

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 21st November, 1960."

The motion was adopted.

12-36 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

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

"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."

At the beginning of this session of Parliament, a very large number of questions were sent to me relating to my visit to New York for the purpose of attending this current session of the U.N. General Assembly. I thought that it would be more convenient to the House and more profitable to me if we could have rather a debate on this subject instead of my making just a statement on my visit there, on what I saw and did there. Therefore, in this particular debate, although there is no limit to any subject which might be mentioned—that is in your discretion—it is particularly intended, I take it, and it is so mentioned in this motion, that we should deal with the important matters that have come up in the current session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

When the question of my going to New York for this purpose arose, I was at first rather reluctant to do so, partly because it was not very easy for me to leave India because of the stress of work here and I was not

quite convinced at the time that my going would serve any useful purpose. But in the balance, I decided to go and I am glad that I did so. Indeed, soon after I got there, I realised that it was very much worth while, my visit to this session. Now looking back, I feel still more convinced that it was a right step to take for a variety of reasons.

Among those reasons are, it was helpful to have a more intimate knowledge for me of the inner working of the United Nations, something which it is difficult to get from reading reports, however full they might be, to see the various pressures and pulls at work there and the way people's minds work. Secondly, there were a large number of eminent personalities from the newly independent States of Africa and it was a privilege to meet them, to get to know them and to discuss matters with them. Thirdly, this session of the General Assembly was rather unique, because it attracted a very considerable number of heads of Governments, heads of Nations and heads of States. Naturally, when so many of these eminent persons were present there, in a sense it gave a special look to the Assembly and a special authority to the Assembly and it was a chance for meeting them and discussing matters with them.

Now, much has appeared in the public press about the proceedings and hon. Members must have noticed how often the tempers and temperatures rose rather high and from that, perhaps, to some extent, they may have even overlooked the basic issues at stake, because the public mind looks at incidents more because they stand out than the exact issues at stake. I am sure, hon. Members of this House are well acquainted with these major issues; I am referring to the general public. There were the unfortunate incidents and there was the language used which, I am glad to say, we are not used to in this House. But the fact is that this

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

General Assembly session was considering, and is considering, some matters of the most vital importance to the future of the world.

We have a number of our own problems, some serious, which trouble us, and yet I would venture to say that the basic problems to which I am going to refer, world problems, are far more important than any particular State's individual problems. In fact, in a larger sense, they are governed by what happens to the basic world problems.

Among the more important issues that have come up before the General Assembly of the United Nations, there have been, first of all, disarmament; secondly, the position in Africa and more specially in the Congo; thirdly, the structure of the United Nations and, fourthly, the broad question of colonialism. All these problems in a greater or lesser degree have been before us, there is nothing new in them, but at this particular juncture they came with a certain element of, well, push in them and importance and vitality which shook people's minds.

Disarmament, of course, is a matter to which we have always attached the greatest importance and on many an occasion our delegation in the United Nations, or sometimes even in this House, speaking in this House during the past few years, put forward certain proposals. Always our attempt has been, whenever we put forward such proposals, not to propose something which may be idealistically right in our opinion but rather something which fits in with the situation of the day; that is, our approach has been partly idealistic—we shall never forget that aspect,—but, nevertheless, realistic, not merely to express our views in strong language and criticise others but rather to put forward something which we think is feasible, and we have tried, therefore, to win over or to produce some-

thing which is likely to be acceptable, if not hundred per cent very largely so.

This question of disarmament was considered in its particular aspect of nuclear weapons, weapons of mass slaughter and its broader aspect too, and we have made various proposals from time to time. Now, a situation has arisen or is arising, when perhaps an even greater urgency comes into the picture for a variety of reasons. One is, if nothing effective is done in the course of the next few years—let us say, the next three or four years, I cannot fix a time limit—if nothing effective is done in regard to effective disarmament, it may be that it may become too late to deal with it, that it may become almost impossible to control the situation. So far as nuclear weapons are concerned, some kind of advance is being made almost from day to day, or from month to month, some little thing, making these weapons more powerful, more dangerous and, what is more important, easier to make, relatively easier to make. Once this spreads to many countries, it is obvious that it will become exceedingly difficult to make all of them agree or to have any effective disarmament or any effective machinery of control. Therefore, something has got to be done before we pass this point of no return in disarmament, because there might well be a point of no return when we have gone too far and atomic and nuclear bombs and the rest spread out, either by the fact that they are manufactured by all the countries or, as is often suggested, by a lavish disposal of them to other countries. Only this morning—I think it was this morning—I read in the newspapers a suggestion of the Commander of the NATO forces that the nuclear weapons should be distributed to all the NATO countries, which means quite a number. Now, I do not wish to challenge the good motives of any country, but it is obvious that if, in addition to the four countries that have some kind of nuclear weapons today, a dozen more

are added to it, the difficulty of dealing with the situation becomes infinitely greater and if, as is expected by eminent scientists, the process of manufacturing them becomes simpler and cheaper, relatively simpler and cheaper, then obviously the matter is quite out of hand. Therefore, we have to take action before we pass the point of no return and therein lies the tremendous urgency of this matter.

Also, when we talk of disarmament we have to consider two or three aspects of it. It is curious that almost all the major countries concerned, and presumably the minor countries too, have agreed broadly, and it is often forgotten what a large measure of agreement there is. Everyone agrees that we want disarmament. I believe everyone agrees; may be there is some exception on disarmament; but I would remind this House of the resolution passed by the General Assembly last year, and again another resolution this year, a little earlier, on the necessity of general and complete disarmament, passed unanimously by the General Assembly. That is agreed to. It is also agreed that disarmament must be accompanied by effective controls. Anyhow, that would be desirable and in the state of fear and apprehension and distrust that is all the more desirable. Therefore, disarmament and control have to go together. There is a curious argument often as to which comes first and which comes second. Obviously, they have to be simultaneous. Countries are not going to agree to disarm without proper controls, and controls coming in without disarmament seems to me rather remarkable, because what does one control? It almost means that armaments may continue under some control. Surely, all that we want is full and complete disarmament and, inevitably, it can only be reached by phases; we cannot change the world overnight. While it can be reached by phases, the objective of full and complete disarmament must be kept.

In any phasing or in any steps that we might take in regard to this

matter, care has to be taken that a certain balance is preserved between the rival groups of nations who fear each other because if at any time they fear that a step to be taken increases the striking force or the military force of the other group then they will hesitate. Therefore this balancing has to take place.

These are the broad major approaches to these problems and I will submit that there is a very large measure of agreement on this as there is in regard to nuclear weapons also. In spite of that, it is well known that nations argue about this subject. They go on arguing and suspecting each other of some trickery and do not come to an agreement. At present there are various resolutions before the General Assembly in regard to disarmament. Among them is a rather long resolution proposed on behalf of India. I do not propose to go into that here. But by that resolution itself India does not represent, if I may say, so, at all an idealistic approach of what we would like to be done, but a conscious, deliberate attempt to put forward something which approaches as nearly as possible the various viewpoints and brings them together. Even that resolution is not a sacred writ to us. If by some change here and there we can achieve greater success, we shall adopt it.

I shall not say much more about disarmament at this stage. But if the House so wishes, I would suggest that my colleague, the hon. Defence Minister, who has been leading our delegation in the General Assembly, might speak on this subject later in this debate and give more precise information as to how matters stand.

The second important subject I mentioned was this question of Africa. Now something has happened in Africa which is of very great importance, of course, but which might be said to be almost one of the turning points in historic processes—the emergence of a large number of countries of Africa becoming independent countries either hundred per

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

cent or maybe somewhat less here and there. But I have no doubt that they will be hundred per cent later even though there might be some limitations at the present moment. In fact, excepting some areas of Africa, the first that comes to my mind is Algeria where a bitter tragic war has been going on for a long number of years. It is a tragedy of the deepest kind. Vast numbers of people have perished and yet such is the urge for freedom that they continue and I have no doubt that they will succeed in achieving it.

Then we come to those parts of Africa which are controlled by Portugal. In this present-day world whenever the question of Portugal comes up, we somehow have to move from this century to some past century in the Middle Ages. It is very difficult to discuss these matters unless one is himself capable of going back to that period two or three hundred years ago, because although it is not my purpose to interfere in any way or criticize even the ways of any Government, even the Portuguese Government in its homelands, we cannot remain silent or look on when something happens in their colonial domain. It is a curious thing to remember now that with these changes that have taken place in regard to colonial territories in Africa and elsewhere, I am not quite sure but probably, today Portugal is the greatest colonial power in the world. (*Some Hon. Members:* Shame shame). It is a remarkable fact. Its colonies which are called provinces of Portugal live in a state of darkness where light does not come at all. We know little about them except some news that escapes. They refuse to submit reports to the United Nations as they ought to as the United Nations has demanded. There is, of course, our own little territory of Goa, a part of India. There are a few other cases in the world where colonies function in a hundred per cent way. Some may be in a somewhat lesser degree.

On colonialism I was dealing with Africa first; I will come to the general question of colonialism later.

In Africa remarkable changes have taken place. Broadly speaking, one may look at these changes. There are the changes which have taken place or are likely to take place in a year or two of the territories which are British colonies. Some kind of timetable has been laid down and we hope that it will be adhered to. Then there are the areas which were under French dominion—quite a number of small and big countries—and some of them belong after independence to what is called the French Community. That is entirely for them to decide.

Then there is this vast area, the Congo. It has occupied so much of our attention. It presents extraordinarily difficult problems. And yet, in spite of the complexity of these problems, one can disentangle them and look at the basic features of the Congo. The first thing that strikes one is the extraordinary state of the Congo when the colonising country, namely, Belgium left it or apparently left it. Here was a country which just has a total absence—total perhaps is not scientifically an accurate word—of any trained personnel in the country apart from Belgians for every kind of work and everything. Normally this should have created a difficult situation. It did. Even supplying those trained persons to them would have meant tremendous strain on the resources of any country or many countries taken together. No other problem, of course, is there. The United Nations was asked to help. They undertook to help. Quite rightly.

I want to make it quite clear that I think it was a right step for the United Nations to take. Having taken it, they have to go through it because the only alternative to that would be that vacuum being filled by others in an undesirable way. One could not have left that. The only alternative

was, maybe, internal civil wars and tribal wars egged on by outside agencies chiefly: outside agencies and countries interfering. There was no way out except for the United Nations to go there and take charge of the situation—take charge not in the sense of becoming a ruling authority and converting it into a kind of trust territory, but to give it a proper foundation and base on which to function.

13 hrs.

So the U.N. went there. Other difficulties arose then and have been arising all the time. I cannot go into that story. But I would commend to the House to read the latest report of the U.N. Representative there, Shri Rajeshwar Dayal. I might mention that Shri Rajeshwar Dayal was not sent by us there and was not our choice even. We were not asked to choose. Mr. Hammarskjold, the Secretary General, asked us—because he had come into touch with him in Lebanon and New York in the U.N. itself—for the loan of his services. We hesitated because he was doing important work as our High Commissioner in Karachi. Nevertheless, we agreed and he went rather at short notice and fell into the middle of this rather steaming cauldron of a situation there. Although he happens to be one of our valued officers whose judgment we trust and we have experience of him, I am not judging him by our past experience. Nor, indeed, is it for me to judge his work there except in so far as we can see it. I may say that during all the time he has been there, we have been practically out of touch with him. He does not report to us. We do not send him instructions though some people imagine that we do. He is an international civil servant, now functioning in a difficult position, reporting to the U.N. He has been sending reports. One of the reports, the second full Report, has been published by the U.N. I have placed a number of copies in the Library here. We did not have copies for

every Member. But, we have distributed some copies to leaders of parties and groups in this House. I would commend the reading of this report which is an objective survey from a man not only on the spot, but a man responsible for dealing with the situation. That itself will give you some picture of the situation there.

Many facts come out of this. One basic fact is, I regret to say, that the Belgians there have not functioned as, I think, they ought to have functioned. Not only that; after the first few weeks, Belgians who had left in the earlier stages of Independence, returned in considerable numbers to the Congo. This became a heavy flow; not only in those provinces like Katanga, etc., which, of course, are practically completely controlled by Belgians of all types, military, civil, technical and all that, but even in Leopoldville itself, the stream of Belgians returning continues. This House will remember that the Security Council repeatedly said that the Belgians should be made to withdraw. Naturally, the Security Council referred to the military element or the para-military element. It could not and it was not referring to the civilians. The military element or at any rate the military people are there still and have gone back there in some numbers. The Government of Belgium apparently says that they have nothing to do with this business, that these are individual Belgians functioning of their own free will and how can they interfere. Perhaps not, though I should imagine that the Belgian Government, if it disapproved of this kind of thing, could and would interfere very rapidly.

I would like to read out one or two brief passages from Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal's report on this subject.

"There is clear evidence of the steady return, in recent weeks, of Belgians to the Congo, and within this framework, of increasing Belgian participation in political

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and administrative activities whether as advisers, consellers or executive officials. Belgian military and para-military personnel as well as civilian personnel continue to be available to authorities in the Congo, notably in Katanga and South Kasai.

This steady return, following the precipitate mass departure of last July, may be attributed in part to spontaneous, individual reactions to an improvement in the security factor following the arrival of the United Nations Forces in the Congo, but the magnitude and nature of subsequent developments is difficult to explain in such terms."

Even in the capital city of Leopoldville where the United Nations is having its force,

"Symptomatic of the changing picture is the rise of the Belgian population in Leopoldville from a low of 4,500 in July to at least 6,000. While a proportion have come back from Brazzaville, the regular Subena service brings back full loads of passengers."

Here is an interesting fact.

"Soon after a measure of security had been re-established in the Congo, a recruiting agency for the Congo was set up in Brussels and supported Leopoldville."

The House will notice the organised way this was done and yet, the Belgian Government says, it is individual action.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): How do they come in even when the United Nations forces are there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are all kinds of things. Here is one striking illustration.

"One striking illustration has been the recent joint application

of 122 candidates from Belgium for posts in the Congolese Judiciary. In this and other cases, there is an implication considerably more than that individuals are seeking employment solely and directly with the Congolese authorities."

12.08 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I won't read much more.

"Belgian influence is also seen in the military field. A Belgian colonel, who recently arrived from Brazzaville, acts as an adviser to the Leopoldville Ministry of National Defence, while a former Belgian warrant officer serves as aide de camp to Colonel Mobutu, with the rank of Captain. Thirty-six Congolese have been sent by Colonel Mobutu to Brussels for military training . . ." and so on.

In Katanga which wants to leave the Congo State,

"In Katanga, Belgian influence is omnipresent. Virtually all key civilian and security posts are either held directly by officials of Belgian nationality or controlled by advisers to recently appointed and often inexperienced Congolese officials."

Going to South Kasai, the other troublesome area,

"In the so-called 'Autonomous State of South Kasai' there is also a considerable Belgian presence. The current emphasis there is on warlike preparation directed by a Colonel Crevecoeur serving in Belgian uniform, and assisted by another Belgian Colonel Levieux."

In conclusion, Shri Rajeshwar Dayal says:

"From the above data and the general consensus of well informed UNCC officers and from other sources, it may be concluded that a gradual but purposeful return is being staged by Belgian nationals, which has assumed serious significance in view of the key areas which they have penetrated in the public life of the country....."

Apart from the enormous difficulties that the people of the Congo had to face after the sudden change, you see this deliberate, purposeful, continuous coming back, you may call them individuals or groups, call them as you like—of the Belgians, mostly previously connected with the Congo, coming back and occupying these offices, a few in the military, maybe more, I do not know, certainly large numbers in every other department of life; and you will find that wherever Belgians are in the greatest numbers, that area is asking for separate Statehood, for separation from the Congo, has a separatist movement. In fact, Belgians are often leading those movements. Now, it is not an unjustifiable assumption for me to make that a part of these troubles at least is due to this Belgian presence, ever-increasing presence, and that one of the first things that should be done in the Congo is to carry out firmly and clearly what the Security Council said previously about the Belgians. As I said, they do not talk about the civilians and the rest but only about military and para-military formations, but in the circumstances, one can see it is very difficult to draw a line between these. And I feel that in all this argument which is going on there between various groups, a basic fact is this; and a further basic fact is that the Belgian authorities there are supporting the disruptive elements. Apart from the provinces that wish to part company from the State, even in Leopoldville, the so-called Government of Congo

that exists today is being pushed hither and thither by Belgians.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): On a point of order. You are unnecessarily dealing with unnecessary facts. The struggle is between Soviet Russia and America for world control.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member, as is his usual practice, has hit the nail on the head.

Here is this difficulty. We hear about President Kasavubu, we hear about Prime Minister Lumumba, we hear about a certain gentleman, Col. Mobutu, we hear about what is called a College of Commissioners, drawn from some young students from the university there, each pulling in a different direction. How can we get hold of this situation?

One thing is perfectly clear—that there was a Parliament which was elected under the basic, fundamental law framed by Belgium, and more or less fashioned after the Belgian Constitution. Parliament was elected, that Parliament appointed President Kasavubu and Prime Minister Lumumba. Then trouble arose, and a new gentleman appeared on the scene, Col. Mobutu, who had been appointed by Prime Minister Lumumba as Chief of Staff. These are big titles, but actually, most of these gentlemen holding these high titles occupied rather humble positions in their previous career. Col. Mobutu, as far as I know, has no previous experience of military matters or anything. He was probably some kind of a clerk somewhere. Anyhow, he maybe a very desirable person for what I know. I have nothing against him. But this Chief of Staff decided to do away with Parliament and the Prime Minister and the rest. He said he was taking charge of the situation and he would not permit Parliament to meet. He tried on various occasions to arrest Mr. Lumumba.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

All this is very extraordinary. After all, the one solid thing there is Parliament, and the one fact which is obvious is that Col. Mobutu has no legal, constitutional or any other basis, and yet, a still more extraordinary fact is that some countries have supported and encouraged Col. Mobutu in his activities, and very strange activities they have been. His army has been behaving in a totally, not only undisciplined, but wholly irregular way, looting etc. It was with some difficulty that the UN troops could establish some order in Leopoldville.

At the present moment President Kasavubu is in New York, in the UN Assembly. As President of the State, of course, he is acknowledged, but the question has arisen as to who should represent the Congo State in the United Nations.

Some little time back, maybe a week or ten days back, the Congo question came up before the United Nations in a somewhat different context, in the context of sending a mission of good offices, or a conciliation mission, to the Congo from the UN, on behalf of the UN, consisting of members of countries which are at present functioning on behalf of the UN in the Congo, about 15 such countries I believe. So far as India is concerned, we have not sent any military forces as such; nevertheless, we have seven or eight hundred personnel there in hospital and other connected works. After much debate it was decided by the UN, a resolution was passed, that further discussion of the Congo question should be postponed till this commission returned and reported. Probably it was a good decision, but a few days immediately after, this question is taken up in another way, as to who should represent the Congo in the UN, for there are different people pulling in different directions, and there are two or three

groups of individuals, each wanting to represent it, backed by some party. It is not for me to say which is the stronger party, and which his not, but I do submit that the one thing we must accept is Parliament, and Parliament there is an elected Parliament. The first thing that should happen is for that elected Parliament to meet.

In the opinion of some, the standard of parliamentary behaviour may not be good there; that does not matter. Let them meet, because the extra-parliamentary behaviour that we have seen there has been pretty bad. Col. Mobutu, of course, forcibly does not permit this meeting of Parliament, but this kind of thing is tolerated by others, and Col. Mobutu is encouraged, certainly by the Belgians there who are often in his staff and all that. Then the blame is cast on the poor Congolese. I have every sympathy for the Congolese, and I am convinced that the Congolese, left to themselves, may break some heads, but they would come to some conclusion and carry on, while now, all these external influences coming in, pulling in different directions, and an element of the cold war coming into this unhappy country, makes it difficult for even Parliament to meet.

It is said that Parliament cannot meet because some Members of Parliament may not be able to come. This is extra ordinary. Why should they not be able to come? If the UN is there in sufficient force, it should guarantee security to Parliament and all its members, whether they come from Katanga or any other place. I am afraid one gets the impression that there is no desire in the minds of some people and some countries for Parliament there to meet, because they do not quite know what Parliament might decide; it might not decide according to their liking. So, they come in the way and encourage these disruptive forces there.

So, I submit that in this matter, the first basic thing is that Parliament should meet. Let them have a new Prime Minister, a new President, if they like, do what they like, and try to come to terms, the UN helping them, advising them, others too. And the second basic thing is: the less of interference from outside, from any country, the better—primarily it is Belgium, but the other countries also who have occasionally interfered, not so obviously as Belgium, but certainly interfered. These are the two basic things I should like to say.

