way, not opposed to anybody, but in a moderate and in a humble way, trying to win over people, has affected the thinking of the United Nations, and thereby indirectly, to some extent—may be not much but to some extent—the thinking of the world. And that is a big thing. Because, in spite of what some hon. Members might think, we cannot live apart from this world. Whatever might have happened in the days gone by, in the modern world you cannot live apart; you are a part of the world, an intimate part of the world and you are affected by what happens in any part of the world.

Two kinds of general criticisms have been advanced in regard to our policy. One is: why do we throw our weight about and get interested in what happens in other countries or even in disarmament? Let the two big powers or other powers concern themselves with it. Why should we get entangled in this difficult question? We have got enough problems here. The other is the exact opposite of this. Some hon. Members have said that we should throw our weight about; we should go and do this in Kenya and we should go and do this elsewhere—leave out the question of Goa because that may be considered an internal problem—that we should go all over the place that we do not accept the challenge of the world. I think Shri Khadilkar used words to that effect. So you will see that the criticism is from both ends and pulling in different directions.

The fact of the matter is that whatever we may do in the outside world, in the first and final analysis—both—it is what we do in our own country that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

counts. That is obvious. For the moment we are discussing foreign affairs. We are not discussing our own country's affairs. But I do say with assurance that the most important thing for us is what we do in our country, how our country progresses and how our country solves its own problems. If we have any weight in the counsels of the world, it is not because of our beautiful language or beautiful resolutions that we put forward. It is in the final analysis due to some faith in the minds of other people in the world that India counts, and India will count more and more in the future. It is because the policies that we are pursuing in this country, political, economic or whatever they may be, have induced that faith in them, that however big our problems we are facing them with courage and solving them step by step. Therefore India counts. All the wisdom in the world of any representative of India would not go any distance at all if there was not this impression of minds of many people of the world that India counts and what India is doing counts. Therefore let us be clear about it. It is firstly and finally the condition of India that makes every difference and that enables us even to play any part in the outside world; otherwise nobody would listen to us. So there can be no doubt about that.

The criticism is: why should we get entangled in disarmament and other matters that are affecting world opinion? I am surprised and a little pained, I must say, that any hon. Member here lives in this narrow groove of thought and does not realise what lies behind all this business of disarmament. It is often being said that disarmament or no disarmament is a question of the survival of the human race. Are we interested in the survival of the human race or not? We happen to be a part of the human race. We are not apart from it. Therefore it is a question of our survival. It is a question of our

achieving any objectives that we aim at or not. Perhaps in the matter of phrases people may agree with that, but I want this matter to be thought of, if I may say so, in a somewhat emotional way to understand the real significance of all that is happening. The fact of the matter is that in India by and large we talk about peace a great deal and, I believe, we believe in peace. But there is no emotional acceptance of the horror of war because we have not had war. The greater part of the world has had it and there is not a single family in all these vast countries, many of Asia, nearly all of Europe and some elsewhere, that has not experienced the horror of war intimately either through death of the members of that family or otherwise. Not one family you will find that has not experienced it. Therefore it is an intimate, emotional thing for them. An intimate emotional thing which has to be multiplied a hundred or thousand-fold in the present conditions is not merely losing a son or a brother or a husband. It is something infinitely more. If you thought in that way, it becomes important. It is not merely a question of some great power. It so happens that some great powers and notably two have tremendous power. Either of them, and both certainly, can make a vast difference to the world, whether they act rightly or whether they act wrongly. There it is. All the wisdom in the world that we may have cannot prevent them, if they decide to do so. Therefore to think of disarmament as something remote from us, which does not apply to us because we have not got the atom bomb, we have not got such vast armies, we have got a relatively small army and a relatively smaller air force etc., is very wrong thinking.

An hon. Member seemed to hint that we should look after our own defence, why should we bother about that, and if disarmament comes it may affect our defence. That again is a very extraordinary argument

which indicates a total absence of, shall I say, full consideration being given to these aspects of the problem. If world disarmament comes, the world is changed and we are far more secure than we would otherwise be. Obviously, there can be no world disarmament with any major country remaining armed. It is out of the question that even if the Soviet Union, United States of America, England, France and maybe some other countries agree to disarmament and China does not, that is not disarmament. In fact, they will never agree to it. You cannot imagine the great or small powers leaving out of any pact on disarmament a mighty power and allowing it to keep all these armaments. It cannot happen. It is not disarmament. When we talk about disarmament, it must apply to all countries in appropriate measure.

