

12.31.

**ASSAM MUNICIPAL (MANIPUR
AMENDMENT) BILL***

The Minister of Health (Shri Karmarkar): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Assam Municipal Act, 1956, as in force in the Union territory of Manipur.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Assam Municipal Act, 1956 as in force in the Union territory of Manipur."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Karmarkar: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

12.32 hrs.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

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

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

Sir, we have this discussion almost in every session and, normally speaking, the discussion may be divided into two parts: one, the narration of the world's ills, the various ills that the world suffers from and which do not seem to lessen but tend to increase, and, secondly, some of our own problems in regard to foreign countries.

Now, although our own problems naturally affect us and interest us, the major problems are, nevertheless, the world's problems, because if something goes wrong in the world it affects us.

At the present moment the world is facing rather a serious situation.

For the last few years there has been a great deal of talk of disarmament, of lessening tension in the world and all that. All this talk has, unfortunately, led, in the present months, to further armament instead of disarmament. Now there is a greater degree of armament and a very definite drift towards an international conflict on a big scale.

Immediately, of the many issues, the world's biggest problem relates to Germany and to the city of Berlin. These matters relating to Germany—West Germany, East Germany, West Berlin and East Berlin—are dependent on a large number of agreements, protocols and the like ever since, I think, 1942 they started up to later in 1945, 1947 and 1948 and so on—and I do not propose to go into all these articles and protocols. Indeed, normally speaking, a decision on them should be made by the principal parties concerned, and we have no direct business to interfere or to express our own opinion. I have, therefore, refrained from expressing any opinion about the legal issues involved, but when a matter threatens to engulf the world in war then it is everybody's interest that this should be avoided. So I have mentioned it, though I do not propose to go into any detail with regard to it.

Now, there are two or three matters, however, that stand out. Recently, in the last two or three days, something has been done which has increased tension. What the legal implications of that are, it is rather a difficult matter—how far one can stop egress or ingress from one part of Berlin or ingress from one part of Germany to the other. But there are two or three things. The first is, I think, whether one likes it or not, as a geographical fact there are two States existing now in Germany: one is West Germany or the Federal Government of Germany, and the other is East Germany. It is desirable, I think it would be a normal development, for the two States to come together. Now, how

they can come together is not clear to me, until and unless these tremendous tensions are resolved somehow and the fears and suspicions that afflict some of the great powers are lessened, because they can either be brought together by a process of war—and one tries to avoid that because that will destroy not only them but others too—or by some agreement. That agreement can only come when these tensions are less and the fears of each party are also much less. I do not myself understand how the geographical fact of two States is going to, well, cease to exist by any other process except by agreement or war. There is no other way out of it. Now, those States not only stand by themselves but one of them, namely, the Federal Government, that is West Germany, is a very important member of the NATO alliance. East Germany is a member of the Warsaw alliance. So there are not only two States, but States having separate alliances with groups of countries.

Now, at the present moment, one issue which has arisen, and which should I hope be cleared up, is the question of the relationship of West Berlin to West Germany and the access to West Berlin from parts of West Germany. I should have thought that it is an admitted matter that the fullest facilities for access to West Berlin should be given. I believe, it has been recognised—naturally Western Germany and western powers want that—fully by Mr. Khrushchev too. If that is a fact, everybody agrees then that at least one major cause of tension and friction will disappear, whatever other developments may take place, and I believe it is this fear that not now but step by step a situation might arise when this access to West Berlin will be stopped or hindered that gives rise to so many fears and, therefore, even some other steps which may not be objectionable or objected to. But that could be made clear, that whatever else happens this access to West

Berlin will remain. It is rather presumptuous of me or anyone to suggest anything to the great powers who are involved in this but, nevertheless, because the situation is so dangerous one has to say something and cannot remain quiet about it. Thus far, in spite of the fact that West Germany and East Germany are opposed to each other, are members of opposing alliances and, in a sense, do not almost recognise each other, the fact is, and quite inevitably, there have been many contacts between them. Large numbers of workers go from West Germany to East Germany; have been going in the past, and large numbers of people from East Germany go to West Germany, work for the day and go back. That has been happening till recently. I am not sure if it is happening now, for the last two days or not, but I gather that in spite of the closure of the frontier, still there is a fair amount of movement between the two and people go. A son of a friend of mine, who is in West Germany, telephoned yesterday because his father was rather anxious about him, and said "don't worry, we are still moving about from West Germany to East Germany". In fact, he told me that he was speaking from East Germany though he was living in the western part. So, he came to East Germany from the western part and telephoned, and there is a reason for it from his point of view, because, the telephone costs are cheaper from East Germany to Delhi. So, these contacts by men, trade, commerce, etc. go on.

If it is our objective that the two Germanys should come together and there should be a unified Germany, I should have thought that the process would be to help these contacts so that there are more and more contacts and, ultimately, it becomes easier to unify them. But, of course, the real difficulty is behind these two Germanys are two opposing forces, two alliances, two blocs and until that is removed, the tension between the two

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

is lessened, they are not allowed to come together, although they may trade with each other, they may commerce with each other and have other contacts. I would have suggested with respect that these contacts should be increased, and that will be a step towards the ultimate unification of Germany, if that is to come about. That cannot come about, I do submit, without some process of getting closer to each other. The only other result would be either continuing tension, as at present, or war, which, I believe, most people wish to avoid.

There is on one side undoubtedly fear of, let us say, Soviet power and the peculiar position of Berlin in the heart of East Germany. On the other side, let us always remember, there is still a continuing fear in the minds of Eastern Europe, not only in the Soviet Union but even in other countries, of the revival of the German militarism. It is a fear which has come basis in history, including the two major wars when all that area has been invaded by Germany. I hope this process will not occur again, but there it is and we have to realise it. It is not a one-sided fear; it is a two-sided fear and you cannot solve any problems when they are wrapped up in this fear.

One obvious way, if not to solve the problem, to lessen the fears is to have disarmament on a very considerable scale. Immediately, many of these fears would lessen, and that is why we have attached so much importance to disarmament; not only because in itself it is good, but because it will lessen these fears which afflict the world. Thus, united Germany, however desirable that may be, it cannot possibly come about without removing these tensions.

I just mentioned disarmament which seems almost a far-off dream. We thought it was coming within grasp but today something is happening which is the reverse of it. Fortunately, the ban on nuclear tests, or suspension of them, still continues.

But, after having come very near to an agreement, something has happened and the agreement is as far off as ever. I should have thought that the very least is that each country should declare, each major power should declare, that it will not use nuclear weapons. Well, if the other party uses it, there is danger; I admit that. But that is the least.

On this question of disarmament and nuclear weapons, specially the question of nuclear weapons, at the present moment only a few countries possess them. There are only three countries which possess them, or three countries which possess them rather fully, and they are the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom. Now France has also entered this ring. But it is obvious that in the course of a few years, may be two, three or four years or more, many more countries are likely to have them, and if there is no check on their production and manufacture now, then it will become impossible at a later stage to put any check on them, if many countries have them. At present, perhaps those three or four countries might agree. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that these countries should try to arrive at a settlement in regard to these nuclear tests and, of course, in regard to general disarmament.

One question which has been very much in the news and which I should mention is Laos. In a sense, some progress has been made in regard to the Laotian situation. But progress has been slow and I can very well understand people who are dealing with it, either in Geneva or in Laos, itself, often feeling rather frustrated. Still, there has been some progress. And the progress has really come because of some agreements arrived at between the three princes. The three princes are supposed to represent three groups, three tendencies. But having come to that agreement there in Zurich, I think the princes have parted company and the agreement cannot be given full effect to, although talks are going on, for the

formation of a national government in Laos itself. In the meanwhile, in Geneva, where a conference is being held, they discussed these matters, waiting for some decision by the princes or by the Laotian people. Therefore, the first question in regard to Laos is the formation of a national government. It is admitted all round that Laos should be a neutral State, as it is called, and should not be aligned to any military bloc and that foreign armies should be removed from Laotian territory. That is admitted, but how is it to be done in black and white is being discussed in Geneva.

Now, there is some argument also about the role of the International Commission. On the one side, it is said that the International Commission should be a powerful body which can act when it chooses and how it chooses. On the other side, it is said the powers of the International Commission should be reduced so that it cannot function easily. Our own attitude in regard to this matter is that the International Commission can perform a very important and useful service in Laos.

But it can only do so with the goodwill of the Government and the people there. It cannot be some kind of a super-Government coming over and functioning over the head of the Laotian Government. That would be a very definite diminution of the sovereignty of the Laotian Government and it will not create smooth relations. It must stand there on its own right, the right given by the 14 nation conference being held there including the Government of Laos and it should have a fair measure of freedom to investigate into charges made and to go anywhere. But it must function ultimately, naturally, under the Laotian Government and with its goodwill. There should be no great difficulty about that if there is that goodwill.

Now I come to Africa. Africa is a country which has in the last year or more come very much on the international scene and has offered tremendous problems in the Congo etc. In the Congo it is still rather difficult to see clearly what is happening, but broadly speaking there has been an improvement in the situation in the Congo and it appears that some kind of an agreement has been arrived at between the Government at Leopoldville and the Government at Stanleyville, that is, of Mr. Gizenga's. The person who is standing out rather is Mr. Tshombe of Katanga. I hope that the decisions of the Parliament that has been held recently will hold and will be given effect to and that the solidarity of the Congo will remain.