In about two or three days' time, I think, day after tomorrow, the Good Offices Commission is going to the Congo on behalf of the United Nations. I wish them success, and I hope they will achieve some success in their work of conciliation; and on their return, the United Nations might be in a better position to deal with this question. We were asked to nominate a member on this commission, and we have selected a Member of this House, Shri Rameshwar Rao, because he has a wide acquaintance with African countries, and we thought that this commission would profit by that experience.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): May I ask the Prime Minister whether we can do anything to bring order in the Congo out of the chaos that has been created?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have ventured to say that the first element in bringing order is for the disorderly elements coming from outside to go away.

Acharya Kripalani: Can we do anything in the matter?

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): What can we do?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What can I do? We are talking about the United Nations' problems, not the Govern-

ment of India's problems. They are the United Nations' problems, and the Government of India happens to be a member of the United Nations, and it takes full part in the activities and the discussions there.

The hon. Member, perhaps, does not quite appreciate any world body functioning. If a world body functions...

Acharya Kripalani: I wanted to know what we could do. I did not want that the world body should not function. I wanted that if we could do something, we must do it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am venturing to do something by expressing the opinion of this Government and this House, I hope, as to what should be done by the United Nations, because this is a matter in which the United Nations is deeply concerned; it is tied up; and we, as members of the United Nations, are, therefore, concerned to express our views, to advise, to help and to co-operate with the United Nations.

Then, the third question, I mentioned was about the structure of the United Nations. This structure was evolved at San Francisco when the United Nations first came into existence. It was not a very logical structure, but it was something that represented the objective—if I may use the word, conditions of the world then, the play of forces etc. It is clear that it was not very fair to Asia or Africa; it is clear that the situation has changed since then; it has been progressively changing, and there has been some talk of the structure being also changed. We have felt that this was necessary, but we have not brought it forward or pressed for it, because of this involving, possibly, an amendment of the charter; and that would become a highly controversial issue, and we wanted to avoid that. But, as things have been developing, now with a large number of African nations coming in, it is obvious that the United Nations' structure is out of tune with

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

conditions in the world today in a variety of ways, and something has to be done about it. I should frankly confess to this House that I have no precise proposals as to what should be done, and even if I do, I would rather not put them forward in this way because this kind of thing can be dealt with satisfactorily only by a large measure of agreement. It cannot be done by the cold war technique of voting and out-voting this; of course, voting has to take place, but there has to be a considerable measure of agreement. That is why we do not wish to put forward any precise proposal. But the point is that the United Nations' structure is not in tune with the present, the world situation, Africa, Asia and the rest. And this fact is recognised by all countries. It is not that only people from Asia or Africa say that. All the countries, to whatever group they may belong, recognise this fact. All I can say is that I hope this matter will be considered, not in the context of the cold war, but rather in the context of reality, and some measures will be evolved.

It is clear that the United Nations cannot be a merely debating body; it has undertaken a very heavy task, and solved some of the difficult problems. I have no doubt that because of the United Nations, war has been avoided on several occasions, in the past few years. I have no doubt that if the United Nations was not there, this world would be in a parlous state, and we would have had to search for it and build up some such thing. I have often criticised the United Nations for some step or the other with which I did not agree, but I should like to pay my tribute to the United Nations broadly speaking, for the work that it has done, and its able Secretary-General.

So, I shall not say anything about the structure of the United Nations.

Now, I come to the fourth problem, that is, colonialism in general. As I

said, it is true that this is retreating. Nevertheless, what remains of it is troublesome enough, and the sooner this too is made to undergo a sea-change to free countries, the better. It is no good postponing the question the way it is being done.

I do not suggest that some overnight change anywhere might take place, but the question has to be taken up and definite decisions should be taken.

These are the four great questions before the United Nations and the world. And many of the conflicts that have arisen in the world, or other conflicts, too, are dependent and are connected in some way with these major questions.

Another fact that I should like to bring to the notice of this House is this. Sometimes, people talk about India being a neutral country. I have always said that I do not like the word 'neutral' in this connection. I do not even like, if I may say so with all respect, what is sometimes referred to as 'positive neutrality' in some countries. We are unaligned; we are uncommitted to military blocs; but we are committed to various policies, various urges, various objectives, various principles, very much so. Anyhow, when proposals are being made that we should form some kind of a bloc of so-called neutral countries, I have not taken very kindly to them. I do not like the system of blocs, but of course, we meet, we discuss, we have common thinking, sometimes, we have common action; and we co-operate

In the old days,—by the old days, I mean, three or four or five years ago—the great countries, great and powerful countries, leaders of these big armed blocs used to speak rather slightly of these neutrals who had no moral basis, and who, therefore, sat on a hedge, perched up somewhere, not daring to come down this way or that way. That attitude has changed a great deal. It has changed into one

of considerable respect for these countries which are unaligned, and a realisation that whatever may be good for them, this position and this policy are certainly good for the countries that call themselves unaligned; and now, with a large group from Africa coming, and more or less also joining this unaligned group, not a formal group, I mean, it has made a big difference; and whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere, this major fact counts that the world cannot wholly be disposed of, although they play a great part, by this mighty armed group or that mighty armed group; the others have a say also, and sometimes, an important say; this development is taking place because, in spite of the terrible importance of nuclear bombs and the like, human beings and their ideas and their urges still count in this world, in every country. It is because of that that there is hope for the world. One of the major things we might see in this world is a growing conviction that the problems of this changing, exciting and turbulent world cannot be solved by threats or by military means. The misfortune is that while that is realised completely, yet energies, resources, money and everything is directed far more to the development and advancement of the military apparatus of a country than to other things. Once we get over this major hurdle then conditions will change in people's minds, in the reaction in people's minds to events.

At present, there is, I would say, a definite indication, a desire, that peoples and countries want to get out of the ruts they were in, ruts of thinking and ruts of action. It is always a difficult thing, difficult even for us in India who are perhaps less in the ruts than other countries, to get out of our ruts of thinking and action; but it is even more difficult for those who have been conditioned in the last many years to believe faithfully in the virtue of ballistic weapons, inter-continental missiles and atomic and hydrogen bombs, thinking these to be

a deterrent which would save them, each ultimately beginning to think that the best deterrent is something which should destroy the other, and putting the fear of destruction in the other's mind. I do not venture to criticise others who think that way; their position may be different, their geographical position and other position may be different from others. Nevertheless, one does feel, and what is more important, they have begun to feel, that this is an out-of-date way of approaching these problems, and they are searching for some other way out of this.

13.34 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I was rather depressed when I was in New York and saw this cold war functioning in all its bitterness and angry rhetoric, and yet looking back—and even to some extent there—I felt that there was a hopeful sign to all this, because the UN—when I say UN, it means the other countries represented there, their leaders, Presidents and Prime Ministers who were there—felt that they were coming to grips with these major subjects. They no longer were there just to have a debate and argue about, or deliver fine speeches, but they were coming to grips with these subjects. They often got angry and cursed each other. Nevertheless, the approach was becoming relatively more realistic. That was a good sign, and I have no doubt that that is what is happening the world over.

There are great dangers all over the world; at the same time, there is this growing opinion because ultimately wars, as I think the preamble of the UNESCO Charter says, start in the minds of men, and if the minds of men change, no doubt that will affect the starting or the continuation of wars. If I may say so in all modesty, we in India have played some little tiny part; by our patient endeavours by our attempt not to be pushed into warlike situations, by our refusal to curse countries even though we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

disagree with them, by trying to cultivate the friendship of all countries and talking with them quietly, modestly and patiently, we have contributed to a small extent—may be to a very small extent, but still to some extent.—in creating this new atmosphere in the world.

Sir, I move.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"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".

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I sent notice of an amendment yesterday, but it reached slightly late. May I be permitted to move that amendment now?

Mr. Speaker: Let me first deal with those amendments which were tabled earlier.

The first amendment stands in the name of Shri Braj Raj Singh. Does he move it?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to other objections, I allow him to move it.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I beg to move:

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, is of opinion that—

(a) the Indian Delegation failed to take the lead at the Unit-

ed Nations in its last session to advocate complete wiping out of all sorts of colonialism in the world;

(b) the Government of India have been complacent about the Chinese aggression on our border." (1)

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): I beg to move:

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, feels that India's policies in the field of foreign relations tend to be unprofitably platitudinous, lack a substratum of realism, and so have not been conducive to the preservation and furtherance of the nation's enlightened self interests.

This House is of opinion that India's interests demand that we should not only pursue strictly a policy of non-alignment between the two world blocs but we should also scrupulously avoid involvement in international matters which have no direct bearing on India's interests.

In particular, this House regrets:

(a) that because of failure to sound both the power blocs before embarking on an effort at mediation, and seeking to emphasize points of common agreement, Indian moves at the U.N. gave an impression of leaning towards one of the blocs;

(b) that the Government should have allowed itself to be involved in the Congo tangle;

(c) that the Government should not only have failed to secure

China's vacation of Indian territory but should have fallen victim to China's strategy of prolonging negotiations with a view to gain time to consolidate its illegal accretions;

(d) that notwithstanding China's continued hostilities, Indian spokesmen at the U.N. should have advocated China's admission to the U.N.; that the Prime Minister should have played down China's misdoings by referring to its aggression as 'a controversy' and that thus India should have lost a valuable opportunity of educating world opinion on the matter;

(e) that India should have failed to enlighten opinion in our neighbouring States in respect of Chinese aggression as was indicated by some of the statements of the Burmese Prime Minister in which he appeared to vouchsafe for China's sincerity;

(f) that Government should have decided not to support in the U.N. the motion in respect of violation of human rights in Tibet, sponsored by Malaya and Thailand;

(g) that the Prime Minister should have made a statement on Kashmir in New York which favouring as it does the present *status quo* in Jammu and Kashmir state may be interpreted as a virtual abdication of our rights on Pak-occupied Kashmir; and

(h) that in pursuance of its policy of appeasing Pakistan, India should have entered into the Canal Waters Treaty which affects our interests adversely"
(2)

An Hon. Member: Amendment No. 2 is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I will decide that later. What about Shri D. C. Sharma? He may move his amendment.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It has not been circulated.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I beg to move:

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." (4)

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Where is Shri Jaganatha Rao?

Shri B. C. Kamble: I beg to move:

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, hereby directs that—

- (a) on important occasions, like the current session of General Assembly, when Heads of important States attend it, the Union Government should establish a convention of first taking the Indian Parliament into confidence, with regard to proposals, they have to make at such sessions; and
- (b) the Union Government, who by any token is less vigorous in pursuing India's own foreign problems for ultimate solution through the U.N., should take further effective steps in that direction, consistently with the directive principles of the Constitution of India." (3)

Mr. Speaker: I will have copies circulated to hon. Members in an hour's time or so.

[Mr. Speaker]

These amendments together with the original Motion are before the House.

As regards the time, we will have 9 hours. Leaders of major Groups will have 20—30 minutes each. As regards other Groups, they will have 20 minutes each, and ordinary Members will have 15 minutes each.

So far as the subject-matter is concerned, the hon. Prime Minister has indicated what the scope of it is. It is a general discussion of the international situation with particular reference to the UNO. But yesterday I had said that so far as the border was concerned, any hon. Member interested in placing one or two matters before the House might do so.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):
This also came up in the UNO.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central): Mr. Speaker, I feel it is a very good thing that we are having this opportunity of discussing the Motion and I am sure the House will agree when I say that it was a very good thing that our Prime Minister went to the last session of the United Nations General Assembly because that was a great occasion, and in many ways it has helped us to know who stands where and what each of the Great Powers is up to. The speech of the Prime Minister this morning has also given us a very clear picture of some of the major problems which confront the world today, and I am very happy that we have this opportunity of discussing the Motion.

From what the Prime Minister said and from what we have already read in the papers, it does appear that all efforts for peace, for colonial freedom and for international co-operation, efforts towards which India has made a very large contribution, are being sought to be perverted—almost sabo-

taged—by certain intrigues being conducted; and the Prime Minister has specifically given the instances of at least two Powers, Belgium and Portugal, which are behaving in a manner which surely world public opinion will detest.

Sir, as I said before, India has made a large contribution towards clearing the air and towards bringing about, as far as that is possible, international co-operation and the advance of colonial freedom and the achievement of peace. In the drama in the United Nations our part has been very heartening. But, what I wish to add, after having heard the Prime Minister, is that we should take certain lessons rather very seriously to heart, lessons which are implicit in the statement which he has made before the House this morning.

In regard to disarmament, I need not repeat that India's stand has been such as certainly commends itself to the conscience of humanity; and the Prime Minister and the Government of India have made their position very clear. I am glad he said how disarmament and control have got to go together. The common man is very disturbed to find out that there is a controversy among the great powers in regard to which should start when. There is a feeling that the Soviets advocate complete disarmament, the acceptance of complete disarmament as an objective and the adoption of certain steps in that regard now. On the other hand, the position of what is called, rather euphemistically, the free world, is that controls have to come first and disarmament will come later. But the Prime Minister has said very clearly that disarmament and controls have got to go together. We have to be absolutely clear about our objective in regard to complete disarmament, and, particularly, immediate abolition of nuclear armament. And that is why it is very good thing that the Prime Minister has made it very clear and unequivocally that dis-

armament and control have got to go together.

And I am happy that in this regard there is complete agreement between our country and the socialist countries, countries like USSR. The most vital issue of the day being disarmament, the first and foremost objective in the world today being the achievement of peace, a world without war being what we all aim at, it is a very good thing that India has come out very clearly. India had stated her position even earlier. But it is necessary to remember that this idea of disarmament and controls proceeding together, this idea of the effective advance towards complete disarmament, towards a world without war is being sought to be prevented, is being sought to be more or less sabotaged by the activities of what are called the Western Powers. And that is why we noticed that when the Prime Minister was in the United Nations—he had said that—how certain proposals which emanated from the Western Powers did not really assist the achievement of this objective.

In regard to anti-colonialism, to the question of Africa in particular, the Prime Minister has expressed sentiments about which, I am sure, there would be complete unanimity in this House. I only wish there was some mention in the Prime Minister's speech of Cuba. I remember his having told Dr. Castro, the leader of Cuba, that he was happy to meet him because he was a very brave man. Cuba is a very brave country. Though small it is challenging the might of the United States of America where imperialism is very much alive and an ugly thing. But, otherwise, the kind of things to which the Prime Minister has drawn our attention could not have happened on the world stage today. In regard to Cuba, I feel that a word of appreciation from the Prime Minister about the effort which the people of Cuba, under Castro's leadership, are making against imperialism and its depredations, would have been very much in order, would have been very seemly.

Congo, of course, naturally occupies the attention of the world most of all at the present moment. And I am very happy that the Prime Minister has repeated that the one solid thing in Congo today is the Parliament and the settlement in Congo must proceed on the basis of the Parliament being called and getting into the picture properly speaking.

In regard to Congo, I do not think it is necessary for me to expatiate a great deal after what the Prime Minister has said. But I wish to say that we are happy that Shri Rajeshwar Dayal, an Indian national, even though he is an international civil servant at the present moment, has done his job of work in such a very splendid fashion. We have got his report. And this report also shows how differently Shri Rajeshwar Dayal has tackled the extremely difficult problems in Congo when we recall what had been done by his principal Mr. Hammarskjöld. I am sorry I have to say that. (Interruptions). After all, it is necessary to remember that perhaps the position in Congo would not have deteriorated; perhaps the waters would not have been muddied in Congo if earlier the United Nations had behaved with a little more integrity, with a little more sympathy and understanding of the desire of the people of Congo.

Acharya Kripalani: Why talk of Shri Dayal? (Interruptions).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Who appointed him; what is he doing? (Interruptions).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is not my intention to pitch Shri Rajeshwar Dayal against Mr. Hammarskjöld. (Interruptions).

Acharya Kripalani: I simply asked a question about Shri Rajeshwar Dayal. That is all. I had no intention of having any controversy with the gentleman.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I think I better disregard the kind of observations in

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

regard to the work of an Indian national, who, as an international civil servant has done a job of work which requires expression of appreciation in an unqualified fashion. (*Interruptions*).

In regard to Congo, we know that Belgium is the villain of the peace. The Prime Minister has made it very clear (*Interruptions*). But Belgium is not alone. Behind Belgium are certain powers which the Prime Minister in his position could not name. But we know who they are. Only the other day, in the city of Louvain in Belgium, Mr. Spaak, the Secretary-General of NATO made a speech; and he said that by any means the NATO powers should stay in Africa, particularly in the Congo, because, otherwise, communists would take over. I can understand this kind of animus against Shri Rajeshwar Dayal himself in certain quarters because of this kind of fear being expressed by the Secretary-General of NATO. I think it is a tribute to communism that whenever our colonial people emerge into freedom there is a fear in certain quarters that their emergence into freedom might take the shape of a communist society. But, we know very well who are behind Belgium. We know very well United States' stand in regard to Congo, in regard to this Good Offices Commission which is going, in regard to the seating of Mr. Kasavubu as representative of the Congo, in regard to all the troubled waters as far as the active settlement on the basis of parliamentary activities being re-established in Congo is concerned. So, the Prime Minister has said very clearly how in Katanga and Kasai and such areas the behaviour of Belgium and the friends of Belgium who are operating not so much behind the scenes but very clearly has been absolutely egregious.

But this being so, the position in the Congo being now very clear, a state of things might arise where the Western Powers, as they are

called, might line up against Shri Rajeshwar Dayal's report as they have done; and we shall see the socialist countries and many of the other countries like our own support the report of Shri Rajeshwar Dayal and its implications and the duties which devolve upon the United Nations in this regard.

I know that the Prime Minister has told us today that we cannot do things overnight, that we cannot do things in a hurry. The position is difficult; all sorts of complicated problems are there. We have to have patience and modesty and all that sort of thing. But where the position is so very clear, it is not necessary for us, only because we are uncommitted, to go on being uncommitted. I am very glad that the Prime Minister said that our neutrality, if it is neutrality, is very positive and that we stand for certain objectives. In regard to Congo the position is now so very clear that as far as the only settlement which will bring about real freedom in the Congo is concerned, that settlement is being opposed, as I said before sabotaged, by certain interests. On the other hand there is the other suggestion put forward authoritatively by Shri Dayal's report as well as by the other Afro-Asian nations and other countries like the Soviet Union and other socialist representatives in the UN which is, on its own merits, the real solution of the problem of Congo. After listening to the Prime Minister, we would expect that the Indian stand continues to be positive, and strong and continues to be such as would bring about conditions of freedom in the Congo.

The Prime Minister referred to the question of structural changes in the UN and as he very rightly pointed out, the structure of the UN today is completely out of tune with the changes that have taken place because of the emergence into freedom of so many countries, in Africa in

particular. Here also he says that things cannot be done in a hurry. I agree I do not expect India should run about the place trying to bring about changes in the Charter and that sort of thing. In this House we have been given particulars about the inadequate representation of even our country in the higher echelons of the UN. According to certain figures which were presented before the UN and reported in the Press, 17 posts of assistant secretary-generals out of a total of 28 are held by representatives of the western bloc—7 by representatives of the US, one by a socialist country's representative and ten by representatives of uncommitted nations. Of the existing 34 posts of directors-general, 28 or 83 per cent belong to the western bloc—14 or 41 per cent are held by the US, 5, by the neutral countries and only one, by a socialist nation, USSR. This kind of imbalance is already there. It is not merely the quantitative imbalance to which I want to draw the attention of the House. The very fact of Shri Dayal's getting into the picture in Congo had brought about a qualitative change in the atmosphere of the UN activities in that part of the country. That shows how the problems in the world cannot be tackled if these problems are to be left to the tender mercies of certain representatives of the free world who happen today to be in a dominant position in the UNO. It is, therefore, very important that, howsoever quietly and modestly it may be necessary for us to move, the move should continue and structural changes in the UN should be sought to be brought about so that the organisation is in conformity with the conditions which prevail in the world today.

The Prime Minister referred for a moment to Portugal and how very outmoded Portugal was. I recall also how Portugal wanted to get into the Security Council but because of a majority of votes she could not oust Italy and that was a kind of a moral

registration of the protest of the majority of the members of the UN against the activities of Portugal. But I was thinking of Goa and I was wondering whether the Indian Government will do something about strengthening its policy in regard to Goa. Only the other day we were told by the Prime Minister himself in answer to a question that there were prisoners in Goa who had been sent to Portugal or perhaps to Portuguese Africa and we could do nothing about it. The Goan patriots themselves feel let down I use the expression deliberately—by the Indian Government whenever they tried to do anything really and truly in order to achieve the objectives of the whole country. I was surprised the other day when the question of Dadra and Nagar Haveli came up and the Prime Minister said that there were some very special reasons why we could not incorporate them into India. They were certain parts of the Portuguese territory on Indian soil where the people themselves have thrown off the Portuguese intruder but they are in a State-less condition and the Prime Minister said that it was a rather interesting experiment of village republic. I hope that we do not have this kind of interesting experiment but we rather go ahead and incorporate that territory, as soon as ever it is possible, with the Indian Union. Perhaps in Angola and Mozambique and such areas in Africa, Portugal would not have a very long lease of life and the sooner we get Portugal out of India altogether, the better for all concerned.