I mentioned this idea of disarmament because that is the most important question today though it does not appear to be realised. It is theoretically approved of by us. We like the idea, but it does not hit us on the head, it does not hit us on the heart, it does not hit us on the mind as it should because the whole future survival of India and each Indian depends upon that. If we once go beyond this, and reach, as I said, the 'point of no return' in regard to disarmament, if we go too far, there is no coming back and it has spread too much, namely, the nuclear bombs and other things, then we can write fiction stories, but what will happen is that even if we write them, there will not be any readers of those stories.

If my analysis is correct then I say the question of disarmament is more important than any problem, internal or external, national or international, because it is a national problem apart from being international. Our survival depends upon it. Yes. In carrying it out it affects the great countries. If we can help in any way in that, obviously we should do so because it is our concern and it is our

problem. There is a certain measure of static thinking about these matters, not realising what is happening.

We talk about our border defence and we use brave language, sometimes a little too brave language without thinking of the consequences of that language. But it is good to have brave language occasionally. I have no objection to it. But let us think of it in this changing world as we are today and not merely give expression to our wrath on every incident that happens.

This motion I had ventured to place before the House, as I explained when I did so, was specially meant to discuss the recent occurrence in the United Nations and what is happening there. Therefore in my opening remarks I dealt with those events and not with many other problems, important as they are. There are many important problems, vitally important problems for us, but I thought and I think normally in debates in this House even in international affairs it may be more advisable to concentrate on one or two subjects, deal with them rather thoroughly than deal with a vast variety and roam about all over the field. Thereby, you get more concentrated attention paid to the questions. This is the normal practice, if I may say so, in other Parliaments. That is for you and the House to decide. I have no objection to either course. I thought it more desirable to concentrate on the particular issue that is mentioned in this Resolution. I say so because some hon. Members took exception to my not discussing in some detail other important problems. There are, of course, and the most important problems in regard to this matter, are, for instance, our relations with China, the aggression on our territory and the consequences thereof. That is strictly true. How can anybody deny the vast importance of this question to us? All our future and everything depends upon it. In fact, it is because it is so vastly important that I speak with great thought and when I refer to it, I do not allow

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

myself to run away with words merely exhibiting my strong feelings on it. But, one has to refer. If I had anything new, I would have said it. I broadly concentrated my attention on these matters which came up before the United Nations or Goa or some other subject like that.

I just mentioned disarmament in its wider context as it appears to me and its primary importance in this world of ours today. When I say primary, every other question is second to it, whether national or international, in that context. That does not mean, of course, that disarmament should occupy the whole place, the whole mind and all our activities. We carry on our activities which we do, except when occasion arises, we express ourselves about disarmament. We must feel that importance of it.

I am glad that my colleague the Defence Minister gave a fairly full account of the steps taken or being taken in regard to disarmament there. It may be that some hon. Members were not interested in those details. But, I am sure many would have been. They must have a full picture. The reports that appear in the papers, long as they may be, never give a full picture, naturally.

I referred a good deal to the Congo situation. Even as I spoke and since I spoke, other developments have taken place in the Congo, as the House knows partly. You will probably read about them tomorrow morning or this evening. There has actually been fighting there between the so-called Congolese army and the U.N. troops, to protect a Ghana diplomat. Casualties were not very many—I forget—7, 8 or 10 or 12. But that, is a new development and a very serious development.

Another development to which I referred yesterday was the question of the U.N. General Assembly deciding upon the Delegation from the Congo

which was to be seated there. There had been much difference of opinion about that and very strong arguments. It had been suggested that this matter should be postponed till the Good Offices Commission comes back. I am sorry I used the words Good Offices Commission; I am told that that is not the correct word to use. It is called the U.N. Delegation to the Congo. As a consequence of the General Assembly voting by a majority that certain person or persons nominated by President Kasavubu should take their place to represent Congo, two members of the Asio-African Delegation to the Congo, the representatives of Guinea and Mali, have resigned. They have decided for the present at least, to postpone their visit. For how long, I do not know. They were going in a day or so. They have decided to postpone it, and may be, they may go after two or three days, I do not know, or a longer period. Anyhow, it has rather introduced a new element of confusion and conflict, certainly in the Congo, and in Leopoldville. This has happened in the capital of Congo, not in some distant province or far off area. It has brought this very extraordinary and difficult issue of how the United Nations and its forces in the Congo should function, if it cannot give protection to its own men or to others to whom it wants to give protection, to diplomats and others, and the so-called Congolese army—I use the word so-called because it is not much of a trained army; it is semi-trained people—can run riot as they have done in the past. In the past it was not against the U.N. They ran riot all over Leopoldville, arresting, beating, looting and all that. It is all in the report. You will see that in Shri Rajeshwar Dayal's report. Now, they come and attack the U.N. people themselves. It is not for me to say what is going to happen there or what should be done. It is obvious that the United Nations can either function or not function there. It cannot remain there without authority to function,