But in Africa there is the old question of Algeria. Repeated attempts at negotiations have not brought any fruitful result yet. One can only hope that these will be resumed and out of them will come decisions confirming the independence of Algeria. Unfortunately for Algeria, the Sahara Desert is producing oil. Oil is always a troublesome thing, something that leads to cupidity and conflict. Normally one should say obviously that the Sahara Desert should be a part of Algeria or, maybe, a part of Tunis. Whatever it is, that is creating a good deal of trouble. I feel that the normal course should be followed and Algeria should include these areas. Anyhow, as the House knows, we have supported Algeria completely throughout this period.

One question has certainly arisen, that is, the recognition of the Provisional Government of Algeria. Many friends, hon. Members opposite and on this side too, have felt that we should recognise the Provisional Government of Algeria. It may be that we have taken a rather legalistic view because normally speaking one does not recognise a government which

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
 does not function on the soil, except in wartime when this is being done, that is, emigre governments. So, while we were completely in favour of Algeria's independence and the success of their nationalist struggle, we did hesitate to recognise this Government. In fact, however, although *de jure* recognition was not given to it, *de facto* recognition to some extent has taken place. We have met the Ministers of the Provisional Government and in a few days time, in a fortnight or so, as I should presently inform the House, I am going to Belgrade to attend a conference of certain non-aligned countries and the Provisional Government of Algeria is also represented there. So we function together *de facto*. It is not a matter of high principle although some principles and practices of international law are involved in it. Nevertheless, it is not a matter of high principle and it is for us to consider afresh whether we should recognise the Provisional Government of Algeria or not and, if so, when we should do so. We thought that our non-formal recognition, that is, *de-jure* recognition, would probably help us in some ways in dealing with this problem, in helping it and in helping them to find a solution. But if that is not so and other circumstances arise, we shall consider the question then of formally recognising the Provisional Government of Algeria.

In Africa, however, the part of Africa which is more before the public eye than any other today is Angola. The Portuguese territory there, according to all the information that we have got, is not very much because the whole place is a closed place where hardly anybody can enter. But whatever information we have got has indicated that something very horrible has been happening in Angola. Although, as the House knows, we have not been very favourably inclined towards Portugal during the last many years, what is happening in Angola has been so horrible that whoever has heard of it, whether in this

country or in any other country, his reaction has been one of extreme anger for there are some things which ought to be ruled out. But under the Portuguese rule there nothing is ruled out. These massacres have taken place on a big scale and yet the people of Angola have been struggling not without some success. It is not an easy matter for the Portuguese Government to suppress the Angolan people now though it may be a long business. Of course there is Mozambique and other Portuguese territories which may also be drawn into this conflict.

One aspect of these Portuguese colonies, more especially Angola now and Goa a little time ago, is the indirect help, or rather encouragement—some times help too in addition to encouragement—that it has received from the fact that it is a NATO country. That is a very important fact which I have no doubt has made a difference to the Portuguese also. But so bad has been the Portuguese activities in Angola recently that many countries, even NATO countries that encouraged Portugal or helped it, have had to desist and express their displeasure. The House may know that even the United States of America voted against Portugal in the United Nations on this issue. One NATO country, Norway, has openly and publicly said that they will not assist directly or indirectly in anything that Portugal does. The fact is that Portugal is supplied with arms by big Powers which, undoubtedly, I believe are being used in Angola against the people. But it is not arms so much that I am thinking of but of the passive support that Portugal has got because of its being a NATO country or because it is said to be, as in the case of the United Kingdom, their oldest ally. Well, because it is their oldest ally everything that it does has to be encouraged, however evil it may be, does not necessarily follow. It has been a very painful thing for many countries including ours to see how in the last few months in various ways the British Government has

shown sympathy for Portugal, and even though latterly they have expressed a certain mild disapproval—very mild—of some of its activities, their close relationship continues. But I might say that I am not in favour of the N.A.T.O. or Warsaw Pact or C.E.N.T.O. or whatever it is. Apart from that general opinion, I should like to say something about N.A.T.O. and it is this. Whatever virtues or good points N.A.T.O. may have, N.A.T.O. suffers very greatly in public estimation in every country because Portugal is a Member of the N.A.T.O. It is manifest, if N.A.T.O. stands to fight for the free countries of the world and Portugal is one of the upholders of freedom, God help those who want that type of freedom.

13 hrs.

An Hon. Member: What about Kenya, Tanganyika and Rhodesia?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Angola matter is not a local matter. It is not just a N.A.T.O. matter to be considered in the purview of the four corners of the N.A.T.O. It is a world matter. It is going to bring grief, of course, to Portugal. But, I fear, the credit of those who support Portugal will not go far if they go on supporting Portugal and its activities in Angola.

An hon. Member opposite said something about Kenya, Rhodesia, etc. Kenya and Rhodesia deserve attention. We are greatly interested in what is happening there and what should happen. There is no comparison between Kenya and Rhodesia and Angola. Let us see things in the proper perspective. In Kenya I am glad to know that Mr. Kenyatta has been released after nine years in prison, after this tremendously long period, and we hope his release will lead to unity in the popular forces in Kenya and that unity will lead to freedom and independence in Kenya. In Rhodesia, in the Central African Federation as it is called, there has been a confusing and a very unsatisfactory position. The mere fact

that the National movement there has been quite unable to agree to some of the recent proposals of the U.K. Government shows that the situation is unsatisfactory. Southern Rhodesia, I am afraid, is affected far too much by closeness of the South African Union. Northern Rhodesia is more distant and seems to pull in a different direction. But, it is clear, whether you take Nyasaland or other parts of the Federation, this Federation, as it is, is not likely to continue. It is opposed by the Africans. You cannot long impose it upon reluctant masses of the population there.

I come to certain things affecting us more closely, certain statements of the President of Pakistan. I am reluctant to say much about them except this that I was surprised and grieved at some of the statements. Not that I expect him to say things that I like or which we may approve of. But, the whole context of some of these statements, the way they were said and the way that India was made the subject of his attacks in foreign countries, did seem to me very peculiar and undesirable. It is not normally done, more especially by Heads of States. That is why I was greatly surprised. It showed a mental approach which I thought was deplorable. The mental approach was just hatred of India, dislike that India should make any progress and generally a basic policy that did not think so much positively of Pakistan, but rather negatively of what should happen to India. I have said previously that although much has been said about Kashmir in Pakistan—President Ayub Khan has said that if the Kashmir question is settled according to his liking, then all would be well—I am absolutely convinced, convinced more than ever that it does not matter what happens to Kashmir,—I know what will happen to Kashmir; that is a different matter—this question of India and Pakistan is not dependent on Kashmir, but has deeper roots, unfortunately, in the minds of the rulers of Pakistan. If the Kashmir

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
 question was removed from the scene today, even then, Pakistan authorities—I say authorities, I do not think the people are concerned in this—would still fiercely attack India, because their whole policy is based on anti-India, on dislike of India, on envy of India, of India making progress and they remaining where they have been and probably going backwards. This is the basic policy and it is difficult to deal with it. One can judge our policies and their policies. Here in India, whether newspapers or the people or Parliament, we do not go about talking about Pakistan all the time. We may occasionally refer to it. We do not curse Pakistan. We want friendship with Pakistan, with the people there. We want the progress of Pakistan. We do not refer to Pakistan or any other issue while, in Pakistan, the major subject for debate is always India, dislike and hatred of India. This is extraordinary. They have developed a complex. Instead of looking after their own progress—Pakistan's progress—which we would welcome, they think their progress consists somehow of denigrating India. It is very difficult for us to deal with this kind of complex, this kind of mind.

If you analyse it, you will see how it has come there. The whole origin of Pakistan was not based on a positive concept. It was based on the concept of hatred, anti-India feeling. The brave people of Pakistan who had fought for Independence shoulder to shoulder with us, suddenly found themselves ruled by people who had taken no part in the Independence struggle. They had taken part against Independence. People who had supported the British rule, they became the rulers of Pakistan. They had no roots in the Independence movement. They had opposed it. Socially speaking, they belonged to certain classes—very good classes no doubt, but there it is—big landlord class and the like in Pakistan. I have no objection to that. I am merely

analysing it socially. So that, there was enormous difference between what took place in India and what took place in Pakistan almost both had the same roots in the Independence struggle. Nobody can ever forget the tremendous part played in the Independence struggle by the people of Pakistan as it is today. We were all together then. People in the North West Frontier Province, people of Punjab as a whole including Pakistan Punjab, people of Sind played a brave part. But, to our misfortune, maybe partly it was our fault—I am not prepared to say it was not—this religious or semi-religious or communal outlook developed in various parts of India and everywhere. I think it was partly our fault; I am not prepared to blame the people of Pakistan completely, because there was communalism in parts of India and there were reactions. However, that developed and that led ultimately to the partition of India and, that became a dominant feature in Pakistan governing the minds of the people. There was no positive approach. Hon. Members here many agree or disagree with the policy that we have been following in India. But, there has been a policy. Before we came to the Government, we had some kind of a policy, an economic policy, agrarian policy, policy in regard to landlordism and the like. And so, as soon as Independence came, we were full of these changes that we wished to bring about. And the record of the past twelve years is an attempt to bring about those changes in India, the Five Year Plans and the rest, and that attempt continues because it is a tremendous job. Regardless of any differences in regard to the actual policies pursued, the fact is that our minds were full of these changes to be brought about in various departments of life here, and that continues on an ever bigger scale.