I wish also that the Prime Minister had made at least one mention of Algeria about which—about the liberation struggle—he has expressed himself very sympathetically. He has expressed himself in other places in regard to a negotiated settlement for the freedom of the Algerian people. If the UN can come into the picture and really under the UN auspices, and not under the western power auspices, they can have a kind of referendum,

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

perhaps there may be a settlement with the Algerians. If the French Government want serious negotiations with the Algerian Government, perhaps even at this late stage, it may bring about an improvement in the situation.

I learn that already 20 countries have recognised the provisional free Government of Algeria headed by Fernand Abbas. I do not see why we should not recognise it. The Prime Minister and the whole country have all sympathy for it. I do not see whether there is any diplomatic hurdle or anything else which stands in the way of our giving complete diplomatic recognition to the provisional free Government of Algeria.

Remembering what the Prime Minister said about the fight against colonialism and the fight for freedom, peace and disarmament which has been conducted by India with great splendour in the forum of the UN, I seem to think that it is rather a pity that we cannot now turn our attention to the solution of certain other problems nearer home. I am not speaking in a manner which would suggest blaming anybody but I do feel that now perhaps is the time for a new Bandung atmosphere to be created and perhaps India can play her part in creating that atmosphere over again. The other day, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia speaking at Dum Dum Airport had suggested this idea of a new Bandung. Of course there may be some practical difficulties in the convocation of a conference here and now but I am speaking of the re-evocation of the atmosphere which was brought about in Bandung, five years ago. I was happy when some of our friends here in Parliament were angry with the Prime Minister because somewhere he had spoken and he had used the expression 'controversy' in regard to the troubles which we are having now with China. They were angry that the Prime Minister used a

mild word. I do hope the Prime Minister because he wishes that there should a termination of the kind of unfriendly relationship which exists between our two countries today, because he wishes that there should be a solution of the problems which have arisen between India and China, because that is the unspoken assumption in his mind, because that is the categorical imperative which is always at the back of his mind, he used this expression 'controversy' because he did not want to highlight the disputes which have taken place. We do wish that this dispute which has arisen—controversy, quarrel or conflict or however you wish to put it—should be eliminated as soon as ever that is possible. Burma, Nepal and Indonesia have settled their problems. Given the time and given the goodwill on either side and given the co-operation even from certain people who are now putting hurdles in the way, we might really and truly have a new Bandung. How else are we going to defend the freedom of the ex-colonial peoples in Asia and Africa when they are being confronted with the opposition, with the money, manoeuvres and machinations—the Prime Minister himself used the word 'machinations' which are being employed against them, when they are emerging into freedom? It is very necessary for us now to have that kind of a feeling again; that kind of Afro-Asian solidarity atmosphere. We have got it very largely in practice. It is only a hurdle here or a hurdle there. Sometimes it may take a serious complexion. But given the will, we can go ahead. These serious and fundamental problems—peace, disarmament, colonial freedom—are all linked together. When these problems have to be tackled it is so necessary that we do get back the Bandung spirit. After Bandung we had the Geneva Conference which produced great results in the context of those days, and after the "new Bandung", perhaps, we will have a very different atmosphere in the whole world.

14 hrs.

Shri Nath Pai: Bandung has been given a burial by China in Lhasa, you should know it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know, Sir, that because all over the world liberation is moving ahead at such a pace some people are highly disturbed and therefore new diversionary tactics are needed and that is why the atmosphere has to be muddy, that is why the whole tempo of the world today has to be disturbed, that is why certain passions have to be roused and that is why my hon. friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has given notice of an amendment which is a loud wail of woe at what India did at the United Nations and which wants us, so to speak, to go back upon all our declarations in regard to our objectives in the sphere of foreign policy. Sir, I know these diversionary tactics are necessary for certain people, but I do not think that these diversionary tactics would really pay and I do not think it would be seemly for the Government of India to give any kind of countenance to these diversionary tactics which are being adopted.

I refer to these diversionary tactics particularly because of what happened yesterday. And even today you said when the debate started that some reference might be made in regard to the question of the borders. We have made our position very clear. We surely want a settlement as quick as we can of the India-China dispute. We have declared over and over again that if Indian territory and its integrity is violated then the Communists would be the first of all to jump to the defence of our country (*Interruptions*).

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): Why is there that "if"?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We have said it over and over again. We have been hauled over the coals because of an allegation.

Shri Harish Chandrg Mathur: Are you still in doubt about it?

Seth Govind Das (Jabalpur): Has it not been violated yet? Why are you saying "if"?

Shri Nath Pai: Is it not violation that has taken place?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members must know the views of all hon. Members. If you prevent him how can they know what his views are?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: When the call for defence of the territory of our country comes we shall find out who responds and who does not. But that is a different matter. The emphasis today is on peaceful settlement of whatever disputes there are. That is the policy of this country, that is the policy of the Government of this country, and we stand by that policy. Because we emphasise the idea of a settlement which is in the interests of our two countries, not only of our two countries but of all ex-colonial countries which are fighting for freedom, we are being hauled over the coals. I do not mind being hauled over the coals, but I do mind when propaganda which is mendacious, which has no truth at all is conducted against it.

Sir, I do not wish to go into the details, but yesterday the Prime Minister mentioned three cases. He said he did it unwillingly, it was not his desire to do so and it was not normal either to do so. But I am sorry, if this is the sample of information on the basis of which he has given some kind of support to our friends here who delight in maligning Communists every time they get a chance, then I am very sorry indeed. With regard to those three people, one man had already given a repudiation of the information which apparently has come to Government. The other man, Mr. Krishan Bhatt is a person whose whereabouts at least I through the apparatus with which I am in contact have not been able to identify. There is another case, that of Shri Mazumdar from West Bengal, whom

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

I know very well, with whom also I have not been able so far to get in contact, but about whom I can say with a great deal of confidence that he is not a person likely to say the kind of thing reported about him. There is no doubt that the Prime Minister naturally depends upon Special Branch information. We know how the Special Branch information is collected. If on the basis of this kind of information we get accusations hurled and sought to be answered—very naturally if accusations are hurled they have to be answered—than I am sorry the whole position is so bad that the atmosphere gets unnecessarily disturbed.

I know, Sir, one of the leaders of our party, a former General Secretary, went to Himachal, because he belongs to that area, to address some party meeting. All the local papers reported him correctly. Even some of the right wing papers of Delhi reported him correctly. Only in one Delhi paper the *Hindustan Times* Special Correspondent sent out deliberately propaganda which is so mendacious, reports which were so inaccurate, which never corresponded with reports given by other people. It shows how there is a deliberate propaganda being conducted only in order to distort the picture in our country today, only in order to muddy the waters, as I have said so many times before.

We are all keen upon the security of our borders and I would rather ask the Government instead of worrying about us—if they want to worry about us let them, they are very welcome—let them also take some other steps about security in the borders. Punjab is a border State. There shootings take place even inside the jail and a disturbed atmosphere continues. I do hope Government gives some attention to solution of problems which have cropped up in the Punjab, a territory which being on the border needs a much greater sustenance, a much greater and more careful looking after. Assam is a border State.

As far as the Nagas are concerned, even today the Prime Minister answered certain questions which shows that the war atmosphere continues in some areas of the Naga land. As far as the Brahmaputra Valley is concerned, the ruling party has condoned certain activities which politically and morally are nauseating. We have not settled the problem of Assam at all. I do wish that some attention, some serious thinking is given.

Then, again, as far as our borders are concerned, there is Pakistan. We want friendship with Pakistan. We do not like some of our friends here to get up and say that the Canal Waters Treaty has got to be written off.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Nobody has suggested that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We do not say that sort of thing. We want friendship with the people of Pakistan. But we want at the same time to warn the country that through the Canal Waters Treaty the World Bank, which is the international mechanism of big money interests abroad, is getting a finger in our pie. We want to warn our country that only the other day the CENTO naval manoeuvres took place near Karachi where the United States and U.K. aircraft carriers took part. We heard reports that the headquarters of CENTO might even be transferred to Karachi. We read reports of the Pakistan Finance Minister making a statement that he appealed to the United States of America and he had got an assurance from the party which is going to be in power, the Democratic Party in the United States, that the United States military assistance to Pakistan is going to be stepped up. We know all that. We read about the time bomb speeches in reference to Kashmir made by President Ayub of Pakistan. We read also about India thinking of handing over certain areas to Pakistan even without the slightest reference to the people living there, the 12000 people

of Beru Bari. Sir, I am not going into the merits of the question. Let us be careful really and truly about the condition of our borders. Let us be really and truly aware of what is happening in our neighbouring countries. Let us remember that the biggest fact today, as the Prime Minister very clearly and cogently pointed out, is the successful fight against colonialism, against chauvinism that is going on all over, and because of the resurgence of Africa and Asia there is no force on earth, not even the United States and U.K. if they are given strength a million fold, which will be in a position to defeat this upsurge of people all over the world. That being the context of things, it is very necessary for us to have a proper perspective. That is why I say that India has done a grand job of work in the United Nations. India has put up her case for peace, for disarmament, for anti-colonialism and all that it implies. India shall go ahead and ought to go ahead now much further with greater élan, with greater spirit, and try to have back a new Bandung atmosphere so that, as in 1955, so again in 1960 or 1961, we can move with such strides that the whole world would soon be a world without war, a world of freedom, a world where the kind of spectre which haunts the peoples,—because of armaments continuing at the rate at which they do today,—is no longer there, a world for which our people have fought for their freedom, a world which we want to achieve as soon as we ever can for our children and our children's children. To that task, India has made a very large contribution. May that contribution be enlarged; may we have a more realistic approach and may we do all we can which will really and truly bring about Afro-Asian solidarity as an instrument for changing the history of the world in the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker: I will call only one of the hon. Members and not both Shri Nath Pai and Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.

Shri Nath Pai: Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we welcome this opportunity to discuss matters about the United Nations in the course of the debate on international affairs today. The issues before the United Nations, as the Prime Minister has indicated, are not national but they affect the world problems. Therefore, we thought it would not be proper for us to move any amendments whatsoever and that let us, first of all, discuss the issues and say what we, the different sections of the country, feel about them.

I am glad that you also were pleased to remark that while discussing this, we should make a reference to the Sino-Indian problem, which is assuming—

Mr. Speaker: I did not say you should make a reference.

Shri Nath Pai: But we could.

Mr. Speaker: You could.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: This is the first opportunity for us after the presentation of the 4th White Paper, to refer to them. Therefore, I think before I come to the United Nations I should make a reference about the serious problems in regard to those issues. Although the Prime Minister, when questions were put to him about the air space violations, rejected the points by saying that such space incursions are petty, I am happy that in the White Paper it has been repeatedly stated that such incidents could easily result in grave consequences. These are the words given in the White Paper. I feel that the present talks which are going on between the two official teams in Rangoon would result in nothing. There are as many as 101 cases of air-space violations pointed out in the

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

White Paper, but what has been the reply of the Chinese Premier? He has not admitted even one single case where dates and other particulars have been given, but rather counter-charges have been levelled against us. I feel that the Chinese are working after a new strategy. It was apprehended from the very beginning that they were only biding time and that when they were in a vantage position, they would certainly start aggression. They have now concluded treaties with Burma and Nepal. Practically they have isolated us from our neighbours and now persistent propaganda is going on which is very evident from the recent interview given by Mr. Chou En-lai to the British Journalist, namely, if the Government of India has been as considerate and peace-minded as Burma and Nepal, probably the problem of China and India would also have been settled.

I would like this House to remember that there is a very sinister desire in this propaganda. Mr. Chou En-lai wants to make a distinction between the people of India and the Government of India in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister in this country, despite the opposition of the people, has gone out of his way to talk to Mr. Chou En-lai on matters for which probably there was no necessity at all. What is the tribute he has paid—I mean Mr. Chou En-lai? He has said that the Government of India is not willing, and he says:

"We are confident that the Indian people like the Chinese people hope that the boundary question between the two countries will be speedily settled".

We repudiate this suggestion. This is a propaganda with which we are familiar. Here is our hon. friend who was just now speaking about the hurdles—that some people are putting hurdles on settlement. Here, what he said coincides with the very words which the Chinese Premier used. The hon. Member said that the people desire a settlement but that certain people

were putting hurdles! I do not know, whether he meant the same way as the Chinese Premier. Sir, according to Chou En-lai the hurdle is the Government of India.

It has been pointed out in this House several times—and it was brought specifically yesterday when the Prime Minister had made the point and had agreed and admitted—that in the border areas a serious, critical situation is developing. The sabotage activity is increasing. Some of us who visited the border areas know how uncertain the people feel about it and how unpatriotic activity is going on in those parts of the country. There is the anti-Government feeling—although we are against the Government, that is in a particular context—and that feeling has been created to show that if the Chinese come in, if the Chinese occupy some parts, then things would be much better than what they are today. I want that these activities should be curbed as soon as possible if this country is not going to face serious dangers ahead.

I am glad that the Prime Minister said that they are contemplating a law. It was also announced in the press sometime back. I feel that the sooner it is done the better for the country.

At the same time, I would also emphasise that the border development activities should be given top priority. I would also urge on the Prime Minister that he should use his good offices to see that in the border countries such as Sikkim, good relationship exists between the people and the Government. I am told that the Yuvaraja of Sikkim is likely to visit this country some days afterwards to discuss the development programmes and our economic aid. We should help them in all possible manner as we have been helping, but I would urge upon the Prime Minister to impress upon the Yuvaraja that unless some popular administration with responsible Government, which is the

unanimous demand of the people and the political parties of Sikkim, is established, probably a settlement in that country would be remote. I urge on him to realise that this is also an important problem and we should see that the such dissatisfaction in our border areas are removed and a congenial atmosphere is brought about.

Then I come to the United Nations. My task has been made somewhat easier, because some aspects have also been referred to by the Prime Minister. I need not, for instance, refer in great detail to Congo, because practically more than half of the speech of the Prime Minister was devoted to Congo. I am also not going to refer in my speech to larger problems such as disarmament, control of nuclear weapons, colonialism, etc., with which probably there is not much disagreement. We are yet to hear the Defence Minister because the Prime Minister has left that part of disarmament to the Defence Minister.

But before I touch upon the most important problem which, according to me, is the structure of the United Nations, I am sorry that the Government of India has not yet made up its mind, as I shall presently show, as to how, when positive proposals have come, they have taken a different attitude altogether; we really should attach great importance to the present structure of the United Nations.

The recent session of the United Nations was more or less a summit session. We heard the Prime Minister telling us that he was rather hesitant before he went there, and then we heard him saying that on his return he was very greatly disappointed. The papers reported that he was sad, but today, I am glad that he says—after second thoughts—that he was glad that he went, because it assumed the character of a summit conference, so to say. Not only that. The whole atmosphere was somewhat influenced by the pre-election situation in the U.S.A. There is no doubt that when so many heads of States and Prime Ministers were there, it was an opportunity to exchange our

thoughts, especially in view of the presence of the newly independent countries from Africa.

We find very good trends in this session. One of them is that the Afro-Asian bloc, which has so long been ignored in international politics, has come out as a focus point. They speak almost collectively with one voice, independent of the two power blocs. This is a very hopeful trend for the future of the world. At the same time, the Prime Minister has rightly said that we were mocked at and laughed at for our non-alignment policy. But this Session shows that the policy of non-alignment is being increasingly felt to be best instrument perhaps and those who adhere to this policy would play a very important role in easing world tensions. That was evident from the expectations that the different countries of the world had of our Prime Minister when he visited USA. We find newspaper articles admiring our Prime Minister, his great qualities, etc.

I am of the opinion that the resolution that the Prime Minister moved on behalf of the five nations was rather ill-timed. It was conceived more out of optimism than out of realism and it received the fate that was expected of it. I do not think anybody would have had the illusion that such a resolution would be accepted. Even the Prime Minister in the course of his dinner speeches here and there had to explain that he did not expect that much could happen, and yet the resolution was moved. Necessarily it received the fate that it had to receive. But I think it was ill-timed, mis-timed and misconceived. So, it ended there, but it left a chain of reactions in the world as well as some impressions on other countries.

I would say a word about Congo. Congo is still a problem. It baffles solution. In spite of the efforts that are being made by the UN, new forces are raising their heads in Congo. The Parliament has been suppressed and the Head of the State is not also being listened to, although in the report that

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

Shri Rajeshwar Dayal has submitted, he has specifically stated that the Chief of State and Parliament should be preserved. In spite of the suppression of the Parliament, no alternative political power is emerging in the country, which would be acceptable to the country or be able to bring about stability. Therefore, it is evident that the role played by the UN is remarkable and when we supported the efforts of the UN, we did the right thing. Even Mr. Lumumba, who was so much opposed to UN and the Secretary-General has now come forward with a statement defending the Secretary-General and the UN.

I also want to join with the other Members of this House in paying our tribute not only to Shri Dayal, but to all officers and men who have played such a glorious part, having a moderating influence in the affairs of the Congo. I want that our Government should make it clear that we have no truck with powers that might try to subvert the efforts of the UN in Congo.

Before I come to the structure of the United Nations, I cannot but refer to the proposals put forward by the Soviet Premier. We did not hear anything from the Prime Minister about it. Of course when he was going to the UN and in the course of interviews, the Prime Minister consistently expressed his disagreement with the views expressed by the Soviet Premier, but what is the alternative? He has not yet thought over the matter. He says, "Precisely we have not thought about it". But I feel that the move of the Soviet Premier, in the guise of re-organisation, was actually to weaken the United Nations. His grouse against the Secretary-General appears to be motivated on account of the fact that Soviet Russia wanted to enter into Africa. The cold war was being introduced into Africa through Congo. They tried, but their attempt was foiled on account of the bold stand that the UN took.

The Prime Minister has said that the proposal made by Mr. Khrushchev is impracticable. I would say, it is dangerous. He was trying to introduce tension into the executives of the UN by proposing that there will be three representatives of three blocs. He was practically trying to perpetuate the three blocs—imperialists, communists and neutralists—which has very dangerous repercussions. I am glad that this move did not get much support.

This is not the first occasion when attacks have been made against the UN. The big powers have attacked the UN whenever it goes against them or it clashes with their interests. The UN is obviously meant for weaker and smaller nations. I shall cite some instances where the UN has been attacked not only by the communists, but also by other blocs. In 1952-54, South Africa withdrew from the UN because of condemnation of racial discrimination. In 1956, Russia took an attitude on account of the Hungarian uprising. Other instances are the Anglo-French attitude in 1956 during the Suez crisis and the French attitude in 1958 when the Algerian question was taken up. In 1960, when the question of Cuba came up and Russia wanted a discussion, America tried to prevent a discussion on Cuba. This has been done by the big powers; whenever it comes into clash with their self-interests, we hear voices of protest. When Tibet and other matters come up, the communist world shouts against. These are voices of vested interests who do not want that the real problems affecting the world and humanity should come before the international organisation.

Therefore, it is desirable that more and more of peace-loving peoples in this world should come together to strengthen the United Nations. I do not mean thereby that no structural change is needed. It is needed. If the United Nations does not reflect the

aspirations, if it does not give appropriate places to the new independent nations which have come up, then the United Nations would cease to be a body reflecting the entire world. Therefore it is highly necessary and desirable that the United Nations reorganisation should take place as early as possible. I may tell you, Sir, in all humility, that the Socialist Party (P. S. P. now) since 1947, has been advocating the universalisation of the United Nations membership; in spite of our attitude towards China we have advocated the admission of China. Even today we feel that if China is admitted the right thing would be done. But I would say that not only China but other countries also should come in, problems affecting Germany and other countries should be settled. The membership of Mongolia has been advocated. People advocating the membership of Mongolia should also advocate the inclusion of Tibet as an independent nation in the United Nations.

Sir, while we talk of reorganisation, the question of veto comes in. The power of veto is perpetuating the division between the small nations and big nations. We are no longer a small nation? Which is the big nation today? Therefore, the power of veto must go and there should be equitable distribution of seats among the different countries in the United Nations.