all the time being battered, hit and itself being attacked. This matter has to be decided. It has been put in a difficult position, because the instructions sent to the U.N. people there have been to be cautious, never to attack, never to do this, and all that. So, they are put in a very difficult position. That question arises. I shall not pursue that. I only wanted to point this out. A very difficult development has taken place in the Congo.

This is reflected in the U.N. itself. You see some African members have resigned from that Delegation. I do not quite know what the next few days might bring about. The situation in the Congo, therefore, is important for the Congo, for Africa as a whole and for the United Nations. In a sense, the future effectiveness of the U.N. has to be settled, whether it can function in such circumstances either in the Congo or elsewhere in the future, or not. If it fails in the Congo, then, naturally, its prestige goes or lessens greatly and it can hardly undertake such a piece of work elsewhere in future. That is a danger.

In the Congo, right from the beginning, we have been laying stress, the U.N., and the Security Council, have laid stress on one thing.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** If I may interrupt, are our army men there in the Congo?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** No. I have said this yesterday. We have no armed forces as such. We have a large number of doctors; we are running a big hospital. In all, we have about 850 personnel.

**Shri Tyagi:** They are all safe, I hope.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Oh yes. They are perfectly safe. We need not worry about anybody. They can look after themselves. They are mostly doing supply work and hospital work. There are nurses and others flying

goods, plenty of flying squadrons, using their planes, not our planes. We have sent air men there, quite a large number. They are very competent people.

There is one danger, a bad thing if it takes shape. That is, the break-up of the Congo. Right from the beginning in this Congo affair, stress has been laid by the Security Council, by the United Nations in their Resolutions, on the maintenance of the integrity of the Congo. Because, the moment it splits up, this means a continuing conflict for the future,—we have too many continuing conflicts for the future,—the sowing of the seeds of conflict which does not end till some mighty thing happens which decides all the conflicts of the world. I think it will be a very sad thing if this kind of a thing happens.

Discussing these general matters, reference was made to what I said—on two or three occasions I spoke in the United Nations—and to the Five power Resolution. One hon. Member opposite spoke in terms of subdued enthusiasm about Mr. Menzies' amendment to our Resolution. Unfortunately, so far as the U.N. General Assembly is concerned, in that large crowd of distinguished people, there were four, or may be five, I am not quite sure, who voted for it. Even the closest colleagues and allies of Mr. Menzies did not vote for it. It is worth considering for that hon. Member that something was surely wrong either in the amendment or the occasion for it or the context of it that it got so little support. It was said—I am not quite sure—it was said that this was quite a record in the United Nations, only five persons voting in the matter. Why was that? There was surely some reason for that? I cannot go into the whole context of these things.

Then the hon. Member repeatedly said that I should not have gone into a temper. Unfortunately, having got a reputation of going into a temper, I am accused of that whether I go into or not. Hon. Members, because I

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

speak with some emotion or some force sometimes here, may say: oh, he went into a temper. Never have I been cooler and without a temper than when I spoke in the United Nations. And I am not referring to my original speech, the statement I made there, but to the subsequent speech when I moved this resolution. It was a forceful speech, certainly, because I thought the occasion demanded some forceful speaking. That amendment of Mr. Menzies struck me as not being a proposal which was positively meant. It might have come separately, I would have had no objection. It came in the shape of an amendment to obstruct, to put an end to this. One has to see this context.

What was this five nation proposal? The Defence Minister said this morning that nobody asked Mr. Eisenhower to meet Mr. Khrushchev. We had said that they should renew contacts. Now, what does all that mean? I should try to spell it out a little.