In Pakistan, there was no such background. The only background was hatred of India, dislike of India and fear of India. Why fear? They need not have feared India, because

India could not attack them, both because our whole background is against it, and because we were full, not of Pakistan, not of anything else but of our economic planning, our Five Year Plans and the rest; we were full of them; we were not thinking of any trouble for Pakistan; we wanted peace to develop our country, and we hoped that they would develop theirs. But they had no such thing to fill their minds. The only thing there was hatred of India, fear of India, fear because they themselves imagined that since they thought of India, we probably think of them, which we did not. So, this is the background; let us remember, let us be clear about it.

Kashmir comes in, which is important, of course; Kashmir comes in, and comes in wrongly, of course, because in Kashmir, they are the guilty parties, as this House knows very well. But leave out these deeper considerations of guilt and lack of guilt. There are some obvious things. One is, and there is no doubt about it, that people from Pakistan or through Pakistan came to Kashmir, invaded Kashmir and committed arson, rape and every kind of crime. There was peace there. They say—and I say so; I am saying that this fact cannot be challenged—that they came to support some kind of a freedom movement in Kashmir. Well, there was some trouble in the Poonch area, some trouble there in the Maharaja's time. I mean there was some trouble there. But there had not been the least bit of trouble in the Kashmir valley, and they came to the Kashmir valley, and committed all this arson and everything in Muzaffarabad, against not Hindus so much—Hindus were only a few—but against the Muslims of those places; and Kashmir reacted in a particular way.

Apart from that, ever since then, for some years, there was this trouble going on, and Security Council, and all that, and there was a certain sense of uncertainty in Kashmir which made it difficult for reforms to

come in for several years. Originally, right from the beginning, we had thought of the Constituent Assembly in Kashmir. We stopped that, 'we' meaning the people, the people there stopped it, of course, certainly, with our consent. I am not referring to legal matters, Kashmir's accession to India etc. We all know that. Of course, Kashmir legally acceded to India, legally, practically and in every way, acceded to India. That is there, and that is a matter which has been accepted by the commissions that the United Nations sent here. So, we postponed this for a while. But when this matter went on dragging along, it was decided by the then Kashmir Government, in consultation with us, that they cannot stop progress. So, they had their Constituent Assembly, an elected Constituent Assembly, and the first act that it did was one of a radical land reform. It was one of the first parts of India to give effect to this radical land reforms and it went, I am glad to say, a little further than many of our States have done. However, there it was. It started functioning on a constructive reform basis, and there is much else since then.

After that, there have been two elections; and they framed their constitution, and after that, there have been two general elections, and the third is coming soon, when our general election takes place.

Repeatedly, the people of Kashmir or of that part of it which has not been aggressively occupied by the Pakistan forces have had occasion to vote in elections and in everything else, and they have been carrying on, and there is no doubt that in spite of all difficulties, Kashmir has made very considerable progress. In education, it has made remarkable progress, because they started from almost scratch. In other matters too, such as power development, and some small industries and some midling industries, it is making progress. Just look at the two pictures, the Kashmir

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
 which is making progress and that bit of Kashmir which is under Pakistan occupation, which is flat, doing nothing, doing practically nothing except singing songs of hatred; it is quite amazing; the difference, of course, is quite amazing. When people in Pakistan talk about plebiscite etc. in Kashmir, it does rather surprise one that a country which has given up the whole business of elections should advise another Power to have plebiscite and elections.

So, I have ventured to take the time of the House a little in probing back as to why it is so; it is because Pakistan has always got tied up in this way, mentally tied up in this way. I do not think that the people of Pakistan are so mentally tied up, though it is true that in the name of religion, it is always possible, whether in Pakistan or in India to rouse evil passions. I admit that, but broadly speaking, the people of Pakistan are free of this, but the governing authorities have got tied up in this way. And the result is that Pakistan has not yet developed roots national roots. You cannot have a national root based on just hatred of India. It must be positive. That is the difficulty that we have to deal with. We want Pakistan to have roots, to develop roots, to prosper, to go ahead, to co-operate with us, and we shall co-operate with them because that is a normal thing for two countries, any two adjoining neighbouring countries to do, more especially with a country like Pakistan which has been really part of us,—I am saying even now; there are so many contacts, human contacts, apart from geography, cultural and historical contact, but somehow, all this is almost wasted because of this approach.

We went pretty far in the Canal Waters Agreement. I think that it may justly be said that it was a generous agreement on our part. We profited by it too; that is why we

have agreed to it, but it was generous to Pakistan; the burdens we took, and with a view to bring about that agreement, other countries took also heavy burdens; Pakistan profited greatly by it. As soon as that was over, some good happened; otherwise too, some frontier agreements took place, which was a good thing, but soon after, a loud outcry was raised again about Kashmir.

Now, there is another matter which has not become a loud outcry yet, but we never know; it is beginning. That is in regard to certain rivers in East Bengal, or in East Pakistan, and West Bengal. The House knows very well about the Farrakka barrage scheme, which, essentially, apart from other things, is meant for the vital purpose of protection for the port of Calcutta. It is a most urgent matter, and unless we take it up, the port of Calcutta may just gradually become useless, and where will the city of Calcutta be, if the port of Calcutta goes that way? It is a matter of the greatest importance. Therefore, we have been dealing with it for some time, investigating this and that, and to some extent, not hurrying this process, because of Pakistan; we were waiting for our plans to be ready, when they became ready, we informed them about it.

When I was in England earlier this year for the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, President Ayub Khan mentioned to me about East Bengal rivers, and he said 'You are building something, and we intend to do something. Let us do it in such a way as to benefit each other, and anyhow, not to come in each other's way, and let us decide this at ministerial level, at a Ministers' meeting.' I said, 'Certainly; we are always prepared to co-operate with you. We shall gladly do this'. Then we had agreed to a Ministers level meeting. But obviously a meeting at the Ministers level can only

be fruitful if facts are gathered together and we know exactly what the facts are. So the engineers—Pakistan engineers and Indian engineers—meet. They have met thus far on three occasions. In fact, they had met previously too, but they have met twice since the beginning of this year, and they are going to meet again. They have been exchanging these facts and figures, which are very complicated, of course. I hope that after the next meeting, which is going to take place fairly soon, both parties would be in possession of these facts. Then the time will come, if it is considered necessary, for Ministers on both sides to meet and discuss, that is, not to allow matters to be dealt with by officials who cannot decide things.

But I see a kind of propaganda gradually beginning in Pakistan and to some extent in other countries by Pakistan's representatives to the effect that we are trying to do something by the Farakka Barrage, to do enormous injury to the people of East Pakistan, and millions will die and this and that. It is a most extraordinary thing. As a matter of fact, even then our approach to the Farakka Barrage is that we do not wish in any way to harm the interests of East Pakistan in this, and we shall try to adhere to that to the best of our ability. We are certainly prepared to talk to them about the whole area or about other schemes that they may have and we may have on the basis of the information gathered.

Now, I come to Nepal. There is one simple matter about Nepal about which I should like to inform the House, because people forget, and even the Nepalese seem to forget it. I am told that even the King of Nepal was rather surprised when he learnt of the measure of help we had given to Nepal and are giving today. He did not know apparently. Why, I do not know. So far, India has spent about Rs. 11 crores in aid to Nepal. In our Third Five Year

Plan, provision has been made for Rs. 18 crores to be spent in Nepal. This is apart from the Kosi irrigation and power project which is being built by us, estimated to cost Rs. 44.7 crores and the Gandak project which will cost us Rs. 50.5 crores. 1250 Nepalese have been trained in India in a variety of subjects. Our annual intake of Nepalese trainees in India is between 200 and 300. We have 137 Indian technical personnel helping in Nepal. These are just some odd figures. We have continued this help, and we have made no difference to it even though some changes took place in Nepal, as the House well knows, which were not very much to our liking. We did not allow that to affect the help we were giving to Nepal.

Now, I should like to say something about our border troubles with Tibet-China and refer specially to something that has apparently not been understood or approved of by some hon. Members, that is, the visit of the Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry to Peking on his way back from Mongolia. He went to Mongolia to participate in the 40th anniversary of the freedom of Mongolia. 40 years ago the Mongolians obtained their freedom from Chinese rule. That was what they were celebrating. Mongolia, although very far from us, has brought old memories and has become progressively a little closer to us in thinking because we have found out now—I confess I did not myself know about it long ago, but in the last few years I have found it out—that Mongolia had many contacts with India in ancient times. In fact, they derived so many things from us. They have produced so many of our old manuscripts which we have not got, and so on and so forth. They were particularly anxious that we should participate in these 40th anniversary celebrations, and we gladly did so. Our Secretary-General went there. The closest route to go to Mongolia is via China. The other route—though longer, sometimes

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

it takes a little less time—is *via* Moscow. He went *via* Moscow, spent some days there and then we decided that he should return *via* China—it was closer. While he was in China—there was nothing casual about it—we asked him, not only as a matter of courtesy, to call on the Chinese President, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, but if necessity arose, to talk to them about our border. There was nothing casual about it. It was the right thing to do. Talking does not mean negotiating anything. He had no power to negotiate, nor could he do so. But we did want to find out what their reactions were to the Report of the officials that had been published, because this House would remember that the Report had been published, containing the report of our officials and the report of the Chinese officials, which, in our opinion, proves almost to the hilt the case that India has put forward. These reports were published; they were placed before this House and discussed here. In China, they were not published at all; they have not yet been published and so nobody knows about those reports except some officials who may have seen them. In fact, they rather expressed their objection or resentment at our having published them before they did so or without their consent. What had happened was that we did not ask for their consent, but we had told them just a few days before that in a few days, three or four days' time, we would be placing these reports before our Parliament, and that meant publication. We did inform them; we had not waited for their consent, nor was it necessary.