I will now take up the question of the Security Council. I am glad the Defence Minister is present here and if I am wrong he will correct me. The Security Council today has practically no representation from Africa and Asia; these countries are excluded. There are places for six non-permanent countries on it. Even that representation is not properly distributed. I understand—as I said I would like to be corrected, if I am wrong—there was a proposal in this session brought forward by 30 nations of Afro-Asian Group that the strength of the Security Council should be increased from eleven to thirteen not only the Security Council but the

strength of the Economic and Social Council should be increased from eighteen to twenty-four. We find from the deliberations that have appeared in the papers that India opposed it. India not only opposed it, but the leader of the Indian Delegation, Mr. Krishna Menon, is reported to have said while opposing this that "it will not serve any purpose other than strain the cold war further". I do not know, when we want more representation of new countries, when there was a positive suggestion, why we should oppose it, even if we were not in a position to make up our mind to lend our support to the proposal. But at the same time India seems to have been a party to another proposal requesting the Big Powers to find a satisfactory solution to enlarge the scope of the UN organisations. After all, whether this resolution or the other resolution had been adopted, before it is implemented, it must receive the support of the big nations. So, I would like that this point should be clarified as to why we did not support this proposal. The Security Council is today dominated by a few big powers. These are the few suggestions that I want to make for the re-organisation of the United Nations.

There is also another aspect to which I would like to draw the attention of the House, that is, economic aid. More and more developing countries are dependent on foreign aid and there is a suspicion that foreign influence is likely to spread over these countries through these aids. We have seen Congo: how taking advantage of its backwardness, the cold war was going to be introduced, and how both sides wanted to enter Africa through Congo and to influence it. We are glad that the United Nations today is not only playing a political role, but economic aid also is given; crores of rupees are being spent for the development of the country. This is a good thing. A new feature of the United Nations has emerged. How effective it is has been proved in the case of Congo. This I

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

feel, is a very favourable trend and I would suggest that we should move the United Nations. Different countries are having trade treaties, and economic aid treaties independently with affluent countries. Let us have a resolution by which all these economic aids should be pooled and made to flow through the agency of the United Nations. This is a suggestion which was made by the Asian Socialist Conference as early as 1953. I think the time has come when the Government of India should press the United Nations and see that all concerned accept this, especially in view of the trend in some of the continents to have their own markets, European, this and that. These are a few points about reorganisation. But two things I want to mention before I conclude.

One is about Tibet. We are happy that Tibet has been included in the agenda. But at the same time we are not only unhappy, but we are surprised that the Indian Delegation.....

Acharya Kripalani: Why are you surprised?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Acharya Kripalani asks why I am surprised—probably he is right. It has been their policy; so there is no need for surprise. Sir, the Indian Delegation has not only refused to give support, but has abstained in this matter; in 1959 as well as on September 22, 1960, when this subject, came up, they did not support it. Sir, I do not think that reflected the wishes of our people when they do that. We should renounce our policy of abandonment of Tibet. That is the first necessity. Tibet has every right to self-determination. I would also point out: let India not be blamed in future for actions like this, that when the question of suppression of humanity and suppression of national freedom came, India remained indifferent. I would like that this point should be considered more seriously.

The Prime Minister explained—it has been a habit with the Leader of

our Delegation to bring forward the admission of China day in and day out—why this time we did not take initiative. The only explanation that he offered was the aggression of China and there is a feeling among the people of India against China. The people of India feel many things more. They feel that aggression should be vacated. He said that there is a feeling among the people of India that we should not initiate the admission of China in the United Nations. To respect that, the Prime Minister says, they only supported the resolution moved by others. I think the same policy should be applied in regard to the question of Tibet. Here we have not initiated it. We may think that no purpose would be served by bringing this matter before U.N. Other countries have brought it. People in this country desire that the question of suppression of humanity in Tibet should be taken up in the United Nations Assembly. Therefore, I would suggest that in order to respect the wishes of the people we should also give our support to Tibet.

Before I conclude, I only want to say a word about the leadership and composition of our delegation.

An Hon. Member: It is a preserve of the Congress.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Not only Congress members but some officials are also in it. This is a problem to which, I think the time has come when some attention should be paid, and Parliament should be given an opportunity to discuss it. I do not know on what basis the members are selected. We know that in Shri Menon we have a person who has very wide contact in the international field. He has also long experience of international affairs and his ability is also recognized. But one thing has got to be remembered. The importance of the United Nations, specially of the Indian delegation, is increasing day by day. So, the delegation should be such as would reflect the real policy

of the country which our Prime Minister is advocating. The high expectations that the people had on our Prime Minister in the United Nations have proved that people attach very great importance to what India says. Unfortunately, with Shri Menon, because of certain peculiar undertones, India is sometimes put in a very embarrassing position.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Fatehpur):
Question.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Only one question?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has come to be recognised in a large part of the world as having sympathy for a particular bloc. In view of this, it is time that India gives serious thought not only to the composition but also to the leadership of the Indian delegation to the United Nations, if India hopes to play that great role which people all the world over expect of us.

Shri D. C. Sharma: It was an amazing spectacle to hear a member of this House supporting the policies of our Government, the foreign policy of our Government, because it is like the declared foreign policy of some other country. It was very strange that our policy with regard to disarmament, colonialism, peace of the world and other matters should have been found to be unexceptionable simply because that policy was in consonance with the policy of a country, whose name I do not want to mention. I believe this is a case of unfairness to the policy of our country. It is not doing the right kind of justice to the policy of our country. I believe the foreign policy of our country can stand in its own right. The foreign policy of our country has been adjudged good not only in the chancelleries of the world, not only in the newspapers of the world but also by millions of people all over the world. It is true that sometimes we may agree with one particular bloc of countries and sometimes we may agree with another particular bloc of countries, but there

is no doubt about it that our foreign policy has been characterised by integrity of thinking and integrity of feeling; our foreign policy has been characterised by something that is unique, because we have not tried to shape our foreign policy in the image of this country or that country, in the image of this bloc or that bloc. Therefore, to say that this policy is of good only because it is in consonance with the policy of some other country is to do a great deal of injustice to our country.

I think that something has been said about the delegation and its leader. Since the leader is here, I think he is in a better position to give reply to the arguments that have been put forward.

I must say that our Prime Minister's visit to New York was one of the most befitting things that has happened during the current session of the General Assembly. It is not only something of which India could be proud it has given some hope to the democratic forces of the world. It was something which made millions of people all over the world feel that there was one voice which was the right kind of voice, one voice which was forceful and which was vocal on all those matters on which people of the world are working. Those who have read the speech of the Prime Minister will bear out the fact that he was able to announce a clear and unequivocal policy on all those problems which are bedevilling the world at this time. I believe that it is a good thing that he said that the first thing should come first. He was very right when he emphasized that the world at this time needs disarmament and peace. I must say that the resolution which was put forward by 20 nations and which was sponsored by the leader of the Indian delegation was a step in the right direction. It was a step which made a constructive approach to the problem of peace.

I am very sorry that the resolution which was sponsored by the five uncommitted nations—Ghana, India,

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

Indonesia, UAR and Yugoslavia—and which was put forward by our Prime Minister was not accepted. An attempt was made to whittle it down, something was done to take away from it the operative part. It was said in the press that all this was done because they wanted to show that our Prime Minister's was not the authentic voice of the free world. I am not using the word "free world" in the sense in which some of my friends use it. It was done from that viewpoint. I am sorry to say that the turning down of that resolution, the whittling down of that resolution, showed the inherent weakness of the United Nations. It was a very sad commentary on the way in which the United Nations functions. It was a very sad commentary on the way in which some of the big powers have been functioning in the world. It is because of this that people feel that the United Nations has become a playground for all those vested interests which want to keep the leadership of the United Nations in their hands, today, tomorrow and for all time to come. But I believe that the world is marching very fast, new forces are coming into being, new countries are attaining independence, new ideas are taking shape in this world and the day is not far off when the leadership will be snatched away from the hands of those who speak for vested interests and when the leadership will come to those who give expression to right causes, irrespective of the frowns and favours of anybody.

I think the part that our Prime Minister played in the United Nations was a part which will be judged not by the temporary standards which are worthy today but will be judged by the standards which will be abiding for all time to come. I believe that his voice will be historic. It was an epoch-making speech and I believe that speech gives us the real characteristics of the United Nations. What the United Nations at present is was clearly expressed by our Prime Minister at that time and I am happy that

even though in some of the chancelleries of the world that speech was not liked, it has been liked by millions of people all over the world.

14:50 hrs.

The big problem that faces the world today is the problem of disarmament. We have seen the resolution which has been put forward by UK and other countries. That is a very detailed resolution. I feel that disarmament cannot be done by means of resolutions which are generalised. Disarmament has to be tackled in a spirit which is realistic and practical. There has to be a kind of gradualism in the handling of the disarmament problem. I shall refer to the resolution which was passed by the All-India Congress Committee at its session held at Raipur. I believe the lead that the All-India Congress Committee gave in that resolution is the correct kind of lead. There should be disarmament but it should be characterised by balance. No power should get the better of the other power when the disarmament plan is going on. There should also be control so far as disarmament goes. There should also be inspection, though there are voices raised against inspection, because unless there is inspection the power of the nations cannot be measured in the right way and in the right proportion.

I am also glad that India has proposed a resolution on disarmament. Though it has been described by some powers to be very imprecise or very inexact, I believe that that resolution goes quite far and will try to put an end to the cold war that is going on in this world.

When I think of Africa, I feel very happy because so many countries of that continent have come to a state of nationhood, though one cannot deny that there is a lot of trouble going on in the Congo. I do not want to go into the details of that trouble. It is a kind of cockpit of tribal warfare. It is

a kind of playground for rival ambitions. It is also a kind of field where the countries of the world are having their field day. All that is there and it is very unfortunate. But we do not think of Congo in terms of powers or vested interests or imperialism. We think of Congo essentially in terms of the people of Congo. We want that we should pursue such policies as can bring peace to that tormented country and happiness to the harassed people of that country. That is what we should want. I am very glad that a countryman of mine is playing a very admirable part in that country. I do not want to add to what the hon. Prime Minister has said about him, but I believe that he is doing a job which is important not only for my country and for Congo but for the whole of the world. If there is peace in Congo, that peace will spread. As the war spirit spreads automatically, so the peace spirit also spreads. I hope that something will be done about that also.

I think of another country, Algeria. I am very sorry to say that the Fifth Republic has not been able to solve the problem of Algeria. The hopes that were held out about the settlement of this country have been belied. There have been no negotiations. There were at one time some negotiations, but they came to nothing. I do not want to say what the Algerian people thought of those negotiations. I believe that the Algerian people should be given the right of self-determination. That right of self-determination should be supervised by a referendum or whatever it is—by an agency of the UN.

It may be said that it is interference in the internal affairs of a country. But I do not think it is like that. Algeria is becoming a world problem. As has been stated just now, 20 countries of the world have recognised the provisional Algerian Government. They do not call it provisional. They call it the right Government. Therefore I believe that the Algerian problem is going to be a very big problem. Now

also it is a big problem and I think the statesmanship of De Gaulle will rise to the occasion and will give the Algerian people peace, freedom and happiness for which they have been fighting all these years.

I do not want to say anything about Portugal. Portugal's colonialism is the darkest spot in the history of colonialism of the world. Portugal still thrives on slavery. It still thrives on slave labour. It does not only do that, Portugal sometimes exports slave labour to other countries in the fashion in which it was done a hundred years ago or more than a hundred years ago. I, therefore, think that Portugal is a country which cannot be called a country in any modern sense of the world. I believe that the people a Portugal have been kept under a kind of martial law all these years and they are not allowed to speak out their mind. Therefore something should be done to liquidate this Portuguese colonialism from the world as something is being done to put an end to the colonial policy of other countries.

Now I want to say something about the structure of the UN. I do not know what the hon. Member who preceded me was saying, but I can say one thing. UN is a very very big organisation. It represents 90 countries of the world. Therefore whatever is done there has its repercussions not only in one particular part of the world but all over the world. It touches the globe at so many points. Therefore though there is a need for the amendment of the Charter, it has to be done in a very cautious way. If the Charter is amended in a precipitate way, I think more trouble may come after the amendment of the Charter than with the Charter as it exists today. But there is no doubt about the fact that the composition of the Security Council should be amended in some way. The Security Council is the main spring of the United Nations. The Security Council represents forces which were very good some years ago when the U.N. came

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

into being. Some of these forces have weakened; others forces have also come into existence. Therefore, the Security Council is not a reflection of the condition of the world as it is today. At the same time, as our leader said earlier, India might get a chance in about 35 years. Because, India is a member of the Commonwealth bloc and if representation goes that way, it may take 35 years for India to get a place in the Security Council. I am not speaking in terms of only our representation in the Security Council. But, the Security Council should have representation of the un-committed nations also and these un-committed nations should have their authentic voice there. It is no use making the Security Council a kind of arena where one bloc works against another bloc, where one bloc is placed against another bloc. Therefore, the Security Council should become a real force for peace in the world. That can only be done if due weight is given to those countries also which are described as un-committed.

15 hrs.

There is one word which I want to say about South Africa. South Africa has been a strange country all these years. South Africa has declared itself a republic. That Republic represents only a very very small part of the population of that country. The coloured people are not there. The other people are not there. Only a small minority of the people has been given the right to vote so far as the Republic is concerned. But, I do not want to quarrel with South Africa on that score. Every country can choose its own Government. But, if the U.N. wants to justify its existence, if all the delegations that go there and make very brave speeches are to be justified, if all the Heads of the Governments of all those countries that go there and try to mould the destinies of nations and countries are to be justified, I believe, racialism in South Africa, against which you find a voice in every part of the world, must be

eliminated. Unless that is done, I think the U.N. does not live up to the expectations of the people.

I would say that the visit of our Prime Minister to New York and his great speech there are very very memorable things that have happened in the history of the United Nations. I do not want to be extra-optimistic. But, I do say and I believe it—I am not saying this because I am a member of the Congress party;—I do believe in it sincerely—that if the composition of the U.N. is cast in the mould to which the Prime Minister referred in his speech, I think the U.N. will have justified its existence and it will become a real force for peace, freedom and happiness of mankind.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Gohokar. He has not spoken at all.

Dr. Gohokar (Yeotmal): I thank you very much, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak on this. We have been discussing this problem in this Parliament for the last two hours. I would like to add a few points. The last session of the U. N. General Assembly has been very important because most of the Heads of different countries have attended this Session and naturally, it has tried to solve many problems which are of international importance. In my opinion, the two most important problems were, (i) Africa and (ii) disarmament. The African problem is most important because of certain peculiar problems existing in the present context in Africa. We know that the Congo question has figured very much in the discussion in the U.N. So also the Algerian question has occupied an important place in the discussions there. First, I would like to discuss the Congo question.

Before dealing with this question, I would like to give a short history of the Congo question. Congo by area is quite a big country. Probably many of us do not know that it has got a size equal to three-fourths of India and

it is one of the most future-promising countries in the world. As regards its potential power, if it goes by population, it may suffer, but so far as mineral wealth and its natural resources are concerned, it will be considered as the most important country in the world in future.

Then, I would like to describe why the Belgians have behaved in this way because if we heard one side of the case, we must also know the other side, the Belgians' case also. As compared with other colonial powers, the Belgians decided to give independence to Congo very quickly. Because the independence movement in Congo started only 3 or 4 years back, in 1956. Within four years, they decided to vacate it. It is not an ordinary thing for a colonial power to vacate the country that they ruled for such a long time. When they started the independence movement in 1956, by 1957, Mr. Patrice Lumumba, the present Prime Minister, was put in jail. After he was put in jail, the national movement took a very speedy turn. The result of it was, they held a conference at Brussels. The nationalist leaders from Congo and the Government of Belgium sat around a Table and decided to give independence to Congo on 30th June, 1960.

I would like to say that Belgium was very honest in giving them freedom. But, at the same time, they had made an agreement that economic assistance and assistance for development of Congo would also be given. By this agreement, they expected that they would be allowed to stay on there. That means, that the economic interests which they had created in this country would be allowed to go on. This country, as I said, is one of the richest in the world in mineral wealth. There is in the south of this country the very rich mineral province by name Katanga which is the richest part of the world in mineral wealth. It produces 70 per cent of cobalt, and more than 50 per cent. of uranium, 9/10 of industrial Diamonds and about 10 per cent of copper of world produc-

tion. It stands fourth in the world in copper production. It also stands first in hydro-electric power potential. We can see how important this part of the world is. Naturally, two-thirds of the national income of Congo comes from this particular Katanga province. Naturally, the Belgians do not want to give up their interests. Even though they wanted to give independence, under the agreement, they thought that they would be allowed to continue there. But, the policy of Mr. Patrice Lumumba was showing leanings towards the leftist side. So, they were afraid of him. They had started evacuation, but later on, when there was trouble, looting etc., in Leopoldville, the capital of Congo, the Belgians thought their nationals were in danger and so Belgian troops were flown to Leopoldville to protect them.

At the same time, Katanga's President, Mr. Tchombe, was not very much pleased with the policy of Mr. Lumumba. At the time of forming the Government, Mr. Tchombe had asked for three key Ministries to be given to his Konakat Party, but this was refused by Mr. Lumumba, and Congo's Commissioner was sent to Elisabethville, capital of Katanga. He was a rival of Mr. Tchombe. All this infuriated Mr. Tchombe. Pressure from the Belgians who had economic interests in Katanga became more and more as the situation deteriorated, with the result that Katanga seceded from Congo. Mr. Lumumba's position was also becoming unstable, and so he sent an appeal to the UN on 12th July. Accordingly, the UN sent Tunisian troops on July 15th, followed by other troops. The UN responded to the call of the Congo at a very early stage, but for which the situation might have deteriorated further.

Meanwhile, Col. Mobutu came on the scene. He accomplished a military coup and declared that Mr. Lumumba had no power to rule in the country. Though he declared he would not listen to President Kasavubu or Prime Minister Lumumba, he was really against Mr. Lumumba, and Mr. Lumumba was in great difficulty. Col.

[Dr. Gohokar].

Mobutu tried to arrest him, but because of U.N. troops there, he could not succeed.

When this question was debated in the UN in the present session, the UN decided to send a conciliation commission to look into the matter, bring the rival parties together and find out a solution. This commission is to meet in Leopoldville on 26th November. President Kasavubu has already declared that it would be very difficult for the Commission to work in the Congo. He has already shown his hostility towards the Commission.

In my opinion, the situation in the Congo has deteriorated because of foreign intervention and lack of experience among the poor Congolese politicians. If there had been no foreign intervention, the situation there would have been much better.

Mr. Lumumba has suggested that a referendum should be taken, but in my opinion, a referendum or any sort of election at present when the situation is so dangerous should not be held. The elected members of Parliament should be allowed to choose new leaders if they do not want their present leaders.

Next, I come to disarmament which was the main topic in the UN General Assembly. In this century we have seen two world wars. After the first World War, the League of Nations came into existence to maintain peace, but it failed. Then the United Nations Organisation came, but this also did not inspire confidence, and the countries of the world did not feel safe without strengthening their defences. This is how the armaments race started. They started suspecting the motives of each other. Last summer there was a Ten Power meeting in Geneva—five Powers from the Russian bloc and five from the Western bloc—but they could not agree on the timing and control measures relating to disarmament. This session, when Mr.

Khrushchev saw that this question was discussed so vehemently in the UN, he suggested that a special session be held next spring. Some of the uncommitted nations also supported this idea, but it was not successful. India tabled a resolution, which has been discussed by hon. Members before me. So, I shall not take time on it. There was a suggestion from Russia that besides the Ten Powers, five members from the uncommitted bloc should also be included, and the new committee should discuss this disarmament problem. Another proposal was put forward by our Defence Minister, known as the Eleven Nation Disarmament Plan. It proposed that East and West should shed their fears and suspicions and resume negotiations for a general and complete disarmament. The Russian delegagte, Mr. Zorin, appreciated this proposal but said that unless the United States agreed to discuss universal disarmament, he would not be able to take part in the discussion.

The other question discussed in the Assembly was about change in the UN structure. There were also the questions of Algeria and colonialism. About the UN structure I may say that when the organisation came into existence, many of the uncommitted countries were not its members. They have since become members. Though they have become members, they are not adequately represented in the different important organs of the UN. So, we feel that some type of change should be made in the Charter, so that the uncommitted countries could get some chance to represent their grievances in the United Nations.