It was an extraordinary thing, sitting there in New York, to see not only this intense cold war at work, but the bitterness, the avoidance of each other, not only dislike, but even the common courtesies that count being avoided. We all knew, every one there knew, that no major step could be taken in this matter, apart from everything else, because of the American elections or the presidential elections. It was obvious. The whole point was that at this particular General Assembly meeting of the United Nations the position may not get so frightfully rigid that even after the election was over, and whatever the result of the election, you could not make it flexible afterwards. That was the point. Whatever was to be done had to be done afterwards, but the object was somehow to make it a little more flexible so that whoever was elected, whether Mr. Nixon or Mr. Kennedy, should have some room to play and manoeuvre and not

be tied hand and foot by all the previous unfortunate happenings and be unable to take any step. That was the difficulty. Therefore, this resolution was meant to draw people's attention there, in the Assembly and outside, to this position. It was not spelled out this way there, but this was the basic thing. About the question of meeting etc., if it could take place, well and good, obviously, even a formal meeting. Nobody thought that a discussion of the problem should take place at that stage. Nobody thought that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev could sit down then or later and solve the world's problems.

In fact, Mr. Menzies spoke particularly about this on his amendment. He asked: why should these two countries solve the problem, why not four solve the problem? Quite naturally, the reply was: why should four solve them, why not all solve them? I said everybody was going to take part in the solution, but it so happened that two of them happened to occupy such positions that their decisions could make a difference to the world.

But our idea was not that they should discuss the problems or solve them, but somehow to bring an element of flexibility in the situation which could be taken advantage of at a later stage and not to petrify it, make it like dead stone and you cannot move it; and when national passions are concerned, they tend to become that way. The American people being naturally very angry at many things that had happened at the summit meeting etc., the Russian people also were very angry at some things that had happened; then sometimes it goes beyond the power of even great leaders when they find public opinion so strongly entrenched in a passionate attitude that they cannot get out of it. That is why I do not want public opinion in regard to any matter becoming petrified in India. We

hold strongly, we should hold strongly, to any position we hold but intelligently, not just in a gust of anger.

So, that was the purpose of that resolution, and if I may say so with all respect, it did not very much matter if the resolution was passed or not. It had that effect. It drew attention to this subject everywhere, and therefore it achieved at least partly the objective aimed at. If not, the situation would have gone on without any shaking being given to it. And that was the purpose. When some of us, those who signed this resolution, sponsored it, discussed it, we said: all of us are going away in a few days, some two days earlier some two days later; we all go away and leave the situation as it is, it will become more and more rigid, more and more petrified, and then it will be difficult to move in the future, therefore we must do something. And after consultation, we put forward this idea which, and I say so quite honestly, I thought was not a controversial resolution. I mean to say, it may not be liked, may not be approved wholly, but I did not consider it a controversial resolution, and many people did not.

And may I interpolate that even this resolution got a majority in the Assembly? It should be remembered. It did not get a two-third majority which was necessary. It came up in a rather curious way, but I will not go into these matters as to how the voting came up in an indirect way. Even this resolution got a majority there, but it required, according to the Chairman, a two-third majority and so in that sense it did not succeed.

After all this had happened, the general opinion there, not only among the delegates and others, but in the noted influential newspapers of the United States, was that those who opposed this resolution had not been wise, that it did not serve their purpose and so on. So that, I think that these aspects should be considered. And the resolution achieved its purpose quite well enough I think.

Acharya Kripalani talked about the defeatist manner in which we were following our policy, and I think he was more especially referring to our frontier with China and our frontier troubles. Some other Members also referred to this frontier trouble.

First of all, this impression that we can only deal with any question, and more especially an important question like this, in a language of violence or anger is not the impression, I think, which should be encouraged. I do not think, and Acharya Kripalani, I hope, will agree with me, that strength consists in the epithets and the strong language that may be thrown about, because he has been bred up himself in a tradition of language being moderate even when dealing with strong matters. Of course, some strong language is used, but when it comes to great consequences having to be faced, one has to be wise and to think about it.

Now, the question of India and China is not just a question of a border affray, and I would repeat I do not attach any importance or much to two horsemen coming across the border, or half a dozen men coming across. Let us keep some true perspective in our minds. You think orders came from Peking for two horsemen to cross the border? Obviously, it is some mischief of some local men there, maybe some local commander, or just the two men themselves. Whatever it is, it is a bad thing, so we protested and all that. But let us not get excited because two men on horseback come there, or ten men come over and rapidly disappear when they see two or three Indians.