It is rather difficult for the present Chinese Government to understand parliamentary procedures or what is due to the public. Anyhow, they have not published those reports, and these still remain in their secret archives or wherever they may be.

Now, under the original agreement arrived at between Premier Chou En-lai and me when he came here, when

we appointed these official commissions to confer with each other, it was decided that after these reports had been prepared, the two Governments should consider them and, maybe, discuss them. It was not clearly specified, but the whole idea was that these should be considered, maybe separately, maybe jointly. Separately, we have considered these fully. I take it that they have been considered them too officially, although these have not been published. The question did arise, and does arise, that on the basis of these reports and facts brought out, the two Governments, may consider them, how and in what form, I am not clear.

So it seemed to me that it would be a good thing if our Secretary-General could, in the course of talks, just find out what their reactions to these reports were, and report to us. These were his instructions and that is what he did. He met them and discussed these matters at some length. But I am afraid the talks he had with those high Chinese authorities were not productive of much good in so far as we are concerned in this matter, and it was a repetition, as usual; in some small matters here and there, there was some slight variation, but basically it was a repetition. So the position in regard to this border situation remains, more or less, what it was. That is, it is static, nothing much is happening. So far as I know, there has been no further aggression anywhere, nor has there been, except in one or two places like Long Ju, any going back by the Chinese. Meanwhile we have been strengthening our position there by building roads, transport etc.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): Please refer to my interview with Marshal Chiang Kai Shek.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do submit to the House that in spite of our strong feelings over this matter of border incursions, and their occupying our territory, we cannot easily rush

into war. If it is necessary ultimately, it is a different matter, and we must prepare for it. That would be rather adventurist, which we cannot do, especially in the world as it is today on the verge, maybe, of war etc. We must take all these factors into consideration. The main thing is that we must firmly hold to our position, our opinions, our views, and try to get them realised, maybe it will take some time, but that is better than going into any adventurist action now.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Our Prime Minister has not referred to the talks that our Defence Minister had with Marshal Chen Yi during the Laos Commission discussions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say that there have been no talks in Geneva about this border situation. Such talks as there were, were about Laos, the conference going on. There was nothing about this border here.

One thing I should like to clear. I refer to the great concern and even excitement about the arms and given to Pakistan by the United States Government. Some hon. Members opposite wanted me to say that this is an unfriendly act of the United States Government. To begin with, I should like to say something that is pretty obvious, that is that the United States Governmental policy has been particularly friendly to India in the last few months—even before that, but in the last few months especially. It is true that their giving this arms aid to Pakistan has caused us very much concern. I have no doubt in my mind that what the United States Government has said they mean, that is to say that they have not done so to embarrass India or to put India in any danger, but the real difficulty is not that we do not accept what the United States says—and they say they are tied to it by their past commitments, they have to do it and all that, I accept all that—but having accepted it, it is still a matter of grave concern to us, because, as has been

made perfectly clear, no commitment of the United States Government is likely to come in the way of the Pakistan Government if they want to use those arms against somebody. They used it against the tribal areas on the Pakistan—Afghanistan border the other day. That was not within the terms of the commitment made to the United States Government. There it is, they used it. Of course, they said they were protecting their borders or territory. Therefore, this concern does continue, and we have to continually think how to meet this new situation that has arisen.

I mentioned Mangolia. I should like to say that it has been a very serious lack that a country like Mangolia should not be taken into the United Nations. What is more surprising is—I speak, of course, from general knowledge, not from any specific knowledge, I may not be 100 per cent. correct—that the United States Government lately, some little time ago, approved or desired to have Mangolia in the United Nations, but the Formosa Government vetoed it. I am not talking of a formal veto. They did have a formal veto some two or three years ago in the Security Council. This is not a formal veto, but they threatened to veto it, and therefore this question has been dropped. It is a most extraordinary state of affairs that the Formosan Government, which is a very peculiar Government in the sense that it is called the Government of China, a Government which has not got a square yard of China under its control and still is called the Government of China, is now coming in the way of another country, Mongolia, coming into the United Nations.

Lastly, I would just say a few words about this Belgrade conference, where I hope to go in about two weeks time from today. This conference was proposed—of course, there were discussions for months and months about some conference to be held; there were proposals by various countries,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru].

especially by Yugoslavia, Indonesia and the UAR, but they did not take shape. This time we got these invitations from the President of the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia. There was some correspondence as to the purpose of the conference, and those who should attend it. It is called a conference of non-aligned countries. What is the definition of non-aligned, which countries are non-aligned? Some countries are not, obviously, non-aligned, some are rather doubtful. All this took place. Ultimately, a Preparatory Committee was held in Cairo, and they laid down certain tests of the countries to be invited. After that, some Ambassadors met to apply those tests. In the application of those tests, there was some difference of opinion between our approach and the approach of some other countries present there. Some of our proposals were accepted, some were not, because it had been laid down that there should be unanimous acceptance, so that even one country could oppose; and one or two countries did oppose, and therefore they were not accepted. As a matter of fact, lately it has been proposed that some countries that we had proposed and which had been rejected should be invited, and naturally we are in favour of that because we had proposed them earlier. This proposal has come from some other countries.

This conference is going to meet there, and we have made it perfectly clear, and it has been accepted all round, that we do not want to say or do anything which might lead to a third force or a third bloc. Why? Because we think that if we form a third bloc, we would, in effect, be supporting this idea of blocs. When we are non-aligned with the major blocs, it follows that we should not be aligned amongst ourselves. It is one thing to co-operate together, and we do co-operate in the United Nations, because we have common outlooks, but it is quite another thing to be aligned in a political or military

way, and so we have made it clear that we propose to remain unaligned. We cannot get tied up with other countries in a sense so that we cannot follow our own policy because some majority decides in favour of another policy. Anyhow, that has been broadly accepted by this conference.

As to the subjects, it has been laid down, generally speaking, that internal matters, internal disputes between two countries, will not be considered, but broad matters like world peace, disarmament, the removal of colonialism, the removal of racialism, and such like general matters which affect us very greatly will be considered. That is the present position. For the rest, the agenda etc., will be discussed there when we meet.

I have ventured to refer to most of the matters which which perhaps are in the minds of hon. Members. About Goa. I will just say one or two sentences about Goa. This matter was brought up today in connection with some torture or murder. We had not yet come to know all the facts. We shall find them out. But it is true that the position in Goa is to be reviewed from time to time and also the action that we should take in regard to it. I think that the policy that we have adopted during the last seven or eight years has been the right policy and what is more, it has yielded results—not in the sense that Goa has come to us but—in gradually convincing of our right policy to many other countries and because of various reasons the general opinion in favour of Portugal has now almost disappeared. We should consider this policy carefully as to what we should do. Our difficulty has been a moral one and a practical one—moral one in the sense that we say that we will not go to war unless we are attacked. Should we try to solve this problem by war? Secondly, there is the practical difficulty because going to war with Portugal—Goa may be a small matter but it means war with Portugal—may mean

war with other countries too if not war, a complicated situation.....
(Interruptions.)

An Hon. Member: Nobody Will bother to help Portugal.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am merely pointing out the logic of certain argument. It may not happen. The situation has changed somewhat now. I admit that. But anyhow, taking military measures against which we have ourselves raised our voice all the time—that is the question. So, that has been the basis and I think our doing so has been justified—not by Goa coming over to us, of course not—but in the world's opinion, our stock, if I may use that word, has gone up because we stick to certain basic policies and not function just in anger or in an adventurous way. But, as I said, we shall have to consider again and again, in the near future, how far we should vary the policies we have thus far pursued.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

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

Now, there are some amendments tabled. I do not find Shri Ansar Harvani and Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri here. Their amendments are not moved. The amendments of Shrimati Renu Chakravartty and Shri Indrajit Gupta—both are out of order. Is Shri Naldurgkar moving his amendment?

Shri Naldurgkar (Osmanabad):
Sir, I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government

of India in relation thereto, approves the policy of the Government of India.”

Mr. Speaker: The motion and the amendment are before the House for discussion. Shri Dange.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): Sir, the Prime Minister has put the central fact of his foreign policy in the first word that he uttered—that was, disarmament and peace. As such that policy meets with approval from all peace-loving people in India and elsewhere. We are also very sorry to note along with him that though disarmament is the need of the hour, armaments have grown. He also referred to certain spots of tension and the atmosphere that was growing around those spots of tension.