श्री बाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हमने दोनों शक्ति गुटों से अलग रहने और प्रत्येक प्रश्न पर उस के गुणावगुण की दृष्टि से विचार करने का निर्णय किया है। यह नीति न केवल हमारे हित में है किन्तु विश्व की दृष्टि से भी

यह नीति सही है और हमें दृढ़ता के साथ उसका पालन करना चाहिये । लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि नानएलाइनमेंट की नीति का एक परिचायक यह भी है कि नानइन्वाल्वमेंट की नीति का पालन करें । दुनिया के ऐसे झगड़ों में जिनके साथ हमारा सीधा सम्बन्ध नहीं है, हम अपने को अलग रखने की कोशिश करें । हमारी इच्छायें कितनी भी अच्छी हों, किन्तु शक्ति गटों में बँठ कर दुनिया में केवल ईमानदारी से भरी हुई छाँव के आधार पर हम नहीं चल सकते । मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी को ४ अक्टूबर को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की महासभा में भाषण करते सुना । मुझे उनका भाषण सुन कर अतन्द्रित हुआ और अभिमान भी । शीत युद्ध के थपेड़ों के अन्दर उनकी आवाज, जो दिल से निकली और सुनने वालों के दिलों पर धर करती चली गई, शान्ति की आवाज थी, शस्त्रों की झंकार के बीच विवेक और संयम की आवाज थी । उनके मुँह से मानो भारत की आत्मा बोली और उनके भाषण में मुझे पुराने हिन्दू ऋषियों की शान्ति की उपासना की झलक दिखाई दी । विरोधी दल में होते हुये भी मैं यह बातें कहता हूँ, यद्यपि उनके भाषण की बहुत सी बातों से मेरा मतभेद है, और उस मतभेद को मैं आपके सामने रखूँगा ।

अच्छा होता अगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की न्यूयार्क यात्रा उस भाषण के बाद समाप्त हो जाती और फिर हम ऐसे मामलों में न फँसते जिन मामलों का निर्णय हमारे हाथ में नहीं है, और जिनमें फँसने से हम बुराई के अलावा और कुछ प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते । हम कांगो का उदाहरण लें । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बड़े रचनात्मक सुझाव दिये । लोकतन्त्र में उनका विश्वास है । भारत एक संसदीय लोकतंत्रवादी देश है । उन्होंने कहा कि कांगो में यूनाइटेड नेशन्स को चाहिये कि वहाँ की पार्लियामेंट को काम करने में सहायता दें । लेकिन इसके मार्ग में जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं उनका निराकरण कैसे

होगा ? क्या यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की फौज कर्नल मोबूतू की फौजों से लड़ेगी ? क्या हम कांगो के आन्तरिक युद्ध में भाग लेंगे ? क्या कांगो में शान्ति और व्यवस्था बनाये रखने का दायित्व संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ लेगा ? अनेक देशों में पार्लियामेंट को भंग कर सैनिक तानाशाही की स्थापना हो गई । यह ठीक है कि कांगो की स्थिति भिन्न है, मगर हम कहाँ तक जायेंगे, इस बात का हमें विचार करना चाहिये । हमारे जो अधिकारी कांगो में गये हैं, श्री राजेश्वरदयाल और । गडियर रि ।, व बड़ा अच्छा काम कर रहे हैं, मगर कांगो की स्थिति ऐसी है कि उसमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ भी फँस गया है और उसके साथ हम भी फँस गये । वहाँ बल्जियम, जिस के पर उखड़ गये थे, फिर वापस आना चाहता है । कम्प्यूनिस्ट देश भी कांगो के बहाने से अफ्रीका की उपजाऊ भूमि को अपने लिये ठीक समझ कर वहाँ प्रवेश करना चाहता है, और अमरीका बल्जियम का समर्थन करके कांगो में पजीवाद को बनाये रखने में मदद दे रहा, है क्योंकि स्वयं कांगो की जनता एकत्रित नहीं है संगठित नहीं है, प्रधान मंत्री और प्रेजिडेंट आपस में लड़ते हैं । इस पहली का सफल सुलभ हम कैसे करेंगे मेरा निवेदन है कि हमें इस प्रकार के प्रश्नों से अलग रहना चाहिये । मैं जानता हूँ कि यह हमारे लिये बहुत कठिन है क्योंकि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में जो अफ्रीका के नये देश आये हैं वे नेतृत्व के लिये हमारी ओर देखते हैं । और भारत असम्बद्ध राष्ट्रों का नेतृत्व करे यह हमारे लिये भी बड़े गौरव बात होगी, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह नेतृत्व हमारे लिये प्रिय भले ही हो मगर श्रेय नहीं हो सकता । उससे हमारा अहम भले ही तुष्ट हो जाये लेकिन वह भारत के हित में नहीं होगा, और मुझ प्रधान मंत्री जी के मुँह से यह सुन कर सन्तोष हुआ कि हम कोई तीसरा गुट बनाना नहीं चाहते हैं । जब तक कि हमारी नीति गुटबन्दी के खिलाफ है हम तीसरा गुट कैसे बना सकते हैं ? भले ही वह गुट ऐसे राष्ट्रों का हो जो किसी

[श्री व.जपेयी]

राष्ट्र से जुड़े हुये न हों। लेकिन जो राष्ट्र जुड़े हुये नहीं हैं वे हमारी तरफ देखते हैं और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी उनके स्वाभाविक नेता बन गये। पांच राष्ट्रों की ओर से पूर्वी और पश्चिमी नेताओं को मिलाने के लिये जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया था यद्यपि वह रक्खा तो पांच राष्ट्रों ने था, मगर यूगोस्लाविया के राष्ट्रपति चले गये और प्रजिडेंट नासिर भी न्यूयार्क से विदा हो गये और अपने बच्चे को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की गोद में छोड़ गये। वह प्रस्ताव जिस स्थिति में रक्खा गया था, मैं नहीं समझता कि वह ठीक था। रूस और अमरीका के नेता मिलें, यह हमारी इच्छा ठीक है, मगर किस परिस्थिति में मिलें? न रूस के प्रधान मंत्री मिलने को तैयार क्योंकि वे अमरीका से माफी मंगवाना चाहते थे। न अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति मिलने को तैयार क्योंकि वे अपने हवाबाजों की रिहाई चाहते थे। जो मिलने के लिये तैयार नहीं, हम ने उन्हें मिलाने की कोशिश की, और मिलाने की कोशिश इस आधार पर कि अगर वे मिलेंगे नहीं तो बड़ा संकट वहां हो जायेगा। मैं नहीं समझता कि उस समय दुनिया में कोई लड़ाई छिड़ जाने का खतरा संसार के सिर पर मंडरा रहा था। रूस के प्रधान मंत्री भी जानते थे कि अमरीका में चुनाव होने वाले हैं और उन्होंने कहा भी था कि अमरीका के जो नये राष्ट्रपति आयेंगे हम उनसे बात करेंगे, और जो अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति थ व भी चुनाव के कारण निष्प्रभावी हो गये थे, वे इस स्थिति में नहीं थे कि अमरीका की ओर से बोल सकते। मगर हमने एक प्रस्ताव रक्खा पांच देशों की तरफ से, और उस प्रस्ताव का गलत अर्थ लगाया गया कि हम अमरीका को एम्बेरेस करना चाहते थे। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह हमारी इच्छा नहीं थी, लेकिन हमें समझना चाहिये कि यदि हम दोनों शक्तिगुटों के बीच मध्यस्थता करना चाहते हैं तो केवल हम उन बातों को लेकर चल सकते हैं जिनमें दोनों एकमत हैं। जिन

बातों में उनमें मतभेद है उन्हें हमें छोड़ देना चाहिये। हम भलाई करने जाते हैं और बराई हाथ लग जाती है। हमें हवन करते हुये अपने हाथ नहीं जलाने चाहिये।

निःशस्त्रीकरण के सम्बन्ध में भी हम ने जो प्रस्ताव रक्खा है उस में भी हम ने इस बात की सावधानी नहीं रक्खी कि जो पश्चिमी देश हैं, उन में कम्युनिस्ट देशों के अचानक आक्रमण का जो खतरा है, उस का निराकरण कैसे किया जायेगा। अपनी यात्रा में मैं पलं हारंर गया था, जहां पर दिसम्बर, १९४१ में जापान ने अचानक अमरीका पर आक्रमण किया और २,००० से अधिक अमरीकी नौसैनिकों को जलसमाधि दे दी। अमरीका भ्रमण में मैं ने देखा कि अमरीका के दिमाग पर शांति की इच्छा रहते हुए भी अचानक हमले का भय सवार है। यह भय निराधार हो सकता है, मगर अगर हम चाहते हैं कि विश्व में निःशस्त्रीकरण हो तो इस भय के निराकरण के लिये भी हमें प्रयत्न करना चाहिये और इसलिये कंट्रोल हो, इंस्पेक्शन हो। लोकतंत्रवादी देश तो खुले देश हैं, वहां पर इस को देखना सरल है, मगर जो कम्युनिस्ट देश हैं, बंद देश हैं, लौह आवरण में हैं, वे निःशस्त्रीकरण के लिये किये गये समझौतों का कहा पालन करना चाहते हैं, इस के निरीक्षण की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। और इस सम्बन्ध में अगर हम सावधानी से काम लेंगे, और जो आशंकाएं हैं, भय हैं उनका ध्यान में रखेंगे, तो विश्व में निःशस्त्रीकरण का मार्ग प्रशस्त किया जा सकता है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की जनरल असेम्बली में, जैसा हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा, किस तरह के भाषण होते हैं, कैसे हाव भाव दिखाए जाते हैं। मुझे यह देख कर बड़ा ताज्जुब हुआ और दुःख भी हुआ। रूस के प्रधान मंत्री ने, जिनका नाम हम बड़ा आदर करते हैं, क्योंकि वह एक महान देश

के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, वहां जो आचरण किया वह उनकी प्रतिष्ठा को बढ़ाने वाला नहीं है, उससे रूस की जनता का भी सम्मान नहीं बढ़ता। किसी देश का प्रतिनिधि विश्व के रंगमंच पर जूता लेकर जड़ा हो जाए तो यह बड़ी लज्जा की बात है। और समय आ गया है जब विश्व के राष्ट्रों को इस बात का प्रयत्न करना चाहिए कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र की महासभा में भी कोई आचरण की संहिता बनायी जाए। बोलते बोलते टोकना और फिर अपशब्दों का प्रयोग करना, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को अपने विचारों के प्रचार का एक हथियार बनाना, यह ऐसी प्रवृत्तियां हैं जिनकी निन्दा की जानी चाहिए, और मैं आशा करता था कि भारत का स्वर इसके सम्बन्ध में निकलेगा, लेकिन मुझे यह देखकर ताज्जुब हुआ कि जब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी नई दिल्ली वापस आए और उन्होंने एक प्रेस कानफरेंस बुलायी तो उस में किसी पत्र प्रतिनिधि ने कहा कि भारत के एक अखबार ने श्री रब्रुञ्चेव ने जो शब्द यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की जनरल असेम्बली में कहे उनकी आलोचना की है, और उस सम्वाददाता ने पूछा कि जो आलोचना की गयी क्या उससे भारत और रूस के सम्बन्ध नहीं बिगड़ेंगे, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह कहने के बजाए कि भारत में लोकतंत्र है और अखबारों को स्वतंत्रता है, कुछ ऐसे शब्द कहे जिनसे उस अखबार की निन्दा प्रकट होती है। मैं नहीं समझता कि यह कोई तटस्थता का दृष्टिकोण है। रूस के प्रधान मंत्री ने जो कुछ किया उसकी निन्दा की जानी चाहिए। और अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी राजनीति कह कर इस प्रकार की निन्दा करना ठीक नहीं समझते, तो जो अखबार या जो व्यक्ति यहां उनकी निन्दा करता है वह रूस और भारत के सम्बन्ध बिगाड़ना चाहता है, यह बात कहना गलत है।

मैं रूस से मित्रता चाहता हूँ....

श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती : ओ हो।

श्री वाजपेयी : ओ हो कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा। हम रूस से मित्रता चाहते हैं, रूस की गुलामी नहीं चाहते। मेरे दूसरे मित्र वह चाह सकते हैं। मैं तो सब से मित्रता चाहता हूँ, लेकिन उस मित्रता का आधार असभ्य व्यवहार का समर्थन नहीं हो सकता, और मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह आशा कर रहा था कि वह अपने संयमित व्यवहार द्वारा संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की जनरल असेम्बली में आचरण का एक आदर्श रखेंगे।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की जनरल असेम्बली में जो भाषण दिया उस में कम्युनिस्ट चीन को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में स्थान देने की बात कही। इसकी मुझे कोई शिकायत नहीं है। चीन को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में जगह मिलनी चाहिए, मिलेगी, देर हो सकती है।

श्री अ० मु० तारि. : (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : अन्धेर नहीं हो सकता।

[شوی اے - ایم - طارق ندھیر
نہیں ہو سکتا]

श्री वाजपेयी : उसके लिये यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के द्वारा स्वयं खुलने चाहिये, लेकिन मुझे शिकायत इस बात की है कि चीन के साथ हमारा जो संघर्ष है और चीन के आक्रमण से जो परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है, उसको उन्होंने—कंट्रीवर्सी कह कर टाल दिया। क्या चीन के आक्रमण के कारण जो स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है वह एक विवाद मात्र है। अगर चीन ने भारत की भूमि पर आक्रमण किया है, तो चीन को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में जगह देने की बात कहते हुये भी प्रधान मंत्री जी को यह कहना चाहिये था कि यद्यपि चीन ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया है और भारत की १२००० वर्ग मील भूमि पर कब्जा कर लिया है, फिर भी हम चीन को जगह देने की बात इसलिये कहना

[श्री वाजपेयी]

चाहते हैं क्योंकि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में सबको स्थान मिलना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर वह चीन के आक्रमण का हवाला देते तो यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में चीन को जगह देने की बात को और भी बल मिलता क्योंकि आक्रमण के बावजूद हम कहते कि चीन को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में स्थान मिलना चाहिये। लेकिन शायद प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कड़े शब्दों का प्रयोग करना ठीक नहीं समझा। और उनके कड़े शब्द शायद लोक-सभा में विरोधी दलों के लिये ही सुरक्षित रखे गये हैं। मगर हम समझते हैं कि स्थिति का स्पष्ट निर्देश होना चाहिये था। हमको एक मौका था कि हम विश्व के जनमत को प्रभावित करते। हमारा चीन के साथ जो संघर्ष है उसको हम दूसरे देशों के सामने रखते। जब तक हम बार बार ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तब तक दूसरे देश चीन के साथ जो हमारा संघर्ष है उसकी वस्तुस्थिति को नहीं समझ सकेंगे। वह समझते हैं कि कोई बड़ा झगड़ा नहीं है, इसीलिये तो भारत चीन को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में स्थान देने की बात करता है। हमको एक मौका था कि हम इस प्रश्न पर विश्व के जनमत को शिक्षित करते और अपने पक्ष में जागृत करते।

और दुःख की बात यह है कि हमने तिब्बत में मानवाधिकारों के उल्लंघन के संबंध में थाइलैंड और मलाया ने जो शिकायत रखी है उसका समर्थन न करने का फैसला किया है। भारत अगर तिब्बत के राइट आफ सेल्फ डिटरमिनेशन को न मानता तो एक बार समझ में आ सकता था, क्योंकि भारत को यह बात अंग्रेजों से विरासत में मिली है कि तिब्बत पर चीन की स्वैजरेनटी है। लेकिन जहाँ तक मानवाधिकारों के उल्लंघन का सवाल है, उसके बारे में तो भारत को चुप बैठ कर नहीं रहना चाहिये। अब यह कहना कि यह प्रश्न तो शीत युद्ध का प्रश्न है और हम नहीं चाहते कि इस प्रश्न पर शीत युद्ध आरम्भ हो, या यह कहना कि चीन वहाँ नहीं है तो इस प्रश्न को उठाने का क्या अर्थ होगा, ये तर्क

मेरी समझ में नहीं आते। यदि चीन वहाँ नहीं है तो हम क्या करें। लेकिन तिब्बत की जनता के प्रति जो भारत की भावना है उसको व्यक्त करने का दायित्व तो हम पर है। अगर हम कालोनियलिज्म और साम्राज्याद का अन्त करने की बात करते हैं, अगर हम अल्जीरिया में फ्रेंच साम्राज्यवाद के विरुद्ध हैं, तो हमारी सीमा से लगा हुआ, हिमालय की चोटियों पर जो एक नया साम्राज्यवाद उदय हो रहा है उसकी ओर से हम अपनी आंखें नहीं मूंद सकते। मेरा निवेदन है कि भारत सरकार को इस संबंध में अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करना चाहिये।

यह ठीक है कि अगर तिब्बत का प्रश्न संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठेगा तो उसका कोई हल निकलने वाला नहीं है। मगर हमने वहाँ ऐसे अनेक सवाल उठाये हैं जिनका हल नहीं निकला, मगर हमको ऐसा करने से यह समाधान तो हुआ कि हमने अपने कर्तव्य का पालन किया। जब हम साम्राज्यवाद और उपनिवेशवाद के विरुद्ध सारे संसार में अपनी आवाज बुलन्द करने का दावा करते हैं तो हम तिब्बत में हो रही घटनाओं के प्रति आंख बन्द करके नहीं बैठ सकते।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने इस बात को भी अनुभव किया कि हमारी विदेशों में प्रचार की जो प्रणाली है उसमें बड़ी कमी है, बड़ी खामी है। उसे और भी पूरा करने की आवश्यकता है। अमरीका के अपने भ्रमण में मैंने देखा कि वहाँ काश्मीर के सवाल पर लोगों में बड़ा भ्रम है, और भ्रम तथ्यों के बारे में है। अनेक नागरिक मूढ़ ऐसे मिले जो यह भी नहीं जानते कि देश के बटवारे के बाद अभी भी भारत में करोड़ों मुसलमान बन्धु रहते हैं जिन्हें बराबर के अधिकार प्राप्त हैं। वह समझते हैं कि देश का बटवारा हो गया, पाकिस्तान अलग बन गया और सब मुसलमान वहाँ चले गये और काश्मीर में भी मुसलमान ज्यादा हैं। इसलिये काश्मीर भी पाकिस्तान में जाना चाहिये। जब

मने उन्हें बताया कि भारत में अभी करोड़ों मुसलमान रहते हैं और काश्मीर के सवाल पर हम साम्प्रदायिक तर्कों को मानने के लिये तयार नहीं हैं, तो वे प्रभावित हुए। लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने न्यूयार्क में एक इंटरव्यू में कह दिया कि जो काश्मीर का हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है उसको हम लेने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे, हम स्टेट्स को मानते हैं, उसको डिस्टर्ब नहीं करेंगे। मैं इस नीति से सहमत नहीं हूँ। अगर हम उस हिस्से पर अपने अधिकार को छोड़ देंगे जो आक्रमण से चला गया है, तो और स्थानों पर भी आक्रमण से चली गयी भूमि पर अपने अधिकार को छोड़ने की बात को बल मिलेगा। और मैं नहीं समझता कि आज की स्थिति में यह नीति ठीक होगी। वैसे भी अभी पाकिस्तान के खबरे में बहुत परिवर्तन होना बाकी है। भारत के हितों का ध्यान न रख कर हम कनाल वाटर देने को मान गये, लेकिन भारत को धन्यवाद देने के बजाये पाकिस्तान के शासक कह रहे हैं कि आपने पानी देकर तो बहुत अच्छा किया मगर पानी जहाँ से निकलता है वह काश्मीर भी हमको मिलना चाहिये। वह शायद आगे भी बढ़ेंगे। मेरा निवेदन है कि हम पाकिस्तान से अपने संबंधों का सुधार करें, लेकिन इसके लिये आक्रमण के सामने झुका जायें, इसके लिये हम तैयार नहीं हैं। आक्रमण आक्रमण है चाहे वह पाकिस्तान का आक्रमण हो या चीन का आक्रमण हो। आक्रमण से हमारी जो भूमि चली गयी है हमें उसको वापस लेने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। अगर हम उसे वापस नहीं ले सकते तो कम से कम उसे देने का सवाल तो नहीं उठता।

जहाँ तक चीन का प्रश्न है, चीन के साथ हमारा जो विवाद है उस पर हमने अपने पड़ोसियों को भी शायद ठीक से नहीं बताया है। बर्मा के आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी हमारे देश में आए हुए थे। हमने उनके वक्तव्यों को पढ़ा। उन्होंने बार बार चीन के प्रधान मंत्री की सिंसेरिटी की दुहाई दी है। मुझे उस में से यह