**Shri Surendanath Dwivedy:** It is not one solitary incident, it is a series of incidents.

**Acharya Kripalani:** May I suggest that the explanation given by the Chinese Government is extraordinary? To say that at 13,000 ft. height bamboos grow is an absurdity which

[Shri Acharya Kripalani]

anybody who has ever gone in the mountains can see. So, it is not a question of one incident, but the policy behind it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Explanation is not a policy.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Explanation is a policy.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member gets all his facts from the very statements that our Government has made.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Quite right.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** So, we are aware of that. We stated it in our explanation, in our reports, and in our notes to the Chinese Government; we did that; and if the Chinese Government abides or tries to excuse itself or finds some feeble excuse, well, that does not do very much credit to their logic or their thinking. That is a different matter. But what I am venturing to suggest is that three incidents have been mentioned; if they were not three, and even they were three times three, I do not think it is something of major significance in this total picture. We must have some perspective about it. It is not a conflict, some people or two or three persons coming over.

**Acharya Kripalani:** But the White Paper takes a very serious view of the thing; it expresses itself, as I said, that it is very dangerous.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am aware of it. The hon. Member should realise that what is in the White Paper is something of which I am aware, because to some extent, when these things were sent, they passed before my eyes too.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Then, you should have corrected it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is one thing. Even the hon. Member does not seem to differentiate between these

two things. A very wrong thing takes place on the border; we protest strongly. That is all right. And we will protest strongly and justifiably. But to make that a major occurrence is also wrong. I cannot, and I do not consider it as a major indication of something. It is bad, it is annoying, irritating, and we may take such action as normally one is taking.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** But what about air space violations? Are they petty also?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I said something about that the other day. If the hon. Member would look back into what I said, he would see that I said that all these violations are very bad. We have protested, because they occurred near the Chinese border, but I am not sure that all of them are Chinese aircraft.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Some of them are.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May be; I am merely saying that I cannot say it with dead certainty.

**Acharya Kripalani:** But the White Paper says with certainty.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Even if one of them is a Chinese aircraft, it matters. Even if one out of the 52 is Chinese aircraft, violating our air space that matters for the country.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Of course, it matters. Who denies that it does not matter?

**Shri Hem Barua:** This cannot be dismissed as a petty incident.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was referring not to the aircraft; I was referring to these three things, about a few people coming across the border, on whatever excuse it might be.

**Shri Hem Barua:** They have come 7½ miles inside.



**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The aircraft matter is a serious matter. The air space violations were a very serious matter. But the only thing is that I cannot honestly say that there were 52 aircraft, because the same aircraft is seen many times; but I cannot say with assurance, that is, with proof in my hand, except the fact that they are near that area, and the Chinese frontier is not far, that they necessarily were all Chinese. I cannot say that. That is the difficulty. As I said the other day, we are not only at liberty to shoot them down, but we intend to shoot them down where we can do it.

But the real question in regard to India and China is much more serious than these matters. It is a matter of the greatest and the most vital importance to the safety of India, to the future of India. And I regret that by concentrating on petty things, one loses sight of the extra-ordinary seriousness of this thing, with which we are, of course, so much concerned.

Some hon. Members, feeling dissatisfied with all this, as I am dissatisfied often enough, demand why we have done this or that. I am not going into past history, of the last two or three years, because we have discussed this on many occasions, but I would beg of the House to consider what exactly can or should be done in this set of circumstances. I should like them to consider that, because I think that we have done as much as we could do, and we are doing that, and I am completely satisfied with what we are doing in regard to this matter.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am afraid the country is not satisfied.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I know, because the hon. Member has not given much thought to it.

**Acharya Kripalani:** The country also does not seem to have given thought to it, because the country is

exercised over it; even Congress people are exercised over it. I am saying this not only because I happen to be on this side....

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is because the hon. Member misleads the country.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I do not mislead. I speak less than the Prime Minister speaks to the people. He does not seem to carry conviction to them. I rarely speak, and I do not speak at all in public meetings, and I speak only in Parliament.....

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I know, but his words count....

**Acharya Kripalani:** They do not seem to believe you.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** But the hon. Member's words count, wherever he may speak them.