The first spot he mentioned was Germany and West Berlin. Therein he made a very fruitful statement that two States existed and that they could come together only by agreement. Certainly the German people should be united and India hopes that they would be united. While agreeing with him on all these points, the point is whether the Government of India's policy is based really on neutrality in relation to Germany. There are these two States—West Germany and East Germany. I am not using the other official names given to these two States for the simple reason that one gets sometimes confused by these names. So, what is the position of the Government of India and what should it be? We know that in olden days the Congress Party and the Prime Minister particularly were vehement opponents of Nazism and when Nazism came to power afterwards and tried to overthrow Republican Spain all the sympathies of our nationalist movement were against Nazis and for the liberation of the German people. During the war our position was very clear. After the war, when the two German States came into existence, consistent with our neutrality, what

[Shri S. A. Dange]

should have been our position? We asked for the unification of Germany and we propagated for the unification. When it was not possible, we ought not to have recognised any of these two States. Today, we find the Government of India recognising the West German State but it does not recognise the East German State. Is that a position of neutrality and non-alignment? This position is surprising, especially when you find that in West Germany all the old Nazi organisations have been revived under new names. All the Powers had agreed that German rearmament must be prevented; Germany should be disarmed and Germany should be demilitarised. But militarisation has taken place in West Germany: all the armament firms had been revived and all the Nazi generals are back again there. This is the position when the other powers are still technically at war with Germany because they have not signed a peace treaty. Still, West Germany has been readmitted into the NATO powers though technically they are at war with Germany. A sentiment was expressed that the NATO States were not behaving properly in relation to the liquidation of colonialism but are encouraging the suppression of such movements. West Germany is a member of such an alliance. Yet, we continue to recognise that State and we allow it to have an Embassy here. Sometime back, it was found that the ambassador or somebody here was a member of the Nazi Party. The matter was brought up in the Upper House and the gentleman was retired. Such is the condition. Is it good on our part to recognise West Germany and not recognise East Germany? It is not consistent with positions of neutrality. If you observe non-alignment or neutrality, then either recognise both or do not recognise any. But you recognise one and do not recognise the other. So, it is not a policy of neutrality but showing preference to a State which is frantically and frankly becoming a Nazi State, a State which is rearming itself and helping

in the suppression of colonial freedom movements and a State which is training its troops on the soils of France and Britain.

There is another funny thing. These two countries which suffered most from Germany militarism are now allowing facilities for German tanks to be trained on their soil. This is the way in which the allied powers, except the Soviet Union which is part of the allied powers, are behaving in relation to German Nazism and revival of militarism. Under such conditions I would have expected the Government of India's policy to be one of recognising both the States or not recognising any of these States.

Sometimes I hear an argument that West Germany is a very prosperous State. There are many prosperous States. Perhaps Portugal also is a very prosperous State in its own way. But there is no reason why we should have feelings or a special consideration for a State which is reviving Nazism and carrying out militarism, and making a hot bed of war on its own territory and suppressing other people.

There is mention of economic aid and that is the tempting thing which persuades some of our friends to be friendly with West Germany. What is the example of economic aid, after all? One dominant, single, outstanding aid which we have received from West Germany is the Rourkela plant, a plant which limps every seventh day, which breaks down every month and which does not fulfil the quota, and where, we do not know, what those technicians are doing to our technicians and what they are producing. It is the most outstanding example of German technique. West German aid to India, to rebuild its own economy. Is it for such a limping aid that we are favouring West Germany and not recognising East Germany? Do we not know that East Germany is capable of giving aid? We have trade relations with East Germany. I know that. There is

trade going on between East Germany and us also. But why should the West German Embassy alone stand here with all the access to the officials and the Ministries of the Government of India? When two Ministers from East Germany visited India, they were treated something like clerks visiting from Berlin, and met by some protocol, a Secretary or somebody from the External Affairs Ministry and so on. No doubt the Prime Minister received them politely and talked with them. But it is not political relation. That is essentially a commercial or cultural relation, a very nice relation of friendliness. But when it comes to the position of neutrality on political grounds, of positions of international relations, then I would say consistent with our neutrality, we ought to recognise East Germany and West Germany.

There was mention of spots of tension. It is considered as if East and West Berlin are the only spots of tension. They are not the only spots. In any case, that has drawn the largest attention. But what is the position in regard to these two States? I have not much time to go into it, but there is something of a misunderstanding: some people do not know perhaps that Berlin is right inside East Germany, something like 100 miles from the Western German border. There was a friend who, the other day, asked me, "Is not Berlin nearly on the border?" Some people do not know that Berlin was not captured by either the French or the British or the Americans whose armies are stationed in the Western part of Berlin. Berlin was liberated by the Soviet forces. They advanced beyond that and liberated almost half of Germany and all that. And then it was decided that in order to reunify Germany and establish a democratic regime, all these powers which had attained victory should have one common centre from which they could carry out these schemes of unification and rehabilitation and so on. Therefore, it was agreed that the French,

the Americans and the British forces should be allowed a part in Berlin, and these four together should work together in the matter of establishing peace inside Germany and West Germany. That was the way in which the Americans, the British and the French entered West Berlin. But now they say, "we have a right of conquest." They were never within sight of Berlin and they were negotiating with Hitler, how he would open the front so that Berlin could fall in their hands and not in the hands of the Soviet Union. That is the way it was done, and that is how they entered Berlin. Now they say, "We have rights." What rights? The only thing that the Soviet Union has proposed is that West Berlin and the whole of Berlin, and particularly West Berlin, should be a free city. "Negotiate a peace treaty." Is it not a wonderful or a funny situation? 15 to 16 years after the war ended, there is no peace treaty with Germany, and who is preventing the peace treaty? It is the British, the French and the Americans who are preventing a peace treaty. When the Americans wanted it, they signed a peace treaty with Japan, even without caring to know whether the other countries approved of it or not. If a peace treaty with Japan which treacherously attacked America could be signed in 1951, why could not a peace treaty be signed with Germany even in 1960-61? Why should there be an objection to the Soviet proposal that they are going to sign a peace treaty with both? If West Germany does not want it, all right, let them not have it. If the Americans do not want it, let them not have it. But the East Germans want it and there are States, who want a peace treaty. "We are going to have a peace treaty." When that State is established as an independent State, having signed peace treaties with everybody, or with the Soviet Union which wants it, then the entry into West Berlin through their territory must be governed by the East German Government. The Americans say, "No. We would not

[Shri S. A. Dange]

recognise that." Well, they will have to recognise that. And with the threat of war, they know what they will get. We all stand for peace, and everybody wants to prevent war. But if by simple tyranny and threats of war, they want to retain their positions in West Berlin—and they are building up armaments and spynets against East Germany—then naturally our position should be that these threats should stop, that a peace treaty with both Germany should be signed by all the powers. In fact, the Government of India should exercise its influence so that a peace treaty with Germany is signed by all the powers immediately, with both the States, since the two States cannot be made one now, and that West Berlin should be declared as a free city as the Soviet have proposed. They say, "Do not come to West Berlin." They say, "you will not have a permit." But when a peace treaty is signed, what happens? West Berlin today is an occupied city under the heels of capitalists. The moment a peace treaty is signed, it ceases to be occupied city. The moment it ceases to be an occupied city, it becomes a free city. And when a free city exists, all the occupation forces have to go out. The civilian people can remain; trade can remain; entry can remain. This is a simple thing that the Soviet Union has proposed. And yet, now it is said that there are growing tensions. They are only regularising the position and restoring the whole thing to normalcy. Actually, they are being called names as if they are now instituting spots of tension.

Here, I would request the Prime Minister to think over the problem. More or less his policy is on the right lines. But it is not on the right lines when this discrimination in recognition is made. It would be on the right lines if he discussed the question of peace treaty. I am sure he is not opposed to the peace treaty and I am quite sure that he is not opposed to West Berlin being a free city. There

can be no quarrel about that, but the questions comes in regard to his being cautious. What was the caution which permits him or persuades him to recognise West Germany alone? Let West Germany have an embassy here. What is it that does not persuade him to let the East German Government also have the same thing? I cannot understand the position of neutrality. A position which holds against militarism, against Nazism and so on, ought to have led to opposite results.

I should say that economic aid also should not be a dominating factor, because it is not of very great importance, so far as West Germany is concerned, and when the British people join the common market, then they will be more in the pockets of West Germany and if we are going to run behind the British with our usual trade relations, gradually we may be withdrawing into the whole vortex of the NATO. There is that dangerous position also, but I think with our position of neutrality we would be cautious about that.

There is one point which the Prime Minister mentioned at the very beginning, and certainly it is the most important point. That is, today, there is tension, and the threat to war grows round it. Of course, in a side remark, he raised the question of blocs—the Warsaw treaty bloc and the NATO bloc. Everybody knows that the NATO bloc is something different in its context, in its policy and objective, in its subjective formulation, and so on, from the Warsaw treaty. East Germany certainly is a member of the Warsaw Treaty Alliance. But East Germany certainly does not go helping Portugal or suppressing Angola or helping Belgium. In NATO powers the policy is very clear. Therefore, on these matters I would suggest that equating the two blocs together would not be a very happy position. Though, of course, they may be described as

blocs or alliances, yet the results are different in relation to all the colonial countries. Have you ever heard of a Warsaw Treaty power trying to suppress an African State or trying to deny help?

14 hrs.

Shri Naushir .Bharucha (East Khandesh) If they have any weapons at all.

Shri P. K. Deo .(Kalahandi): They go to Hungary with tanks.

Shri S. A. Dange: I think you are still not rid of the ghost of Hungary.

Now, coming to the next important subject to which he mentioned, and that is his visit to the Neutral Summit Meeting or the meeting of the non-aligned powers, I agree with his standpoint, that we should not form a third bloc because, after all, all those states meeting there are dissimilar in so many respects. The argument which he really has given is that just because we do not approve of blocs to form a third bloc itself would be a wrong thing. Though, of course, I may not equate the two blocs on the same level, put them on the same level, yet I agree that we should not form a bloc, because our being in a bloc would make us subject to votes of a majority or even a unanimous decision with regard to our political, military policies and so on.