ध्वनि निकलती मालूम पड़ी कि वह शायद हमारी ईमानदारी पर उतना विश्वास नहीं करते। संस्कृत भाषा में एक पद्धति है कि अगर किसी की दो पत्नियाँ हैं और यह कहा जाय कि एक पत्नी पतिव्रता है तो बिना कहे उसका यह अर्थ निकलता है कि जो द्वितीय पत्नी है वह शायद पतिव्रता नहीं है। उन प्रधान मंत्री का यह बार बार कहना कि चीन के प्रधान मंत्री ईमानदार हैं, वह समझौता चाहते हैं, तो इस में से यह आवाज निकलती है कि शायद हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पर उनको शक है। मैं नहीं समझता कि ऐसा होने का कोई कारण है लेकिन अगर ऐसा है तो हमारे लिए बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है। शायद हम बर्मा के प्रधान मंत्री को भी इस झगड़े के बारे में अपना दृष्टिकोण पूरी तरह से समझा नहीं सके हैं। जो बात चीन चल रही है वह झगड़े को टालने के लिए चल रही है। चीन समझौता नहीं चाहता है। हमारे कम्युनिस्ट नेता प्रोफेसर मुर्कजी कहते हैं कि वह समझौता चाहते हैं तो समझौते का एक ही रास्ता है कि चीन के कब्जे में भारत की जितनी भूमि है उसे चीन खाली कर के चला जाय। अन्य कोई भी समझौता भारत को स्वीकार्य नहीं होगा क्योंकि वह समझौता नहीं होगा, समर्पण होगा। समझौता हम भी चाहते हैं मगर आक्रमण के आधार पर नहीं। चीन के पास नक्शे नहीं हैं। चीन के पास दस्तावेज नहीं हैं इस लिए वह ऐक्चुवेलटीज को मानने की बात कर रहे हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि रंगून में वार्ता सफल होगी लेकिन अगर वार्ता सफल नहीं हुई तो चीन के अधिकार में जो भारत की भूमि है उसको वापस लेने के लिए भारत क्या करेगा इस संबंध में अभी से विचार करने और तैयारी करने की आवश्यकता है। धन्यवाद।

पंडित ब्रज नारायण 'ब्रजेश' (शिवपुरी) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्र संघ में संसार स्थिति के सम्बन्ध में विचार करने के लिए

[पंडित ब्रज नारायण "बजेठ"]

संसार भर के राज्यों के स्वामी संसार भर के बुद्धिमान पुरुष एकत्रित हुए। उस में भारत वर्ष के प्रधान मंत्री का जाना और भाग लेना यह परमावश्यक था। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस दृष्टि से प्रधान मंत्री वहाँ गये। उन्होंने वहाँ पहुँच कर सभी के साथ सम्पर्क प्रस्थापित किया। राष्ट्र संघ का दौरा करने के पश्चात् प्रधान मंत्री महोदय जैसे ही राजधानी में वापिस आये, लोक-सभा के सदस्यों को एकत्रित कर के उन्होंने वहाँ की जो स्थिति थी उस से हमको अवगत कराया। सौभाग्य से मैं भी उस में उपस्थित था। देश की जो अवस्था और स्थिति है उसको सामने रखते हुए मैं यह तो नहीं कह सकता कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय बिना सोचे-विचारे काम कर रहे होंगे। अपनी स्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए, देश को सुदृढ़ और सशक्त बनाने के लिए करना चाहिए अपनी बुद्धि के अनुसार वे अवश्यमेव कर रहे हैं। परन्तु कभी कभी हमने जो एक नीति निर्धारित की है उस नीति के बीच में और समय की स्थिति के बीच में संघर्ष खड़ा हो जाता है। संसार में सब से बड़ा संघर्ष आदर्श और व्यवहार के बीच में आ गया है। यदि कोई विचारक बुद्धिमान और समझदार व्यक्ति आदर्श को लेकर चलना चाहता है तो व्यवहार उसके हाथ से खिसक जाता है। यदि वह व्यवहार को ले कर चलना चाहता है तो आदर्श उस के हाथ से निकल जाता है।

दुनिया में इस समय राम और रोटी के बीच में झगड़ा खड़ा हो गया है। यदि रोटी पकड़ते हैं तो राम निकल जाते हैं और यदि राम को पकड़ते हैं तो रोटी खिसक जाती है। ऐसी अवस्था की स्थिति में से निकलना यह बड़े कौशल का कार्य है। प्रधान मंत्री जी वहाँ गये। संसार भर में संघर्ष न हो इस के लिए उन्होंने अपनी आवाज वहाँ बुल द की। इस में दो मत नहीं हो सकते हैं। इस में भी कोई संदेह नहीं है कि राष्ट्र संघ का संसार में होना अत्यावश्यक है। सारे संसार

में जब किसी न किसी बात में लोग लड़ रहे हैं तो उनका फैसला करने के लिए कोई होना भी तो चाहिए। इसी के लिए राष्ट्र संघ का निर्माण हुआ और उस राष्ट्र संघ में यदि हम न पहुँच और पहुँच कर यदि उसका मार्गदर्शन न करें तो वह और भी दुर्बल हो जायगा। हम यह जानते हैं कि राष्ट्र संघ जितना सशक्त होना चाहिये, जितना बलवान होना चाहिये और स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक कार्य करने की जितनी उसमें क्षमता होनी चाहिये उतनी आज उसे प्राप्त नहीं है। राष्ट्र संघ स्वयं गुटों से दूर हुआ नहीं है। इस पर गुटों का प्रभाव है। एक गुट का प्रभाव यदि कोई देखता है और अपनी चलती देखता है कि नहीं हो रही है तो वह जूता उठ लेता है। ऐसी स्थिति राष्ट्र संघ में न हो जिसमें कि किसी आदमी को बलप्रयोग करने का अवसर मिले। न्याय के साथ अग्र हो सके यह स्थिति राष्ट्र संघ में अवश्य आनी चाहिये। राष्ट्र संघ में काम करने वाले प्रत्येक सदस्यों के गुटों के बीच में हमें यह भावना निर्माण करनी होगी विशेषकर उन देशों में जोकि अभी अभी नये राष्ट्र संघ के सदस्य बने हैं और जो अभी बलवान और सशक्त नहीं हैं। उनमें यह भावना निर्माण करनी चाहिये कि राष्ट्र संघ में भाग लेकर कोई भी पक्ष अपनी अनुचित बात को राष्ट्र संघ के द्वारा स्वीकार्य न करा सके ऐसी स्थिति वहाँ निर्माण होनी चाहिये। जितने छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र हैं उन्हें संगठित होना पड़ेगा। मैं इस बात को स्वीकार करने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि हमें अपना कोई साथी नहीं बनाना चाहिये। तटस्थता का तात्पर्य यह नहीं है कि हम एक-की रहे अकेले ही हमें रहना चाहिये। हमने एक नीति निर्धारित की कि हम किसी के साथ नहीं मिलेंगे तो क्या यह अकेले ही हम रहेंगे? हमें दूसरों को भी इस मत का बनाना पड़ेगा और जब वह इस मत के हो जायेंगे तो वह गुट अपने आप बन जायगा। जैसे अभी मैं कहूँ कि मैं हिन्दुस्तान में जो पार्टियाँ हैं उनमें से किसी पार्टी में नहीं रहूँगा। मैं नौन पार्टी-

मैं न हूँ तो मैं नौन-पार्टीमैन तैयार करूँगा और इस तरह एक नौन-पार्टी पार्टी हो जायगी। वह तो स्वाभाविक रूप से हो जायगी। यह कहना कि हमें कोई गुट नहीं बनाना चाहिये, यह कैसे हो सकता है? संघ शक्ति क्लोयुगे। कलियुग में संगठन में शक्ति है। यदि अमरीका शस्त्रों के कारण ताकतवर है, रूस भी शस्त्रों के कारण ताकतवर है तो हमें संसार के जनबल को लेकर अपने आप को खड़ा करना पड़ेगा। इसके सिवाय कोई दूसरा मार्ग नहीं है।

मुझे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की वह बात बड़ी पसन्द आई जो उन्होंने अपने भाषण में वहाँ कही कि यदि यह ताकतवर गुट नहीं मानते हैं तो हम कमजोर लोक इकट्ठे होकर उनको दबायेंगे उनको हम समझायेंगे कि तुम्हें किस प्रकार चलना चाहिये। दुर्बलों को बलवान होकर सताते चले जायें और दुर्बल एकत्रित न हों यह मैं बात मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। इसलिये मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि जितने भी दुर्बल, दीन हीन देश हैं उन सब का नेतृत्व हमें प्राप्त हुआ है। मैं यह भी मानने को तैयार हूँ कि रूस और अमरीका इनमें से कौन प्रथम शक्ति है यह एक विवाद का विषय है लेकिन हम संसार के दीन हीन देशों का नेतृत्व करने वाले तीसरी शक्ति हैं। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि संसार में जितने दीन, हीन और दुर्बल देश हैं, उन सब के अग्रुवा हम हैं। सब से अधिक भार हमने खाई है। सबसे अधिक भूखें नंगे हम हैं और आज भी हम पर सबसे अधिक अन्याय हो रहा है। पाकिस्तान भी हमको मारता है। चीन भी हमको मारता है। पाकिस्तान के साथ मैत्री संबंध हम कायम करते हैं, चीन के साथ हम मैत्री संबंध कायम करते हैं और दोनों ही उसका बदल हमारे साथ सज्जनता के बजाय दुर्जनता के साथ देते हैं। पाकिस्तान को हम अपनी और रुपया देकर अये। वहाँ से प्रधान मंत्री लौट कर आये तो वहाँ के पाकिस्तान के शासक आँख दिखा कर कहते हैं कि काश्मीर की समस्या तो फौज सुलझा लेगी। यह क्या बात हुई? अभी तो आपने हमारे प्रधान

मंत्री के पाकिस्तान पहुंचने पर उनके ऊपर हार और फूलमालायें डालीं और तत्काल उसके बाद आपने गाली देना शुरू कर दिया और धमकियाँ देना शुरू कर दिया। यह सज्जनता का भाव नहीं है। हमको क्या करना होगा? जो छोटे छोटे देश हैं उनको सबको अपने साथ में लेना होगा। आज जो राष्ट्र संघ के सदस्य बने हैं, बहुत से अफ्रीकन देश उसमें आये हैं तो हमें उनके साथ दौत्य संबंध प्रस्थापित करने चाहियें और अपने दूतावास वहाँ स्थापित कर लेने चाहियें। उनको अपनी स्थिति से अवगत कराना चाहिये और उन्हें अपने साथ लेना चाहिये। राष्ट्र संघ में बहुत बड़ा बहुमत हमारे साथ हो और जो प्रस्ताव हम वहाँ पर रखें, वह मान्य हो जाये। प्रस्ताव के संबंध में यह कहा गया है :

प्रस्ताव सदशम् वाक्यम्
सद्भाव सदशम् प्रियम् ।

अ.त्मशक्ति समम् कोपम्
यो जानाति स पण्डित : ॥

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय पंडित कहलाते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रस्ताव क्या रखना चाहिये और कोप किस पर दिखाना चाहिये, यह तो वह स्वयं जानते ही होंगे। यही समझ कर कोप दिखाना चाहिये। केवल यही कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि हम चाइना को देख लेंगे। कैसे देख लेंगे? उसको चरखे से नहीं देखा जा सकता है। चाइना के पास बम हैं, र ईफ्लज हैं, गन्स हैं, रक्षा है और वह लौह आवरण में है। उसकी भेड़िया वृत्ति प्रत्यक्ष सामने है कि हमने उसका कुछ बिगाड़ा नहीं है फिर भी वह चढ़ कर आ गया, हम भाई भाई कहते रहे और वह हम पर आक्रमण करके यहां आ गया। अब वे कहते हैं कि हम समझौता करने के लिये तैयार हैं। पहले फौजदारी की, हमको मार दिया और मारने के बाद कहते हैं कि समझौता कर लो। हमको जो भाव हो गये हैं, उसका क्या होगा? उसकी दब:

[पं.ित ब्रज नारायण ब्रजेश]

आप करते रहना। यह तो समझौते का कोई प्रकार नहीं है। उन्होंने जो भूमि दबाई है, वे उसको छोड़ दें और फिर बात चीत करें। इस समय जो स्थिति बन गई है, वह बड़ी भयावह है।

रशा और अमरीका को एक साथ मिलाने के लिये हमने संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में एक प्रस्ताव रखा। वह प्रस्ताव न्यायसंगत था और संसार के प्रति सद्भावना प्रकट करने वाला था। यदि रशा और अमरीका, ये दो राष्ट्र नहीं लड़ते हैं, तो फिर संसार में और कोई राष्ट्र नहीं लड़ेंगे। लड़ाई तो इनके बीच में है। छोटे तो व्यर्थ में पिस रहे हैं। यह ठीक है कि हमें छोटों के झगड़े में फंसना नहीं चाहिये, बड़ों के झगड़ों में हमें नहीं जाना चाहिये। परन्तु हमने गुरुत्व लिया है और गुरुत्व सदा हमारे पास रहा है। संसार को आदर्श का उपदेश भारतवर्ष देता रहा है। जब दुनिया लड़ने बैठी है, तो शांति का सन्देश कौन दे सिवाये भारतवर्ष के? यह ठीक है कि उसके लिये हमें खतरा हो सकता है, लेकिन

निन्दन्तु ीतिनिपुणा : यदिवा स्त्वन्तु ।

लक्ष्मी समाविशतु गच्छन्तु वा यथेष्टम्

अद्यौव वा मरणमस्तु युगान्तरे वा ।

न्यायात् पथः प्रविचलन्ति पदम् न धीरा : ॥

धीर पुरुष कभी न्याय के पथ से नहीं हटते हैं। संसार का नाश हो जायगा, यदि रशा और अमरीका के बीच समझौता नहीं होगा। इसलिये हमको उस न्याय की बात को कहना पड़ेगा, चाहे थोड़ा बहुत खतरा हमारे ऊपर आता हो। अगर हम पर खतरा आयगा, तो दुनिया उस खतरे से बचेगी नहीं। भारतवर्ष इस स्थिति में है कि यदि कोई भारतवर्ष को मिटाना चाहेगा, तो उसे यह याद रखना चाहिये कि वह स्वयं भी बच नहीं सकता है। चालीस करोड़ के देश को हानि पहुंचा कर कोई जिन्दा नहीं रह सकता है। इस प्रकार का अन्याय और अत्याचार यहां पर नहीं हो सकता है,

यह हमारा विश्वास है। हमारा देश बड़ा है और अगर चाइना या पाकिस्तान चाहें कि हमें खूना जायें, तो वे दोनों मूर्खतापूर्ण स्थिति में हैं। वे हमें खाना नहीं सकेंगे। ये खुद अपने मरने का उपाय कर रहे हैं, यह उन्हें समझना चाहिये। हमें कोई डर नहीं है। यदि पाकिस्तान उत्पात करेगा, तो चाइना उसके सिर पर बैठा है, वह उसे खा जायगा और यदि चाइना कुछ करेगा, तो अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान में पहले से ही अपने अड्डे बना लिये हैं। दोनों ने इतना कर लिया है। पर हम यह चहते हैं कि हमारे सिर पर आप क्यों प्रबन्ध कर रहे हैं। हम तो उपदेश देने वाले हैं। हम दोनों को समझौता करने के लिये कहते हैं, मगर वे दोनों ही हमारे सिर पर आये हुये हैं। यह उपदेश की वृत्ति जो हमारी सरकार ने अपनायी है, वह अच्छी है। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि उपदेश देने के साथ साथ भीतर से सशक्त होना भी जरूरी है। हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति राष्ट्रीय नीति पर हावी नहीं होनी चाहिये। केवल कहने से चाइना नहीं भागेगा। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति का सबसे अच्छा उपाय यह होना चाहिये कि संसार को शांति का सन्देश और उपदेश दें, लेकिन साथ ही बार्डर पर अपने लोगों को बसा दें और उनको हथियार देकर उनको सशक्त बनायें। वहां पर अनिवार्य सैनिक शिक्षण कर देना चाहिये। वहां पर बार इंडस्ट्रीज खोलनी चाहिये और लोगों को धंधे देने चाहियें। वहां के लोगों को राइफल और बम देने चाहियें। फौज कब तक वहां बैठी रहेगी। वहां फौज रखने से ही काम नहीं चलेगा। अपनी जन संख्या वहां बढ़ानी चाहिये और उसको हथियार देने चाहिये और उनको इस बात की छुट्टी देनी चाहियें कि जब चाइना आये, उस से वे निपट लें। चाइना को कहना चाहिये कि यदि तुम बमों का प्रयोग करोगे, तो हमें कोई डर नहीं है कोई और दमदार तुम्हारे सामने आ जायगा, अन्यथा संधारण हमने से बचने की हम में तकत है।

जहां तक संसार में प्रचार सामग्री का संबंध है, इसमें कोई सन्देश नहीं है कि

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति के आधार पर, संसार में शांति लाने के लिये भारतवर्ष की जो विशेषता रही है, उस आधार पर अच्छे विद्वान लोग यहां की राजनैतिक स्थिति से लोगों को अवगत कराने के लिये विदेशों में जाने चाहियें। दूतावासों में खास तौर से इसका प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये। हमारे यहां रशा और अमरीका के जो दूतावास हैं, उन्होंने हजारों आदमियों को अपने धंधे पर लगा रखा है। मुझे पचासों आदमियों से वास्ता पड़ा है, जो अमरीकन एम्बेसी में काम करते हैं और बहुत से तो हमारे भीतरी आफिसिज में घुस कर वहां से बारीक खबरों को लाने की चेष्टा करते हैं। यह स्थिति रशा और अमरीका ने यहां पैदा कर रखी है। हमारे दूतावास पता नहीं वहां केवल लड़कियों के डांस करवाते हैं, या पता नहीं क्या करवाते हैं। यह हमें मालूम नहीं है। इस प्रकार के नाच-गाने के काम बाहर बन्द होने चाहियें और इसके स्थान पर वास्तविक स्थिति से अवगत कराने के लिये हमारी तरफ से द्रव्य खर्च होना चाहिये। हमारे दूतावास जागरूक, सतर्क और सावधान होने चाहियें और जहां हमारे दौत्य संबंध नहीं हैं, वहां दौत्य संबंध प्रस्थापित होने चाहियें, खासकर उन नये देशों से, जो अभी अभी राष्ट्र संघ में आय हैं।

चाइना को राष्ट्र संघ में लाना परमावश्यक है। इसका समर्थन हम खुले शब्दों में करते रहे और आज भी करना चाहिए। यदि चाइना राष्ट्र संघ में पहुंच जायेगा, तो फिर हम वहां पंच-फ्रैण्डला करा सकेंगे। जब वह राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य नहीं है, तो फिर राष्ट्र संघ उस का फ्रैण्डला कहां से करेगा, विचार कहां से करेगा। जो भी आदमी वहां होगा, उसका वहां फ्रैण्डला हो सकेगा। इसलिए चीन को राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य बनाने के लिए जितने जोर से हम आवाज उठाते रहे हैं, वह आवाज उसके आक्रमण के कारण बिल्कुल नहीं कम होनी चाहिए। उस को राष्ट्र संघ 1335(A)LS—7.