**Acharya Kripalani:** That is very good.... (Interruptions)

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The matter is a very serious matter, a very important matter, one of the most vital matters that a country can face. Let us get that. It is no good talking as Dr. Ram Subhag Singh talked about trade commissioner doing this and that and Mrs. Kapoor doing this or that. Really, all these things are annoying, but the matter is much too serious. I do not know what exactly he wants to be done in regard to our trade commission and others.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** I suggested that they should be closed, if they are not allowed to function.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Reciprocal action can be taken against the Chinese here, against their counterparts here in India.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know who the counterpart is and how he functions, but this I may say with extreme firmness that we do not believe in this policy, this kind of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

vicarious punishment of people, of innocent people, because somebody else has committed an error; that is not our policy, nor the ethics or morality that governs our policy.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** That is the Chinese Government.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Again, I would repeat that this matter is a little more important than Acharya Kripalani seems to imagine or the hon. Member who has just interrupted, because it is a matter in which we have to consolidate all our strength and will to meet it. It is not a minor matter; it is a not to be dealt with by some action, as the hon. Member suggested, against some Chinese resident of some town here, that we punish him because somebody has done something wrong to our man in Tibet.

**Acharya Kripalani:** May I point out....

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I continue, Sir?....

**Acharya Kripalani:** May I point out that the Prime Minister's own utterances give advantage to our enemies inside and outside the country, when he says that not a blade of grass grows in a certain place? I say it is very dangerous. We have to answer the country.

**The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya):** You are guilty of that.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I go on, Sir? I have had enough of interruptions. I beg of the hon. Member to hold himself in patience. I did not interrupt him.

I know something of the subject I am talking about. The difficulty is that the hon. Member does not know anything about it.

**Acharya Kripalani:** We know what we are talking about....

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not agree with the hon. Member in the extent of the knowledge that he possesses about the matters he talks about. (*Interruptions*) I speak with some confidence because I speak with some knowledge. Here is this position, and I would like....

**Shri Hem Barua:** We speak with both with feeling and knowledge.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I should like here to know precisely—he can do it privately or secretly or in writing or orally—and exactly, apart from these expressions of annoyance and irritation, what he thinks the Government of India should do in the circumstances, in the major sense; I am not talking of petty incidents. What we can do, we should try to do, namely to increase our defensive strength, both in regard to positions and otherwise; we should increase it by building up communications etc. in order to be able to defend adequately and to take such action as we may consider necessary from time to time. These things are not done very quickly. They take time. We are building a thousand miles—I cannot say exactly what the figure is—of communications in all these border areas. It is not a light task; it is a heavy burden on us and on our budget financially, and we are doing it with extreme speed. We are doing it roughly in one quarter of the time or one-third of the time—one-third is perhaps more correct—that the Central PWD thought possible. When we asked them, they said it would take so much time. We decided to do it in one-third of the time and, more or less, we are keeping to that schedule.

If I may say so in all humility, I do not wish really to argue about these small matters. When I referred to these matters as relatively small, it was from the point of view of the bigness of the real matter connected with India and China and this conflict

between India and China, bigness in the present and in the future. We are not going to deal with that unless we realise the problem and prepare to meet it. It is not the path of wisdom to take steps or to talk about taking steps before you are prepared for them, before you can take them effectively and before you have exhausted every other means. All these things are normal things for every country, not merely for a country like India which is supposed to be addicted to peace. Every country does that. No country that I know of, big or small, be it the greatest Power in the world, would, I say with all respect, function as sometimes some hon. Members have suggested that we should function, that is, rush an army, start a war or start a local fight or big fight. That is not the way countries function. Even bitter enemies do not function that way.

In this matter, it is obvious that if by some great misfortune there is war between India and China, it is going to be a terrible affair. China is not going to overwhelm India; nor is India going to overwhelm China. We are too big for that and neither is weak in that sense; one may be stronger and one may be weaker. It is a tremendous thing. And even if that is going to happen, one prepares for it; one does not go about waving banners and all that to deal with the situation. It is something as a result of which world developments may take place—they are bound to. It may last a whole generation. It is not a question of a police action or something. It may put an end to all kinds of what we are doing in our country or it may affect them.

All these factors have to be considered and the real fact of the matter, as I said, the basic problem is the attitude of China, what the Chinese Government may have in mind and may be thinking of in the present and in the future. I do think it is of the highest importance for us to have friendly relations with China. That does not mean, and I do not think,

that there can ever be friendly relations by adopting a weak attitude to a strong country. That is not the way to have friendly relations. If you do not respect yourself, if you cannot protect yourself, others will not respect you. Our self-respect and all that demands that we should not take up a weak attitude in the matter. Nevertheless, the fact should be remembered that it is a matter of the utmost importance in the present and more historically speaking that these two mighty colossuses, China and India, should not be in perpetual conflict with each other. It makes a vast difference to the whole of Asia and to the world. We will live on the verge of a world war if that happens.

Unfortunately, some hon. Members here think rather lightly of these matters of war and peace, not having had any experience of them. Therefore, they do not see this picture in this context.