Then, what I was distressed to see was—though now my distress is reduced today after some of the statements which he has made—the role that India played in the Cairo meeting. It really pulled down India's position amongst the newly liberated countries—the way we took a position, which he correctly described as perhaps more or less legalistic, when we insisted that only those countries which are members of the United Nations or legal governments will be allowed in that conference. The Algerians were being offered a seat and were in fact being invited to become a member, and it was India which stood out till the last in a most pig-headed way, I must say. Every coun-

try said that Algeria should be admitted. India said: "No, if we do not admit them and do not support them we shall be strengthening their hands while talking with France." It was exactly the reverse. When negotiations on Algeria were conducted with the French imperialists, at that time if India had supported Algeria and her seat in the Cairo meeting it would have influenced the French far better than our being non-committal. In fact, the French are not influenced by any such things. We know that they are taking nine years to hand over *de jure* authority in Pondicherry and other places, and we know the way they are treating Algeria and other countries. Therefore, in the Cairo meeting when our representative objected to Algeria sitting there and when all others wanted it he ultimately said: "I would not object to it, but I abstain." That was a complete and perfect expression of neutrally minus any principle! Abstention is neutrality, but abstention without any principle is not mere neutrality. It is the opposite.

Now the Prime Minister says: "he might reconsider." He has used these words very carefully. He might consider the question of recognising the Algerian Government, and I hear reports that a certain committee of the Congress leadership has also desired that Algeria should be given recognition, and even now in our country some papers are coming forward in support of that recognition. So I hope when he goes to the Summit—of course, he has stated that Algeria will be a part of that meeting and so it is an indirect recognition—he would offer direct recognition, because consistent with our views of anti-colonialism—it is not a question of legal standpoints, being a member of the United Nations and so on alone—we should recognise Algeria. That is one point with regard to the non-aligned countries' meeting which I would press for his attention.

Then, the other point on which I wish to say a few words, or make a little critical remark, is with regard

[Shri S. A. Dange]

to our role in Congo. There also I think we were too much legalistic. Our representative, perhaps, in Congo was functioning within the framework of his being a representative of the Secretary-General Hammerskjöld. India was not merely sending somebody to function as a projection of Mr. Hammerskjöld, but it was also for participation in a movement or in a move to re-unite Congo and establish a democratic government there and guarantee its independence and liberation from Belgian forces. Under such conditions, if our army which was there and the man who was in charge of the army found that right under his nose the Prime Minister Lumumba was being arrested, what should he have done? He should have immediately moved his forces to see that the Prime Minister was not arrested and he was liberated. We just legalistically or technically waited to see whether Mr. Hammerskjöld would allow an intervention or not, whether that army at all was there to protect Lumumba or not or whether it was there only to see that two Congolese did not fight each other. But we allowed two Congolese governments to arrest each other, massacre each other and we were saying that we were there only to restore peace and liberate Congo. That was a most inconsistent position. That episode still is not very clear in my mind, why we could not have prevented the murder of Lumumba, his arrest and then his being kidnapped by the Katanga Government and being murdered? Why could we not do that? If we could not do that, in that case the best thing for our forces would have been to withdraw. Then what was our function? If we could not give protection to the democratic forces in Congo, were we there to give protection to Hammerskjöld and pay so much attention and respect to the dignity of the Secretary General? Well, when those very powers who fight with us and against whom we have to fight on questions of colonialism came to the question of Hammerskjöld's visit to Paris on the question

of Tunis, they said: "Gentleman, you will not enter Paris", and he could not enter. He did not enter. That is the way in which they treated Hammerskjöld, and correctly treated. Therefore, in this case also, when India is having such an independent position and India is not just a small country, it is a power and a power on the side of anti-colonialism and freedom, I thought on the question of Congo also we were not very correct in our attitude towards the United Nations Secretary as well as the behaviour of certain other forces there.

These are two or three outstanding points which were before me—the problem of war that is being threatened around the question of West Germany and Berlin, the peace treaty with the two German States, the question of Algeria and its recognition and the question of Congo. Of course, he covered the whole field of foreign relations for which I certainly have not got the time at my disposal. He has mentioned Angola. He has mentioned Kenya. He certainly casually placed Kenya as apart from Angola. I do not know whether it is really so much apart from Angola, in the sense whether the British were more merciful in hanging the Mau Mau revolutionaries than the Portuguese are with regard to Angola. When it comes to suppressing the Africans, whether it is the British or the Portuguese or the French, they are more or less of the same level of culture. But there is certainly a difference that Lumumba was murdered and Kenyatta was released. There is no doubt a difference as between two imperialist powers—one being an outright Nazi power and the other an imperialist power; certain differences do exist. In that way there is a difference that Angola is being simply wiped out while in the case of Kenyatta, he is released. But nine years imprisonment is a fact that we should notice. We should be glad with the release. We should certainly not forget Mau Mau being hanged and Kenyatta being impri-

soned for nine years and now released with a ban not to participate in politics. Imagine the ban against Lokmanya Tilak in 1914 when he was released after seven years. There was a ban that he should not participate in politics and so on. Something like that is happening. The British are true to type whether you see them in 1900, 1914 or 1961. That is the way in which Kenya is being handled.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, there is nothing to say because he has made a very significant statement that the Americans in the recent period have been showing greater friendliness towards us, especially in the last three or four months I wonder whether the sign of that greater friendliness is the supply of greater number of supersonic aeroplanes to Pakistan and whether friendliness to us is measured by such instances. Well, the policy is the same and the friendliness is of the same type—give aid to India and make it spend that aid in order to prepare itself against Pakistan, which has been supplied military aid. They supply arms to Pakistan and dollars to India so that the same dollars are spent again on the purchase of arms rather than for the purpose of peaceful constructive work. This sort of policy follows from the policy of monopolistic rule in America. They are out to make profits. Whether it is the supply of wheat, or buying sugar, or the supply of supersonic arms or anything, it is a question of profits. And even the aid that is supplied is always not up to the mark, but I think that is not the subject matter of the present discussion. Therefore, on the question of Pakistan we certainly agree with what he said.

The last question which the Prime Minister touched was the China border. It was quite correct of him and nice of him to have sent the Secretary-General to Peking to find out what is their reaction to the official teams's report. Their reaction, as he said, was more or less nil. The question is why they have not co-operat-

ed when we have co-operated and when this problem is going to be settled. He said that it is not going to be settled by war, as we do not settle any of the questions by war, not even Goa, let alone the China border. So, on that question, there is nothing to be said; there is stalemate, stay put where we are. Therefore, on that question no more policies are being evolved and no policies are being demolished; it remains a stalemate and it may remain a stalemate for some time to come though, certainly, ultimately a way will come out and we shall have what is ours by right. On that point I am satisfied with the statement, because there is nothing new to be said on that point.

If one goes through the whole statement that he has made, one can say that on the whole the policy is right, the policy of peace, the policy of disarmament, the policy of helping nations to achieve independence from colonialism, the policy of helping to resolve the tensions. But a certain line runs through that correct policy, a line of hesitation, hesitation to take the correct stand. Though the leader is convinced that he is correct in his reactions and he should recognise certain things as correct, he wonders what his friends would think. Whether it is the denunciation of the policy followed by Portugal in Angola or in Goa, or the policy of Belgium in Congo, there is a hesitation to take the correct step.

So, my submission to him and to the party which he leads would be that this hesitation should be given up; this kind of vacillation which ultimately negates the basic principles that inspired the correct policy should go. Because, ultimately, the correct principles have to be translated into practice and the more you hesitate in bringing the correct principles into practice, the more those principles become negated. It took such a long time for us to decide our position with regard to Algeria that we first denied them a seat in Cairo. Many people in India were distressed

[Shri S. A. Dange]
about it and even the Congress Party was silent. Now it has come up with the correct solution. What does it indicate? It indicates a policy of vacillation, hesitation, the fear of hurting the feelings of those who should be hurt. At present, we are hurting only our own friends. For example, there is hesitation to tell West Germany "you are nothing but militarist Nazism". There is hesitation as to what Britain will feel or American feels about our proposed attitude. So, my submission is: cut out that hesitation and follow the principles and policies which we have underlined and which is the correct policy. Then everything would be all right.