का सदस्य बनाने के लिए अवश्य बोलना चाहिए। रशा राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य था। जब राष्ट्र संघ विरुद्ध हो गया तो काश्मीर के मामले में रशुशोव साहब न अपनी वीटो पावर का प्रयोग कर के काश्मीर की समस्या को और उलझने से बचा लिया। अन्यथा राष्ट्र संघ हमारे विरुद्ध होता है और पाकिस्तान संसार में घूम कर अपने प्रति सहा-नुभूति प्राप्त करने का प्रयत्न कर रहा है। इस पर भी हम सोचते हैं कि हम सद्भावना से पाकिस्तान को जीत लेंगे। उस की वृत्ति हमारी अपेक्षा शासन खूब जानता है, क्योंकि वह उस से भिड़ता रहा है और रोज उस के साथ व्यवहार करता है। पाकिस्तानी मनोवृत्ति हिन्दुस्तान में एक दूषित मनोवृत्ति मानी जाने लगी है और उसको हिन्दुस्तान में पनपने नहीं देना चाहिए। पाकिस्तानी मनोवृत्ति हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार के लिए घातक रही है, घातक है और घातक होगा, यह मैं निश्चित शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूं। इस लिए पाकिस्तान से सावधान रह कर हमें संसार के जनमत को अपने प्रति जाग्रत करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये।

इस के साथ ही साथ हम को तटस्थता की नीति पर बुद्धिमता पूर्वक कार्य करना चाहिए। जैसा संयुक्त श्रवण गण राज्य ने किया है, अगर हम भी वैसा ही करें, तो काम बन सकता है। उस ने रशा और अमरीका दोनों से दोस्ती की। फिर स्वेज कैनल अपने हाथों में ले ली और बाद में कम्मूनिस्टों को धात बतवा दिया। दोस्त के दोस्त हैं और माल अपने हाथ में है। दूसरी ओर न हम गोआ ले सके, न काश्मीर ले सके और न ही हम हिमालय को बचा सके। इस का अर्थ यह है कि अपनी नीति को चलाने की पद्धति में, रीति में—जिस को अंग्रेजी में इम्प्लीमेंटेशन कहते हैं—दुर्बलता है, कमजोरी है। उस के सम्बन्ध में हमारी असावधानी हो जाती है,

[पंडित ब्रजेश नारायण ब्रजश]

उसमें दृढ़ता की कुछ कमी है, इस लिए हमें मार खानी पड़ती है? मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह इस सम्बन्ध में थोड़ी जागरूकता से काम लें। क्यूबा का मामला है, और भी कई मामले हैं, जिन से कुछ बड़ी शक्तियों का सम्बन्ध है। क्यूबा में बहुत सी अमरीकन शूगर कम्पनीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया गया और अमरीकन को फांसी पर चढ़ा दिया गया। हम छोटे भाई को बचाने जायें और बड़ा भाई नाराज हो जायें, यह ठीक नहीं है। उसमें थोड़ा चुप रहने की आवश्यकता है। उसमें कुछ सावधान रहना चाहिए।

रहिमन झगड़ा बड़िन कंहं पड़हु बीच जनिघाय,

लड़े लोह पाहन दौ बीच रूई जरि जाय।

दो पत्थरों के बीच रूई जल कर नष्ट हो जाती है। उसमें थोड़ी राजनैतिक दूरदर्शिता से काम कर लेना चाहिए।

मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि यहां पर एक एशियन कमेटी लोगल कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी का निर्माण हुआ है। समाचार पत्रों में भी हम निरन्तर पढ़ते रहते हैं। इस कमेटी का पिछला अधिवेशन कोलम्बो में हुआ था और इस वर्ष यहां हो रहा है। यह कमेटी क्या करती है, इसमें कौन कौन से सदस्य हैं, अखबारों में हम पढ़ते हैं, लेकिन यहां तो हमें कुछ बताया नहीं जाता है। एशिया के जो दूसरे देश रह गए हैं, उनको इसमें क्यों सम्मिलित नहीं किया जाता है, प्रधान मंत्री हमको इससे अवगत करने की कृपा करें। उसको भी बलशाली बनाने की जरूरत है और एशिया को सशक्त बना कर हमें आगे आना चाहिए।

हम ने नार्थ कोरिया का ट्रेड कमीशन कायम किया है, लेकिन साउथ कोरिया ने क्या बिगाड़ा है? हमको दोनों से लाभ उठाना चाहिए। हमारे बड़े व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध

भी नहीं हैं, इस लिए हमें दोनों से लाभ उठाना चाहिए। इसी प्रकार इजराइल बन गया है और जब हम सत्य का प्रतिपादन करने चले हैं, तो हमको उसे भी दौत्य संबंध स्थापित करने चाहिए। एक दो बार प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बात की थी, लेकिन फिर उसको टाल दिया। सत्य के प्रतिपादन के लिए हमें साहस के साथ आगे आना चाहिए और जहां भी हमको देश के लिए लाभ मिल सके, हमें लाभ उठाने की चेष्टा करनी चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में कार्य तो किया जा रहा है, लेकिन थोड़ी और सतर्कता और सावधानी बरती जायें, तो भय का कोई कारण नहीं है। हमको देश से भय के वातावरण को निकालना चाहिए और देश के लोगों को सशक्त बनाना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय अवश्यमेव सफल होंगे। भय का कोई कारण नहीं है। देश उन के पीछे है और सारा संसार आज नहीं तो कल, कल नहीं तो परसों या तो उन के पीछे आयागा, अन्यथा नष्ट हो जायागा। इस के सिवा दूसरा कोई मार्ग नहीं है। उसको शान्ति के मार्ग पर आना पड़ेगा। और अगर वह नहीं आता है, तो उस के लिए विनाश का द्वार खुला हुआ है। यही हमारे गुहत्व का कारण है, जो हम ठीक प्रकार से कर रहे हैं, इसमें कोई दो मत नहीं हो सकते हैं। यह एक निर्विवाद चीज है। परन्तु इसके लिए हमें थोड़ी सावधानी से प्रयास करना चाहिये। घर वालों को ज्यादा नहीं दबाना चाहिये और बाहर वालों से सावधान रहना चाहिये।

16 hrs.

सेठ गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय जी, राष्ट्र संघ में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री गए, बहुत सी शिक्षक के बावजूद, इसे में एक ऐतिहासिक घटना मानता हूँ। जहां तक राष्ट्र संघ का सम्बन्ध

है, संसार में भी और हमारे देश में भी ऐसा मानने वालों में मैं नहीं हूँ जो समझते हैं कि राष्ट्र संघ एक निरर्थक संस्था है और वह अब तक दुनिया में कुछ नहीं कर सकी। मेरा इस सम्बन्ध में शुरू से मतभेद रहा है। आज भी है। राष्ट्र संघ की स्थापना के बाद राष्ट्र संघ अब तक क्या कर सका यह तभी मालूम होता है जब राष्ट्र संघ के पहले एक इस प्रकार की जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संस्था थी, लीग ऑफ नेशंस, उसका हम इतिहास देखें। दुनिया तब टुकड़ों में विभक्त थी, हजारों वर्षों से रही है। यदि हम दुनिया के इतिहास को देखें, मानवता के इतिहास को देखें तो हमें स्पष्ट मालूम होता है कि हमारा देश भी न जाने कितने टुकड़ों में विभक्त था। पहले पहल दुनिया को इकट्ठा लाने का प्रयत्न हुआ १९१४ के संसार व्यापी युद्ध के पश्चात् और उस समय लीग ऑफ नेशंस की स्थापना हुई। वह अपने कार्य में सफल नहीं हो सकी। दूसरा युद्ध हुआ और उसके बाद संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की स्थापना हुई। लेकिन हमें यह मानना होगा कि लीग ऑफ नेशंस चाहे युद्ध रोकने में समर्थ न हुई हो, उसने पहले पहल दुनिया के एकीकरण का एक वायुमंडल बनाया है और यदि हम उसके इतिहास से राष्ट्र संघ के इतिहास की तुलना करें तो हमें स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि राष्ट्र संघ अपने काम में यदि पूर्ण रीति से नहीं तो कुछ न कुछ सफल अवश्य हुआ है।

हजारों वर्षों से दुनिया में युद्ध चलते रहे हैं। दुनिया का विभाजन रहा है। ऐसी हालत में यदि राष्ट्र संघ को इस समय तक सफलता नहीं मिली तो इसमें खेद की बात नहीं है, इसमें आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है। मैं यह बात इसलिये कहता हूँ कि मैं एक छोटा सा साहित्यकार हूँ, इसलिए कुछ दूर की बात को देखता हूँ। लीग ऑफ नेशंस का मैं समर्थक था, राष्ट्र संघ का भी समर्थक हूँ। इसकी पूर्ण सफलता

और सुखद सफलता तो तभी हो सकती है जब दुनिया की एक सरकार स्थापित हो जाए। आज यह कल्पना की चीज है। लेकिन दुनिया में चिन्तकों ने, विचारकों ने पहले पहल कुछ चीजों की कल्पना की। पहले पहल वे चीजें, महान वस्तुयें कल्पना की वस्तुयें रही हैं। कल्पना का एक आकार साकार हुआ है समय के बाद। दो बातों में से एक बात होगी। या तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की शान्तिपूर्ण नीति के अनुसार चल कर दुनिया में आगे चल कर एक सरकार की स्थापना होगी या फिर दुनिया का नाश हो जाएगा। वह दुःखद और असफल घटना होगी। मैं तो बड़ा आशावादी व्यक्ति हूँ। मैं तो सुखद और सफल बातों की कल्पना किया करता हूँ, दुःखद और असफल बातों की नहीं।

बारूद जिस समय पहले पहल ईजाद हुई तो पहला वह विस्फोटक पदार्थ था जो दुनिया में ईजाद हुआ। कोई उस समय यह नहीं सोचता था कि आगे चल कर वह विस्फोटक पदार्थ एक अणु बम और एक उद्जन बम का रूप ले लेगा। तो एक बात हो सकती है, या तो युद्धों की समाप्ति दुनिया की एक सरकार या फिर उद्जन बम और अणु बम से बड़े किसी विस्फोटक पदार्थ का निर्माण जिससे हमारे इस प्लेनेट के ही टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायेंगे।

इस समय दुनिया दो दलों में विभक्त है और केवल एक भारतवर्ष ही ऐसा देश है—प्रधान देशों में मैं कहता हूँ—जो... सच्ची शान्ति चाहता है। भारतवर्ष कोई धनवान देश नहीं है, भारतवर्ष कोई बहुत सैनिक दृष्टि से सशक्त देश भी नहीं है। लेकिन भारतवर्ष की एक विशेष प्रकार की परम्परा है, वह शान्ति की परम्परा है कि जिसके कारण भारतवर्ष को संसार की इस समय की स्थिति में एक विशेष प्रकार का स्थान प्राप्त है।

[सेठ गोविंद दास]

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जो भाषण संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में दिया, जिस प्रकार उनका जाना वहां एक ऐतिहासिक घटना हुई, उसी प्रकार वह भाषण भी वहां की एक ऐतिहासिक भाषण है। मैंने संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के अधिवेशनों की कार्रवाइयों को इधर उधर पढ़ने का प्रयत्न किया है। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के उस भाषण से पूर्व उस प्रकार का संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में भाषण हुआ है, वह कम से कम मैंने नहीं पढ़ा है। यद्यपि उनका प्रस्ताव वहां पर गिर गया तो वह तो होने वाली बात थी लेकिन प्रस्ताव ने अपना काम कर दिया। जिस समय महात्मा गांधी दूसरी गोल मेज परिषद् में गये थे, उनके जो वहां भाषण हुये थे उस समय जो वह चाहते थे वह नहीं हुआ परन्तु अन्त में उन भाषणों ने अपना असर दिखाया। दूसरी गोल मेज परिषद् में महात्मा गांधी कांग्रेस की ओर से भारतवर्ष के एक मात्र प्रतिनिधि थे। उनकी बात उस समय तो नहीं सुनी गई परन्तु हमने देखा महात्मा गांधी के दूसरी गोल मेज परिषद् के भाषणों के अनुसार ही हमारे देश को स्वतंत्रता मिली और आज हम निर्माण कार्य में संलग्न हैं। इसी प्रकार जो प्रस्ताव पंडित जी ने वहां पर रखा था वह स्वीकृत न हुआ हो लेकिन उस प्रस्ताव के रखने के बाद उन्होंने वहां पर जो भाषण दिया वह दुनिया के विचारकों को, दुनिया के चिन्तकों को एक दिशा में ले जाता है, इसमें सन्देह नहीं है।

निःशस्त्रीकरण इस समय की सब से बड़ी आवश्यकता है। इसी प्रकार उपनिवेशवाद का अन्त भी सब से बड़ी आवश्यकता है। ये दोनों बातें इस समय सबसे महान हैं। एक नई बात उसके बाद हुई और वह है अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति का चुनाव। कनेडी साहब चुने गए वहां के राष्ट्रपति। लोग एक विशेष प्रकार की दृष्टि से इस चुनाव को देखते हैं। मैं

यद्यपि इस चुनाव से कोई बहुत आशा नहीं करता, मैं नहीं समझता कि इस समय दुनिया में जो तनाव है वह कोई विशेष रूप से कम होगा लेकिन कनेडी साहब तभी सफल माने जायेंगे इतिहास में जब वह निःशस्त्रीकरण और उपनिवेशवाद का अन्त करने में या निःशस्त्रीकरण को आगे बढ़ाने में और उपनिवेशवाद के अन्त को आगे बढ़ाने में सफल हों। पहले आप जानते हैं एशिया की जागृति हुई। एशिया के देश उस समय बड़े गिरे हुये देश माने जाते थे। रूस को भी मैं बहुत दूर तक एशिया का देश मानता हूँ। यदि आप रूस की भौगोलिक स्थिति को देखें तो उस का एक अंश भले ही योरप में है लेकिन उस का अधिक अंश एशिया में है। इसलिये रूस को मैं बहुत दूर तक एशिया का देश मानता हूँ। एशिया में पहले पहल जापान की जागृति हुई, उस के बाद रूस की जागृति हुई, फिर भारतवर्ष जगा और उसके बाद चीन जगा। एशिया में जो कुछ हुआ वही आज अफ्रीका में हो रहा है। अफ्रीका में जब मैं गया उस समय, सन् १९३७ की बात है, एक विचित्र अवस्था थी उस की। उस समय वहां के भारतवासी अपने हकों की बात कहते थे, लेकिन कांग्रेस ने सदा उन से एक बात कही कि अफ्रीका के उन निवासियों को जो भारत से गये हैं, अपनी बात अलग नहीं कहनी चाहिये। उन को वहां के मूल निवासियों से मिल कर सब के हकों की बात कहनी चाहिये। सन् १९३७ के बाद के इस २३ वर्षों के जमाने को जब मैं देखता हूँ तो वहां बड़ा फर्क हुआ है। अफ्रीका में आज छोटे बड़े सब देश जागृत हो रहे हैं। जिस प्रकार एशिया को योरप दबा कर नहीं रख सका, उसी प्रकार अफ्रीका को अमरीका दबा कर नहीं रख सकेगा, यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। जिस प्रकार एशिया का उत्थान एक अवश्यम्भावी वस्तु थी उसी प्रकार अफ्रीका का उत्थान भी एक

अवश्यम्भावी वस्तु है। योरप में इस समय जो दशा है वह हम देख रहे हैं। अमरीका की इस समय सब से ऊंची स्थिति है, इस में सन्देह नहीं। परन्तु मैं तो उस समय की कल्पना करता हूँ जिस समय चाहे पंडित जी न हों, मैं न होऊँ, हम में से अधिकांश न हों, किन्तु जिस समय अमरीका का वही हाल होगा जो कि इस समय योरप का हुआ। चक्रनेमि क्रमेण। जैसा कहा जाता है कि चक्का ऊपर जाता है फिर नीचे जाता है, उसी प्रकार जागृति अब सारे एशिया और अफ्रीका की हो कर रहेगी।

जहां तक हमारा सम्बन्ध है, हम सदा न्याय के संग रहे हैं। जब हम पराधीन थे उस समय भी, आप यदि कांग्रेस के प्रस्तावों को देखें, तो आप को मालूम होगा कि हम ने उन देशों के साथ, जिन के प्रति अन्याय होता था, सदा अपनी सहानुभूति प्रकट की है। आज भी हमारी वह अवस्था है। कांगों के सम्बन्ध में भी हमें वही कहना है। आज कांगों को बहुत बड़ा स्थान मिल गया है। उस की बड़ी चर्चा हो रही है। किसी समय इस प्रकार की स्थिति अन्य देशों की भी थी। कोरिया की भी थी। लेकिन यह छोटी छोटी बातें हैं। कांगों के प्रश्न को मैं बहुत बड़ा प्रश्न नहीं मानता। मैं अफ्रीका की जागृति को बहुत बड़ा प्रश्न मानता हूँ, और कांगों का जो प्रश्न है वह उसके अन्तर्गत एक छोटा सा प्रश्न है। तो हम सदा यहां तक कि पराधीनता के समय भी, उन के संग रहे, उन देशों के संग र जिन के प्रति अन्याय होता था। आज भी हम उन के संग हैं।

जहां तक हमारा खुद का मामला है, चीन और पाकिस्तान की बातें यहां बहुत कही गई। मुझे तो आश्चर्य हुआ श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी का भाषण सुन कर। उन का भाषण सुन कर मुझे सदा आश्चर्य होता है और जब कभी वे बोलते हैं उस के बाद मुझे बोलने

का मौका भी मिलता है। वे बोले जहां तक साम्यवादी दल का सम्बन्ध है, "यदि भारत पर आक्रमण हुआ तो भारतवर्ष के बचाव के लिये साम्यवादी दल सब से पहले आगे बढ़ेगा" मेरी समझ में उन का यह "इफ" नहीं आया। आज भी यदि हमारे साम्यवादी भाई चीन का भारत पर आक्रमण नहीं मानते हैं तो वे ऐसा कब मानेंगे, यह मैं समझ नहीं पाता। कल एक वक्तव्य में पंडित जी ने यहां पर कहा कि उन की इस समय की जो कार्रवाइयां हैं, उनकी रिपोर्टें उन के पास आती हैं, लेकिन अभी तक वे कार्रवाइयां देशद्रोह तक नहीं पहुंची हैं। मैं पंडित जी से अत्यन्त . . .

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैंने ऐसा कब कहा ?

सेठ गोविन्द दास : कल आप ने एक स्टेटमेंट में कहा था।

श्री अन्तार हरबानी : कुछ और कहा था।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : आप ने यह कहा था कि इतनी दूर वे नहीं पहुंचे हैं कि जिन पर कोई कार्रवाई की जाय।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैंने यह कहा था कि इस का फंसला करना कि क्या हो, यह गौरतलब बात है। मैं कैसे राय दूं। एक फिक्रा देख कर? अगर कोई कानूनी बात है तो गौर किया जाय, और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स गौर करती हैं।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं एक बात निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ पंडित जी से। पंडित जी की नीति इस तरह की है, जैसा कि महर्षि वाल्मिकी ने कहा "मृद्वनि कुसुमादपि" जब यहां हड़ताल होने वाली थी, उस समय भी मैंने यह निवेदन किया था। मैं आज भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि साम्यवादियों की जो कार्यवाइयां हैं वे अब इस हद तक पहुंच गई हैं कि चाहे वे किन्तु, परन्तु, लेकिन, अगर, मगर लगा के हमें उन के भुलावे में नहीं आना

[संठ गोविन्द दास]

चाहिये। समय आ गया है जिस प्रकार हम को अन्य कार्रवाइयां करनी चाहियें, उसी प्रकार से उन के सम्बन्ध में भी हमें बहुत गम्भीरता से विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

पंडित ब्रजनारायण ब्रजेश : सम्भव है कि कृष्ण की तरह से शिशुपाल को देख रहे हों।

संठ गोविन्द दास : जहां तक पाकिस्तान का सम्बन्ध है, अभी पंडित जी अग्र्युब साहब से मिले। उन से मिलने के बाद भी अग्र्युब साहब ने एक वक्तव्य झाड़ दिया कश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कहूं, पाकिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी देश है। हमारे आपस के झगड़ों के सबब से यहां तक नौबत पहुंच गई है कि सन् १९४८ में जो हमारा पाकिस्तान से १८१ करोड़ ६० तक का था वह सन् १९५६ में घट कर ११ करोड़ तक आ गया है। कहां १८५ करोड़ और कहां ११ करोड़। यह स्थिति कोई अच्छी स्थिति नहीं है, यह मैं स्वीकार करता हूं। इस के साथ यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान से हमारे अच्छे से अच्छे सम्बन्ध रहें, यह तो ठीक है, लेकिन उसी के साथ साथ जहां तक कश्मीर का सम्बन्ध है, हमें जरा भी नहीं झुकना है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी झुकना नहीं भी चाहते। कश्मीर हमारी भूमि है, कश्मीर कानूनी तौर पर हमारे साथ हुआ है। तो जहां तक काश्मीर का सम्बन्ध है, हम को यह मान लेना चाहिये कि उस की अन्तिम पुष्टि हो चुकी है। कश्मीर हमारा है और हमारा रहेगा। यह दो बातें तो हमारे देश से सम्बन्ध रखती हैं।

अन्त में मैं आप से यह कहूंगा कि मनुष्य का सृष्टि में सर्वश्रेष्ठ स्थान उस की ज्ञान शक्ति के कारण है। पहले हर शरद ऋतु में युद्ध में जाना राजाओं का कर्तव्य माना जाता

था। आज दुनियां की वह स्थिति नहीं रही। आज यदि कोई युद्ध भी होता है तो उस के लिये बीस दलीलें देनी पड़ती हैं कि विवश होकर हमें युद्ध करना पड़ रहा है। जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया हमारे पास फौजी ताकत नहीं पर हमारे पास शांति का दूतत्व है जो भारत वर्ष की हजारों वर्षों की संस्कृति है। भगवान श्री कृष्ण ने भी यही शांति का दूतत्व किया, भगवान महावीर और भगवान बुद्ध ने भी शांति का उपदेश दिया, महात्मा गांधी ने भी वही शांति का कार्य किया और पंडित जी उस संस्कृति के अनुसार चलते हुए वह कार्य कर रहे हैं जो आज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परसों दुनियां में अपना बेजोड़ स्थान रखने वाला है और शांति स्थापित होने वाली है क्योंकि यदि शांति स्थापित नहीं होती तो दुनियां का कोई भविष्य नहीं है।

Dr. Vijaya Ananda (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can assure you that you will have no occasion to ring the bell where I am concerned. I believe in brevity, and give more opportunities to hon. Members of this House to follow and speak. It is now nearly two months and three weeks since we last had a debate on foreign affairs. Much water has flowed and many things have happened in this world. There was a terrific congregation of Heads of States and in that august body there was the lone voice of our Prime Minister who stood by certain principles irrespective of whether it pleased the people or displeased the people. In this congregation, which should have really produced good results, what actually happened was, there was showing of fists and thumping of tables and there was a representative of one country, whose name I am not prepared to mention, who actually took out his slipper and hurled it at the table. So, it was not a body which really had much decorum in it.