Let us go a little further afield. It is said in newspapers and elsewhere—I hope the hon. Member, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, will not mind my saying so—that there is an ideological conflict even in the communist world, a fairly big one. Whatever it is, they think in different ways and pull in different ways. I do not mean to imply that they are practically breaking with each other. But there it is.

I am interested in that not from the point of view of which ideology is correct or not. But I am interested because of its effect on world problems. And I cannot ignore that, not because of the communist party in India. That is a very little, minor issue. The major issue is its effect. If it is true that the Chinese Government's policy basically does not accept the concept of co-existence—even though it is said that it is accepted—if they think war is more or less inevitable in the world which is part capitalist and part socialist or communist, that presents a type of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

picture which is rather alarming; that war is inevitable on that issue. That means our living in a state of semi-war all the time, intense cold war, some time or other breaking out into full war. As I understand it, that is not the attitude of the Soviet Government. So it is a very vital difference

The other day, because Prof. Mukerjee asked me or challenged me, I read out some reports of speeches delivered by 2 or 3 individuals. One of those who is a Member of the West Bengal Assembly has sent me a telegram protesting that he did not say so. But it is not what he himself said. I would say that the Bengal Branch of the Communist Party itself by a resolution has said more or less that. It is not the question of an individual opinion. The Bengal Branch of the Communist Party is up against its Central Executive and is fighting them. And that is a well-known fact. Their resolution criticises strongly the Central Executive's resolution in regard to China etc. broadly.

Shri Muhammed Elias (Howrah): I am one of the members of the Bengal party. There is the Bengal Council of the Communist Party. But I have never seen such a resolution passed in the Bengal Council. They have criticised some steps which had been taken by the Central Executive of the Communist Party of India; but they have not stated this way, as you are stating that the Member of the Bengal Assembly has said.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not saying that the resolution and the words of the hon. Member are the same. I am not saying that. But what I am saying is that the Central Executive, or whatever it is called, of the Communist Party in India passed after long thought a resolution in which they dealt with their policy towards China-India frontier aggression etc., and in which they for the first time, more clearly than before, criticised China in this matter. Now, the

Bengal Branch of the Communist Party has criticised the Central Executive's resolution and.... (Interruptions).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): The Central Executive of the Communist Party has passed a certain resolution which discusses a vast number of topics including certain primarily ideological matters, especially in relation to the whole concept of peaceful co-existence and how it can be worked out in conditions of today. The West Bengal Committee—I have not got the document here now with me—in a resolution has disagreed with certain formulations which were put forward as an understanding of the concept (Interruptions). But, as far as the attitude of the Party towards the India-China question is concerned, it continues to be governed by the National Council Resolution. As far as the Party is concerned, it continues, as disciplined body of people, to follow the National Council resolution which was passed at Meerut. And, the West Bengal Committee's recent resolution does not say one single word or one single syllable in contravention of the Meerut resolution. It cannot under the constitution.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish to enter into an argument about the resolutions; I am saying something which is public knowledge.

17 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: There can be two readings of the same matter.

Shri Nagi Beddy (Anantapur): There cannot be a reading of a matter which has not been written.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish to go into that; it is more or less public knowledge that the Communist Party of India had for many months been tortured by scruples of conscience.. (Interruptions).

Shri Tyagi: They have none; you are mistaken.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Some people felt in one way and others the other way. There is no doubt about it. The same thing has happened outside too. The hon. Members of this House—one hon. Member at any rate has taken a lead in this and if I may say so, more or less in the right direction—that is, with reference to this, not about everything. Anyhow, it is not a question of what an individual has said here or there. It is the basic matter, conflict in the world—in India and elsewhere and the attitude like the attitude which appears to be the attitude of the Chinese Government is, to my thinking, quite apart from the border issue, a dangerous ideological attitude and ideology and action in China are closely allied, as they should normally be everywhere; still they are closely allied there. Therefore, this dangerous situation arises against which we have to be prepared whatever may be the cost we may have to pay for it.