डा० गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ। जब मुझे अवसर मिलता है तब मैं उस नीति के कुछ सिद्धान्तों की तरफ लोगों का, इस सदन का और इसके बाहर का, ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ।

हमारी वैदेशिक नीति पर जब हम विचार करते हैं तो संसार की मानवता का इतिहास हमारे सामने आ जाता है। जितना भी हमें इस संसार का इतिहास उपलब्ध है, उससे पता लगता है कि इस विचारशील प्राणी मनुष्य की जो भी कृतियाँ हुई हैं, उनमें उसके विचारशील होने के कारण विचार की पृष्ठभूमि अवश्य रही है। साथ ही हमें एक बात का और पता लगता है कि महान विचारों को कार्य रूप में परिणत होने में काफी समय लगा है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की पृष्ठभूमि शताब्दियों से "बसुधैव कुटुम्ब" के विचार की रही है जो दो प्रधान तत्वों पर आधारित हैं, एक सत्य और दूसरा अहिंसा। हमारे ऋषि मुनियों ने, हमारे तत्व वेत्ताओं ने, हमारे दार्शनिकों ने एक सत्य का पता लगा लिया था और वह सत्य था कि यह समस्त सृष्टि यथार्थ में एक ही तत्व है। आज के वैज्ञानिक भी इसके आगे नहीं बढ़ पाये हैं। यदि यह समस्त सृष्टि

एक ही तत्व है तो अहिंसा तो आप से आप आ जाती है। गांधी जी ने इन पुराने तात्विक और उच्च विचारों पर हमारी जो भारतीय संस्कृति अवलम्बित है, उसी को सामने रख कर सत्य और अहिंसा पर चलना हमारे और संसार के लिये कल्याणकर है, वह बात एक नवीन ढंग से कही थी। गांधी जी के पहिले भी अहिंसा का प्रतिपादन हुआ था लेकिन उस समय अहिंसा जीवन के एक क्षेत्र में आती थी, धार्मिक क्षेत्र में। गांधी जी ने मानव जीवन के समस्त क्षेत्रों में अहिंसा की आवश्यकता बताई और उन्होंने ने यह कहा कि उनके दूसरे कथन, उनकी दूसरी बातें तो समय के अनुसार परिवर्तनशील हैं, परन्तु सत्य और अहिंसा में कभी कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हो सकता।

14. 16 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO in the Chair]

आज की दुनिया की स्थिति का हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कुछ वर्णन किया है। कुछ बातें डांगे जी ने भी कहीं। जर्मनी का सवाल, बर्लिन का प्रश्न, ये आज बड़े ज्वलंत सवाल हैं। परन्तु जैसा मैंने आप से आरम्भ में निवेदन किया, मैं वैदेशिक नीति की जब चर्चा होती है, तब उस चर्चा के कुछ सिद्धांतों का ही प्रतिपादन करना चाहता हूँ। आज बर्लिन का प्रश्न है, इसके पहिले स्वेज कैनल की लड़ाई का सवाल था, इसके पहिले कोरिया का सवाल था। बर्लिन का प्रश्न हल होने के बाद भी क्या इस प्रकार के दूसरे सवाल नहीं उठेंगे? निसर्ग ने मानव को जिस प्रकार गढ़ा है और मानव की कृतियाँ जिस प्रकार चलती हैं, उनमें इस प्रकार के सवाल सदा उठते रहते हैं, आज तक उठे हैं, आज भी उठ रहे हैं, भविष्य में भी उठते रहेंगे। लेकिन हर परिस्थिति में अपनी विचार धारा पर कायम रहना मुख्य बात है। बर्लिन का सवाल भी किसी न किसी प्रकार उसी तरह हल होगा जिस तरह स्वेज कैनल और कोरिया के प्रश्न कुछ दिन पहले हल हुये थे। किन्तु

बर्निन के सवाल के हल होने के बाद फिर इसी प्रकार के सवाल उठेंगे। हम ने जैसे आज तक अपनी वैदेशिक नीति को अपनी सत्य और अहिंसा वाली संस्कृति के अनुसार चलाया है, आज भी तथा भविष्य में भी हमारे सामने यही प्रश्न रहेगा चाहे जैसा भी समय क्यों न आये, चाहे जैसा भी प्रश्न क्यों न आये, हम उस समय उन सवालों को अपनी आधारभूत सत्य और अहिंसा की नीति के अनुसार ही हल करने का प्रयत्न करें। जिस समय कोरिया का सवाल उठा था, जिस समय स्वेज केनाल का सवाल उठा था, और उसके पहिले भी, यह कहा जाता था कि हम जो कुछ बातें कहते हैं वे अव्यवहार्य हैं। परन्तु हमने देखा कि व्यवहार में वे बातें आईं।

जहां तक हमारे देश का प्रश्न है, कुछ समय पहिले तक यह कहा जाता था कि हमने तो अपनी वैदेशिक नीति के कारण हानि ही उठाई है और अनेक बार हमारी वैदेशिक नीति कहाँ तक ठीक है इस पर संदेह भी व्यक्त किया जाता था। लेकिन हम ने देखा कि यह संदेह कितना गलत था। अभी कल ही यहां पर नगर हवेली के सम्बन्ध में एक विधेयक आया। हम ने उसे पास किया। तो नगर हवेली के सम्बन्ध में जो सफलता हमें मिली वह सफलता यही सिद्ध करती है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति हमारे देश की दृष्टि से भी हितकर है।

श्री विजयराज सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : वह तो सात साल पहिले ही हल हो गया था।

डा० गोविन्द दास : गोआ का सवाल उठता है। अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने गोआ के सवाल पर कुछ कहा। परन्तु गोआ पर कुछ कहने से पहिले मैं उस बात का जवाब देना चाहता हूँ जो कि अभी कही गयी कि यह सवाल तो सात साल पहिले हल हो गया। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के सिद्धांत भी केवल सात वर्ष पहले नहीं,

स्वराज्य मिलने के समय तय हो गये थे और जिस समय हम पराधीन थे उस समय तय हो गये थे। पराधीनता के समय भी हम उन्हीं सिद्धांतों पर चले सात वर्ष ही क्या, जब से हम स्वतंत्र हुये तब से ही हम उन्हीं सिद्धांतों पर चल रहे हैं।

गोआ का प्रश्न अभी पंडित जी के सामने उठाया गया। पंडित जी ने लड़ाई की भी बात कही। वे लड़ाई के पक्ष में नहीं हैं, यह मैं जानता हूँ। गोआ के प्रश्न का हल भी, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, लड़ाई नहीं है। लड़ाई यदि हन करना चाहते तो गोआ का प्रश्न कब का हल हो जाता। एक पुलिस ऐक्शन भर का काम था, लेकिन फिर तो एक दूसरी बात सिद्ध होती कि हम इस नीति को मानने वाले हैं कि "मीठा मीठा गप्प और कड़वा कड़वा थू।" जब हमारे स्वार्थ का प्रश्न आता है तो हम लड़ने को भी तैयार हो जाते हैं। प्रश्न यह नहीं है, प्रश्न जैसा मैं ने आप से निवेदन किया दूसरा है। गोआ का प्रश्न भी हम उसी प्रकार हल करेंगे जिस प्रकार हम ने अपने आजादी का प्रश्न हल किया और जिस प्रकार हम अपने और संसार के दूसरे प्रश्नों को हल करना चाहते हैं ?

पाकिस्तान और हमारे सम्बन्धों के विषय में भी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कुछ कहा। उन सम्बन्धों में कड़वाहट आ गई है, कटुता बढ़ गई है, अभी जो नानागाही अयूग साहब और प्रेजिडेंट कैनेडी के वक्तव्य निकले, उनके कारण। उन के वक्तव्यों के भिन्न भिन्न अर्थ भी निकाले गये। अभी जब श्री चेस्टर बोल्स यहां पर आये तो उन्होंने भी इस संबंध में एक वक्तव्य दिया। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस विषय में भी अर्थों की आवश्यकता नहीं है। बहुत जल्दी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री अमरीका जाने वाले हैं और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि अमरीका का हमारे साथ जो बर्ताव है उस को देखते हुए जो कुछ

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

गलतफहमी अयूब साहब और प्रेजिडेंट कैंनेडी के वक्तव्य से हुई है वह दूर हो जायेगी। इस संबंध में मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ। अंग्रेजी में जिसे "नो मैन्स लैंड" कहते हैं अनेक बार काश्मीर को भी मान लिया जाना है। मैं तो यह मानता हूँ कि काश्मीर का प्रश्न हल होने को शेष रहा ही नहीं है। काश्मीर का प्रश्न हल हो चुका है। काश्मीर भारत में सम्मिलित है, काश्मीर हमारा है। कभी भी पृथक न होने वाला अंग है। यह हमारा घर मसला है। बाहरी मसला नहीं रहा, और कभी भी यदि काश्मीर के सवाल को इस प्रकार उठाया जायेगा तो पाकिस्तान और हमारे बीच में कटुता ही बढ़ेगी, उसमें कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है।

चीन की बात कही गई। हमारे डांगे साहब ने एक लम्बा चौड़ा भाषण दिया। मैं आशा करता था कि चीन के सम्बन्ध में वे कम से कम अस्वीकार करेंगे कि चीन आक्रमणकारी देश है। उन के दल में इस बात पर बड़ा मतभेद हाँ गया है। जहाँ तक डांगे साहब का सम्बन्ध है, मुझे जो कुछ मालूम हुआ है, उस से जान पड़ता है कि उन का स्वयं का मत भी यही है कि चीन ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया है। लेकिन इसके सम्बन्ध में वे न आज कुछ स्पष्ट बोले न इस के पहले कभी बोले। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस विषय में इतने संकोच की आवश्यकता क्या है। जहाँ तक उन के दल का सम्बन्ध है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वे इस समय वहाँ पर नहीं है, लेकिन मेरा भाषण तो पढ़ ही लेंगे—कि उन के दल की जन्म भूमि या मातृ भूमि या फादरलैंड यदि कहा जाय

श्री बजराम सिंह : मदरलैंड।

डा० गोविन्द दास : मदरलैंड सही, मैंने मातृभूमि कहा, वह हमेशा रूप और चीन रहे हैं। मास्को और पीकिंग