Our Prime Minister moved a resolution in order to bring the nations together, particularly America and Russia. He stood for those principles—it did not matter whether they pleased or displeased the people. I read in the papers that the Australian Prime Minister was very offended and said that he would take up the matter, but later on he realised and, as a sportsman, he came forward and, I am told, he shook hands with our Prime Minister.

But, at the same time, I was also pained to read in the papers that when our Prime Minister passed through England the usual diplomatic courtesies were not extended to him. I do not know whether it is a fact or not.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say, Sir, that it is not correct?

Dr. Vijaya Ananda: I am very happy to hear it. It was only a newspaper report.

The resolution and the speech made by the Prime Minister will be written in letters of gold, as it was one of the finest speeches made in that great Assembly. Whatever the result was, the world admired that resolution and it was a moral victory for India.

From the Prime Minister's speech today, it came to our knowledge that Shri Rajeshwar Dayal was chosen by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I really thought that it was a routine appointment. But this is indeed a happy event, because they have selected an Indian officer from this country and it speaks volumes of the administrative ability in this country of ours.

Since you have allowed a little reference to border disputes, I would just like to mention about China. The violation of our air space still continues. Their indifference to the various protests made by this country both by diplomatic and personal approaches is still as ruthless and inhuman as it has always been. I do not know why we are still sponsoring their case in the United Nations, because I am one of

those who subscribe to that school of thought that a Biblical saying comes to my mind—"An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth". That is how I view China. And, Communist propaganda is still worse than before both outside and within our frontiers.

Field Marshal Ayub was all honey and jam to Shri Nehru when he went there. Noble as he is, he gave all that; and he gave with both hands. But the moment Shri Nehru left Pakistan and returned back to India, Field Marshal Ayub issued a statement the other day, which is reported by the PTI. The statement reads as follows:

"President Ayub Khan today expressed doubts whether it would be 'worthwhile' for him to go to India. Answering questions by newsmen on his return here this morning after a 12-day tour of the UAR and Saudi Arabia, President Ayub said:

"There is no date fixed for my visit to India. If it is worthwhile to go to India, one could go any time. But the question is whether it is worthwhile to go."

A correspondent asked President Ayub to comment on 'bitter criticism in the Indian Press' of the speeches he made during his recent tour of occupied Kashmir.

President Ayub: "Truth is always bitter. But it was meant for the good of both India and Pakistan. (President Ayub had said during his tour that the Pakistan Army would not allow the Kashmir problem to remain unsolved for long and that Pakistan could not trust India until the Kashmir issue was solved)."

What he has said about the Army is his usual threat of "I shall take all I get and I shall keep on asking for more". This is, in my opinion, hitting below the belt and may I also say is just not cricket. Having invited our Prime Minister to his country and having said that the best of relations

[Shri Vijaya Ananda].

will now exist between us, to turn round and do this is just not cricket.

It is pleasing indeed that youth is going to play a big part in world affairs. Mr. Kennedy is the next President of America and indeed this is going to be a great event in world affairs, because he will not have those conservative ideas and he does not belong to that school of thought which follows the old regime and the old system. So, it augurs well for the whole world that Mr. Kennedy is going to be the next President, who has already been called as a friend of India.

I can say that our policy of non-alignment has resulted in commanding the respect of the whole world. Shri Nehru is the apostle of non-alignment. It is India's supreme good luck—thanks to the Prime Minister's supreme wisdom—to have steered clear of the two blocks and remained, as firmly as ever, wholly uncommitted. The world situation today, we may justly claim, has given a new sanction to the basic policy of non-alignment. There is growing recognition that non-alignment, which is stepped in the *ahimsa* of our priceless heritage is the only sovereign remedy to nuclear annihilation. This policy of non-alignment has served us so well that it becomes our duty to salute our Prime Minister as its apostle. Gandhiji was the apostle of non-violence and Shri Nehru is the apostle of non-alignment. I also congratulate the External Affairs Ministry on the splendid work it has done.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard with great interest the opening speech of the Prime Minister, which is a summary of his address to the UNO. The safety of a nation, the integrity of a country and its future depend mainly on a wise, judicious and effective handling of its foreign affairs and any wrong step taken may

spell disaster not only to the present generation, but to the posterity also. So, it is necessary that on questions of foreign policy the leaders of all parties are taken into confidence and foreign policy is placed above party politics. There must be a considerable measure of agreement on fundamental principles. It is only this united action that will ensure the continuity of our foreign policy and also strengthen the nation.

At the same time, it is necessary for us to express our views and our ideas freely and frankly, not to embarrass the Prime Minister, but in an endeavour to lead the country in a safe path. After the war, the world has become very much disturbed. It has become a tumultuous world. Blocs have been formed. Distrust among nations is growing. Talks on disarmament have been going on, but still no concrete step has been achieved.

In this connection, I must state that the United Nations have played a notable part in preventing conflicts among great nations. It has played a supreme part in preventing war on many occasions. It is true the UN has its own shortcomings. But the nations that are members of this world organisation must not become impatient at them. All the nations must work together with that supreme object of achieving peace and preventing war. But if any nation wants to set at naught the good work of the UN or to break away from it, it is all the more necessary for the remaining nations to band themselves together and carry forward the banners of freedom and justice with a stout heart, and also uphold the true ideals of democracy.

The recent meeting of the world organisation, as was pointed out by the Prime Minister, is a unique one and a historic one. Heads of States, including Presidents, Prime Ministers and Kings participated in the present meeting of the United Nations. Mr. Khrushchev also very jubilantly came

and attended the meeting. Our Prime Minister also attended the meeting full of hope and buoyancy. But he had to return most depressed. Though the present session of the United Nations was attended by the Heads of States, it was a foregone conclusion,—at least I had no delusion,—that nothing tangible would be achieved. I know that nothing tangible will be achieved and the complications will increase on account of the background. This meeting was preceded by many unpleasant incidents, incidents which were not only political but personal. There was the break-up of the Summit meeting; there was the flight of the U-2 plane on the Russian border, which was brought down by Soviet Rockets. If that Summit meeting had continued, perhaps some substantial progress would have been made towards achieving peace. Then again, there was the unpleasant incident of withdrawing the invitation that was extended to the American President. The Americans had to confine the Russian Prime Minister to the Manhattan Island, and the Russian Prime Minister was insistent on the removal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. All these incidents not only created increased complications but also a personal animosity between these two mighty nations. On this background, we knew perfectly well that nothing tangible will be achieved and, there would be more complications rather than achieve peace.

Mr. Khrushchev, Judging from what happened subsequently—it is quite obvious to all—attended the meeting of the United Nations, not with a genuine object of achieving peace but to disrupt and disintegrate it, and his main idea seems to be to create a bloc, specially a Communist bloc within the world organisation. The world organisation, in my opinion, must be a non-party organisation and when the members function there they must feel that they are above the nations and they must think of the world. But this idea was to create complications and to have one of his own Secretary.

I am glad that his manoeuvres were not appreciated by the other countries and various other countries resisted it. As I said, if any member of the United Nations tries to disintegrate it or wants to have it split up, it must be resisted by other nations. His behaviour, his gestures, his undemocratic expressions, culminating in the brandishing of a shoe certainly would not pave the way for peace. On the other hand, it looks as if Mr. Khrushchev attended this meeting with the sole object of strengthening his own doctrine, the Communist doctrine and turning the world to his side, as, he once expressed that he would like to see the Communist flag flying over every country. That seems to be his sole object.

Our Prime Minister played an important part in the United Nations. His address, which I heard over the radio, had a mixed reception. As he said, the four points to be considered were: disarmament, colonialism, Congo and the structure of the United Nations. So far as disarmament is concerned, I do not think any country or any nation is opposed to it. Every country wants disarmament. We want disarmament because we know that unless there is disarmament there would be no peace. Now the question is: how to achieve disarmament? We have come to the conclusion that disarmament cannot be achieved now on account of the mutual distrust existing between the nations. That distrust must be removed. So I say that our Prime Minister should have concentrated himself on how to remove the distrust. He has played the role of a conciliator. He tried his best to reconcile these two mighty nations. But some of his utterances made them lose their confidence in him. For example, he referred to Congo. I agree with him that Congo is an important matter. But Congo is in its present position because of the Congolese people themselves. Belgians wanted to get out of Congo and leave or entrust it to the people

[Mohammed Imam].

of Congo. But the Congolese people are not united. They fight among themselves. There are parties of Mobutu, Lumumba and Kasavubu fighting among themselves. So, the present situation is not due to the fault of the United Nations or any other power.

Then, our Prime Minister referred to colonialism. It is true that colonialism is bad and all the nations or powers that are dominating over other countries must withdraw. At the same time, we must give credit to the Western Powers for their attitude, for their action in releasing a number of countries which were under their subjugation, which were colonies till now. I think nearly 30 countries have been released from colonialism and they are independent nations now and many of them have got an honoured place in the United Nations. I wish our Prime Minister had shown some appreciation of this attitude of the Western Powers. I am sure that in future colonialism will become a thing of the past.

But I must refer to another form of imperialism, which our Prime Minister has not criticised. Here I am speaking of the Communist form of imperialism. Russia has been pursuing the policy of a new form of imperialism, an imperialism which is not only strategic but also ideological, which threatens the welfare and safety of several nations. Formerly, eastern Europe comprised of nearly 13 to 15 States. Where are they? They have all become satellites of Russia. All those ancient nations have been extinguished. What about East Germany? Russia does not want it to go to West Germany and it does not want to restore it to its original status. What about Hungary? What about other countries? This is a more dangerous form of imperialism because it is not merely imperialism but it assimilates. Communists want to assimilate all the other countries.

We are placed in a similar danger. One Communist country, China, is keenly pursuing a policy of imperialism without rhyme or regard and it has stealthily occupied 40,000 sq. miles of our territory and now it does not want to give it back. It is true that many unpleasant things have happened since then. The Prime Minister, has not the same robust confidence and the determination which he had at the commencement of the aggression because at that time he said that he would not have any talk or any negotiation with China unless they vacate the occupied territory. But he is arguing now, that there may be Chinese plane flights over India, there may be incursions. The safety of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim is threatened. Their position has become very vulnerable. With all these things he seems complacent. In fact, we have to apprehend the greatest danger from that quarter.

It is true that some negotiations have been going on between the two teams of officials, that is, the Indian and the Chinese teams. I have no illusions about it. I know how it will end. While these negotiations have been going on. The Chinese Prime Minister, Chou En-lai gives a press statement in London and accuses India of being in possession of Chinese territory. While that is going on, do you expect that there will be any negotiations and any concrete steps to restore what has been taken from us unlawfully?

Even if some negotiations take place and some settlement is arrived at, still the fundamental danger is there. When the Chinese occupied Tibet, when Tibet was obliterated by China, a permanent source of danger to India was created. Till now historically India was supposed to be impregnable from its northern border. If the enemy approached, it was through the west. But now it has become very vulnerable from the northern side.

The Chinese are sitting on the hoary heights of the Himalayas as I said last time, and looking greedily at the Indo-Gangetic valley. Not only the integrity of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim is affected. I do not know what is their future. If China pursues its Communist-imperialist policy, India will have to face a very great task. So unless Tibet is restored to its original position and is given back to its original peace-loving people, India will have to face the danger constantly and posterity will curse us. This question had been brought up in the U.N.O. But I regret very much that the hon. Prime Minister never made any reference regarding the Chinese aggression in the U.N. He never made any reference to it and never brought to the notice of the U.N. of Chinese aggression. On the other hand, India was very vociferous in supporting China's inclusion in the U.N.

As has been pointed out, perhaps China by itself formerly had a seat. But can an aggressor be made a member of the UN? When you advocate its inclusion, your advocacy clearly shows a spirit of appeasement. That policy of appeasement may give a wrong impression to others and they may think that we are yielding to Chinese pressure. So I submit that we must be firm and we must fight for Tibet's restoration because unless that buffer state is constituted, India's safety is at stake. Dalai Lama's cause must be taken up and supported. The initial mistake was committed when India admitted the suzerainty of China over Tibet.

Now I may speak of the internal differences. We can fight against external foes and defeat them, but it is very difficult to fight against ourselves. The unfortunate position is that in our country there are people who keep the party above the country. The country may go, but they want their party to continue and to flourish. In their zeal to uphold their party principles, they will have no

hesitation when an occasion arises to invite persons to come from abroad. That is what is happening. You were pleased to state yesterday, though it has been refuted by my hon. friend Professor Hiren Mukerjee, that there are Communist elements who are in sympathy with the Chinese policy and who, when the occasion arises and if the party demands, will give aid to them and act against the interests of the country because this party is a worldwide organisation and they are under so many obligations.

I read recently in some paper that the Home Ministry wanted to introduce legislation treating any doubt entertained regarding the integrity of the country as treason. It was also pointed out therein that at the interference of the External Affairs Ministry, the Bill could not be brought before Parliament. This is a paper report; I do not know how far it is true. Anyhow, I feel that the time has come when necessary action has to be taken to suppress fifth columnists. The country is at stake. Its integrity is most important. Its safety is most important.

Only one word about the affairs in the U.N. You, Sir, in all sincerity, supported by four other nations, brought up that Resolution with a view to bring together Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower. Your intentions were laudable, no doubt. But, I am afraid, the Resolution was not a practical one. Besides, it was a personal one. Your idea was to bring together Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev and ask them to talk over. Do you know the personal differences? In fact, the differences were so acute and were so personal that any amount of Resolution or any number of resolutions of the U.N. would not have brought them together. Even supposing the U.N. had accepted the Resolution, nobody could have compelled these two leaders to meet, if they did not want. It is something like this. A boy does not want to marry a girl and a girl does not want to marry a boy. A Resolution of this

[Mohammed Imam].

Parliament cannot compel them to go and marry. On the other hand, it would have been more prudent, it would have been more practical if you had held prior consultation with them. In fact, whenever we from the opposition bring up any important matters here we meet you and it is only if there is a 50 per cent chance of its acceptance, we bring it up. Before bringing up the Resolution, I wish you had consulted the two leaders as to what their reaction would be and whether they are willing to meet. A person who has been confined to Manhattan island and a person who has been faced with refusal of invitation—was there any chance of these two coming together? On the other hand, the amendment moved by the Australian Prime Minister Mr. Menzies was a more practical one, though you did not like it. The amendment was to omit the personal reference to Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, and suggesting that Russia and America should meet. Russia and America included Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower. If you had accepted it, it would have been more practical. On the other hand, that amendment upset you and you withdrew the Resolution in a temper.

Mr. Speaker: All these are addressed not to me, I suppose.

Shri Mohammed Imam: No, Sir. The Australian amendment was more practical. I do not know whether our Prime Minister's prestige has gone high or low. But, one thing, I must submit. There is a general feeling not only in this country, but in others also that our Prime Minister is being influenced by the Communist bloc.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Mohammed Imam: I am speaking frankly.

An Hon. Member: For the Swatantra party?

Shri Mohammed Imam: Whatever it may be, in fact, his denouncing of colonialism, the absence of any reference to communist domination, his partial support to Mr. Khrushchev to reconstitute the secretariat of the U.N., our Prime Minister suggested along with the Secretary an Assistant Secretary, his advocacy for the admission of China to U.N.—all these have created a feeling in India and elsewhere, it may be wrong, that his leanings are more towards communism.

I submit that India must be strong. Peace can be achieved in three ways. It can be achieved through strength, through appeasement, through conciliation. Appeasement and conciliation are out of the question. If we want to achieve peace, it must be through strength. Of course, our Prime Minister is very much wedded to a policy of non-alignment, but in a time of emergency, when we have a mighty enemy at our doors, there should be at least some Powers to whom we can turn for help. The time has come for the Prime Minister to revise his policy of non-alignment. It has been suggested that India has been running with the hares and hunting with the hounds. The policy must be changed. I feel that the country's future will not be safe unless we revise our present foreign policy and adopt a sounder policy so that the safety and integrity of the country may be ensured.

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Our Prime Minister, having studied at close quarters the work of the U.N., has been able to give us a complete and comprehensive picture of the problems that come up before the U.N., and it is indeed very creditable to all of us to know that our Prime Minister played a very important role in the present session of the U.N.

He has brought out in his speech the useful part that the U.N. continues

to play in the world, and emphasized that this House, the Government of India and the people of India must uphold the U.N. There can be no doubt that the U.N. has, of late, been taking interest in maintaining the independence of the smaller countries which have recently become free, and trying its best to support them with resources in order that they may maintain and guard their independence. It has been real good work under the direction of the present Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld.

If India went to the U.N., it was with a view to utilise the U.N. for a good purpose, namely the advancement of peace, unlike our friend Mr. Khrushchev who, obviously, went there to destroy the influence and also the importance that the U.N. commands, at any rate, among the new rising nations of the world whom they generally describe the uncommitted nations. The part that India has played under the direction of our Prime Minister recently in the U.N. has, I think, in a way taken India a long way towards getting her the leadership of the uncommitted nations in the U.N. It is perfectly plain that influence is gradually and increasingly shifting from what are called the Western democracies to these uncommitted nations as a number of these uncommitted nations join the United Nations Organisation. I believe that India will soon come to play an important role in the United Nations, particularly as the leader of the Afro-Asian Group in the United Nations Organisation. While we make a great contribution in the general field towards the advancement of peace, that may also mean that India is going to incur a greater financial expenditure by way of contribution to the increasing expenses of that organisation. Having regard to the objectives that we have in view about the United Nations, I suppose, it is permissible for our Government and our country to make a greater contribution towards

the expenses of the United Nations Organisation.

The Prime Minister referred to one very interesting feature of the work done by the United Nations, particularly in Congo. The United Nations put its foot there in order to see that the integrity and the independence of Congo are maintained without being destroyed by external factors or external forces, and I think it has done a really very good job in sending out its own forces there and its other organisations to set up a sort of administration which will protect that independence, at the same time adopting the principle that the sovereignty of the Congolese Parliament and the Congolese set-up of the Prime Minister and the President must be upheld, though, as the Prime Minister of our country has pointed out, there are other forces which are trying to disrupt that integrity.

I am not at all surprised that when a new community gets their independence, there is a tendency, however, to disintegrate themselves. Unfortunately, it has happened in our own country, when India was divided into Bharat and Pakistan. And it is not such a very tragic feature that Katanga or any portion of Congo wants to remain a separate entity, though, ultimately, if good forces are at work, they might be united into a kind of federation. However, if we maintain that the Congolese people are one, and that the Congo is one vast territory, which must be under one administration, we must, uphold the line and the stand taken up by the United Nations, which our Prime Minister did.

With regard to colonialism, the Prime Minister said that even though the Belgians, having granted independence, have gone out of Congo, they are coming back and gradually filtering back into Congo in order either to disrupt or perhaps to get control over the economic resources of the country which they had been

[Shri Siva Raj].

enjoying hitherto. Colonialism works more like communalism in India. Communalism quite often disappears under the guise of nationalism and so on, but it comes back in various shapes, in other features of our economic life. So, likewise, colonialism also, even though it is supposed to have gone out of these territories, comes back to have a hold on the economic resources of these countries.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Member concluding his speech now, or does he want to speak for some more time?

Shri Siva Raj: I shall take a few more minutes.

Mr. Speaker: He may continue tomorrow.

17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 23rd November, 1960/Agrahayana 2, 1882 (Saka).