There is one thing more. Reference was made in this House, yesterday and may be, today also, about the Burmese Prime Minister's visit here. I am sorry that Prime Minister U Nu's name has been brought in here and I am sorry that many of our newspapers gave currency to the story that he was coming here to mediate between India and China or to bring a message to me. There was not an iota of truth, shadow or substance, in this story and it has absolutely nothing to do with it. At no time did U Nu write to me previously about the India-China problem—not at all in this connection. I am not talking about a year or so ago; sometimes he has asked for my views about the situation; we have been corresponding and I explained to him. He decided to come here fairly a long time back. He came here particularly, as he does almost every year, on a pilgrimage to certain Buddhist places here. All he said to me when he came here was that he wanted to explain to me his own treaty with the Chinese Government because I had been connected with this matter for the last 2, 3, 4 years,

corresponding with them, even writing to Premier Chou-En-Lai, 3-4 years ago about the Burmese matter. So that he came to explain to me—I knew the problem—that this was the problem and the boundary has been decided here and there and so on. That is all. He did not give me a single hint or advice about the India-China problem or any message.

He was criticised by some hon. Members because when newspaper men were asking him here he said that he believed that Premier Chou-En-Lai was sincere and criticisms were made that inferentially, that means that we were not sincere.

Now, does any Member in this House accept that inference—they said so, some of them—or expect U Nu to say anything except what he said? Is it conceivable? Is that the way people function in responsible places? May I respectfully suggest to this House that the troubles of the world are not due to the fact that sincere men are up against insincere people. The troubles of the world are due to the fact that sincere men are up against equally sincere men on the other side. They may be misguided—that is a different matter—they may be wrong or right but they are sincere in what they believe. That is the trouble in the world. That is the difficulty. You can move insincere people, but when two sincere persons come with rigid attitudes, rigid beliefs, then comes trouble and conflict. That is the trouble in the world today, and always this has been the major trouble. It is very easy to consider a person with whom you do not agree as insincere, as bad or as a Knave. You can deal with knaves but people who are equally firm in their own belief it is very difficult to deal with. Certainly, so far as U Nu is concerned, who is a very dear friend of ours, with whom I have had the privilege of friendship for many years, to conclude that because he said that Mr. Chou-En-lai was sincere he thought that I was not sincere, I submit, is an absurd inference.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Sir, I am sorry I have exceeded the time that I wanted. I have not mentioned other matters. But one thing I think I should mention, because whether it is Congo or whether it is any other place, the real trouble is, if I may somewhat paraphrase Raja Mahendra Pratap, there are these major conflicts which prevent people from dealing with a situation as it is and inject a cold war element into them. Take the case of the Indo-China States—Laos for the time being. When the Geneva Conference agreement took place five or six years ago it was patent that these States could only exist, could only function if they did not fall into this cold war—that is, if the major military blocs did not throw their weight about them—because if one did it the other will surely come in and there is that conflict. That was laid down quite clearly for Laos, for Viet-Nam, and also, in a slightly different way, for Cambodia. Now there have been many internal troubles. At the present moment the Prime Minister of Laos, Mr. Souvanna Phouma, has been trying his best to constitute a government which might be called, for want of a better word, a neutral government. He is more or less succeeding. But so many difficulties are put in his way, with the result that if one party pulls him in one direction and exercises pressure, immediately the other party comes and exercises pressure in the other way and the whole country is split into bits. The only way to save Laos and all these countries in South-East Asia is for the cold war to be kept far away from them. In fact, that is the only sensible way, because, if you want to exercise your influence on them in a particular direction, the inevitable consequences are the other party pulls in another direction. In order to keep out the other party it is best not to exercise those pressures.

I am sorry I have gone beyond your time-limit. May I say—I need not say—that I do not accept these amendments. Most of them are long essays.

I do not know if there is any limit to the length of the amendments. Other wise, it can be a whole book—essays dealing with all manner of subjects almost under the sun. Quite apart from the merits, on the length of these amendments we ought to reject them! But I would commend to the attention and to the approval of the House Shri D. C. Sharma's amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall now take up the amendments.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** May I submit that I only wanted to emphasise the problem of colonialism? I do not want to press my amendment.

*The substitute motion was, by leave, withdrawn.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Then, I take up the next amendment. Shri Vajpayee—he is not here.

**Shri Assar:** We are not pressing it.

**Mr. Speaker:** As the mover is not present, the amendment will be deemed to have been negated. Then, Shri B. C. Kamble—he is not here. His amendment will also be deemed to have been negated.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** My amendment may be put.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

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

“This House, having considered the international situation, with particular reference to the matters that have come up before the United Nations General Assembly in its current\* session, approves of the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto.”

*The motion was adopted.*

17.13 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, November 24 1960, |Agrahayana 3, 1882 (Saka).*

\* Fifteenth session of the U.N. general Assembly