रहे हैं और जब तक उन की दृष्टि इस सम्बन्ध में परिवर्तित नहीं होती तब तक चीन के विषय में भी जाँ उन का अपना मत है उस को वे स्पष्ट नहीं कर सकेंगे। कोई भी बड़ा काम विश्वास के बिना या फेथ के बिना सम्भव नहीं हो सका है। आवश्यकता यह है कि बिना विचलित हुए हम अपनी नीति पर चलें। मेरा यह विश्वास है कि हमारे सवाल और संसार के सवाल इसी नीति पर चलने में हल होंगे। कम से कम मुझ को कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं दिखता। दो ही बातें हो सकती हैं: या तो एक भ्रंशण युद्ध हो और उस भ्रंशण युद्ध में अणु बम, उदजन बम और जैसा रूसने कहा है उसने कोई बहुत बड़ा बम तैयार किया है, वे बम चलें यह मानव ही नष्ट हो जाये और या फिर इस भूमंडल इस प्लैनेट के टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायें, या फिर इन प्रश्नों को हम अहिंसा से हल करें। जैसा आरम्भ में मैंने कहा कि मनप्य विवरणील प्राणी है, उस की कृतियों की पृष्ठ भूमि में विचारधारा रही है। हमें विश्वास है कि हिन्देशिया, अफ्रीका आदि के सवाल और जिन सवालों का हम में सीधा सम्बन्ध है जैसे गोआ, पाकिस्तान और चीन के प्रश्न, वे भी हल होकर ही रहेंगे। हाँ वड़े बड़े सवालों के हल होने में समय अवश्य लगता है और मानव इतिहास से स्पष्ट है कि बड़े बड़े सवालों को हल करने में मानव को शताब्दियाँ लगती हैं। समय की गणना दो प्रकार से होती है। एक व्यक्ति का समय और दूसरा राष्ट्र और संसार का समय। दस, बीस, पच्चीस वर्ष व्यक्ति के जीवन में महत्व रखते हैं, परन्तु जहाँ तक राष्ट्र और संसार का सवाल है, दस, बीस, पच्चीस या पचास वर्ष यहाँ तक कि शताब्दियाँ भी कोई महत्व नहीं रखतीं। हमने हजारों वर्षों पहले जो खोजें की थीं, जिन के आधार पर हम अब तक चले हैं, हमारा विश्वास है कि यदि हम उसी विचारधारा पर चलते रहें तो हम उसी विचारधारा से अपने प्रश्नों को, और संसार के प्रश्नों को हल कर सकेंगे।

जैसा मैं ने आप से कहा कि मैं अपनी वैदेशिक नीति का बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ क्योंकि मैं भारतीय संस्कृति का एक छोटा सा पुजारी हूँ। मेरा मंत्र और अहिंसा में विश्वास है, गांधी जी के बतलाये हुए मार्ग में विश्वास है, इसी लिये मैं सदा इस नीति का समर्थक रहा हूँ, इन के निन्दाओं का समर्थन करता रहा हूँ और आज भी हृदय से इस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah): Mr. Chairman I would have spoken at some length on the question of disarmament and the break down of the nuclear weapon test ban negotiations. But, I want to disabuse the mind of Shri S. A. Dange with regard to two points. First, he seemed to be under the impression, when he was criticising the representative of the U.N. Secretary General in Congo, that he was our representative. It is true that he happens to be an Indian national. But, he was acting definitely under the direction and guidance of the Secretary General and he was wholly and solely responsible to the U.N. Secretary General. If there are any actions of his which were not to the liking of Shri S. A. Dange, whatever actions they were, he was responsible for these actions to the Secretary General and the Government of India has nothing to do with regard to them whatsoever.

Then, Shri S. A. Dange said that there has been a line of hesitancy with regard to the policy of the Government of India in certain matters. He referred to the question of Algeria. I say there has been no such question of hesitancy. Because, I know, when Shri Ferrhat Abbas was here, the hon. Deputy Minister of External Affairs had occasion to preside over some meetings with the Prime Minister of the Provisional Government. We had definitely established contacts with him. The Prime Minister felt that if we did not recognise *de jure* the Provisional Government of Algeria, it

was possible that we would be more helpful to the Provisional Government of Algeria. That was the only reason. Shri S. A. Dange said that there has been a line of hesitancy. I do not see there has been such hesitancy on the part of the Prime Minister in any way to recognise the Provisional Government of Algeria. Now, matters have become ripe and I believe the Prime Minister will soon announce recognition of the Provisional Government of Algeria as the *de facto* and *de jure* Government of Algeria.

Now, I will go to the question of nuclear weapon test ban, and the break down in the negotiations for this particular reason. You will recall that it was in this House in 1957 that a resolution was unanimously adopted—a resolution which called upon all the great powers, especially the powers which were carrying on nuclear weapon test explosion to suspend without further delay their programme for testing purposes nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons and pending agreement on their discontinuance, abandonment of production and stockpiling of such weapons. After that, in the 12th, 13th and 14th sessions of the U.N., India took the lead in inscribing the question of suspension and discontinuance of nuclear test explosion in the agenda. India's resolution and other resolutions along with it were almost unanimously adopted. It was the view of most of the nations that the nuclear and thermo-nuclear test ban talks should be held separately from the disarmament negotiations.

You will recall that although after the unfortunate U2 incident, the disarmament negotiations which were going on in Geneva broke down, the nuclear weapon test ban talks did not break. In 1960, several resolutions were adopted in the U.N. All these resolutions all along reiterated that the talks which had been going on between the three nuclear powers for the suspension and final

[Shri Kasliwal].

discontinuance of these tests should continue. At this stage, I want to point out what was the area of agreement that had been reached up to that time between the various parties. We are informed that several clauses of the Test ban treaty had been unanimously agreed to. There was agreement that the headquarters of the organisational structure should be located in Geneva. There was agreement that the obligation to stop nuclear weapon testing and the establishment of the control system must go hand in hand. There was agreement that the treaty should last indefinitely, but should be reviewed periodically and it should be open for adherence to other nations. There was also agreement about the nature and scope of the task as a whole.

But, when the talks were resumed in March, this year, it was found that there was a large area of disagreement. What was that? There was disagreement about the composition of the Control commission. The Soviet view was that in the Control Commission there should be three from the Soviet Union, three from the Western bloc and one neutral. That is to say, they wanted parity. The western view was that there should be three from the western bloc, two from the Soviet Union and two representative of neutrals. Subsequently, I will point out that this position was given up by the western bloc. There were other points of disagreement with regard to the question of on site inspection, with regard to control posts, as to how many posts should be on the territory of the Soviet Union and how many control posts should be on the territory of U.K., and U.S.A. As I said, when these talks were resumed in March 1961, the western bloc perhaps realising the rigidity of their position, made several concessions to the Soviet position. They decided to increase the number of inspections on the soil of the U.K. and U.S.A. and they decided to decrease the number of inspections

on the soil of the Soviet Union. At the same time, they conceded parity on the Control Commission to the Soviet Union. They said, all right, you can have four representatives from Soviet Union, four representatives from the western side and three representatives from the neutral countries. When these talks were going on suddenly, the Soviet representatives countered the whole proposal by putting forth a new suggestion that there should be a three man Administrative council instead of a single administrator which had been agreed to previously by all the three nuclear powers. Subsequently, the Soviet Union decided to merge the entire test ban talks with the disarmament negotiations. In this way, all these talks have been thrown into the boiling cauldron of disarmament negotiations. One never knows now what is going to happen to these talks. I am very happy that the Government of India have again decided to inscribe in the agenda the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapon tests in the ensuing session of the U.N. I am glad that the Government have made an appeal to all three powers not to resume these tests unilaterally. I may here say a word with regard to the attitude of France. The attitude of France has been certainly very unsatisfactory. In spite of the fact that not only our Prime Minister, but several other countries made appeals to France not to do anything with regard to nuclear weapon testing, they have already had three tests in complete disregard of world opinion. And I must say that this was one of the reasons why probably the Soviet Union thought that was better that these talks should now be merged with the disarmament negotiations, for, after all, it is well known that France is a very important member of the NATO Powers.

I am glad, as I said, that the Prime Minister has now decide that this topic should be taken up once more, in the United Nations, separately from the disarmament negotiations.

Now, I want to deal with some of the questions relating to disarmament. You will recall that when the disarmament talks were going on in September, 1957, in London, all the parties were very close to an agreement. In fact, certain papers said at that time that they were perilously close to an agreement. But subsequently we do not know what happened, and the talks broke down; they began to abuse each other, and the talks completely broke down. Then, in 1957, when the matter went up to the United Nations, it was decided that there should be a kind of disarmament commission established, but that resolution proved infructuous. In 1958, on the initiative of the chairman of the Indian Delegation, a disarmament commission consisting of all the members of the United Nations was formed, but it was soon realised that such a large body, a body composed of one hundred members, would not be able to discuss in detail such a big matter as disarmament. So, subsequently, it was thought that there should be a smaller disarmament committee. In 1959, both the blocks, not under the purview of the United Nations, but on their own separately, and out of goodwill decided to form a ten-nation committee, and the ten-nation committee continued to function until the time when these talks were broken down on account of the unfortunate U-2 incident.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Kasiwal: I would beg of you to give me five minutes more, because you would remember that I had given notice of a no-day-yet-named motion but that motion has now been merged with this motion.

In 1959, a resolution was again unanimously adopted by all the nations for complete and general disarmament. In 1960, there was again a talk going on as to whether control should precede disarmament or whether disarmament should precede control. I want to refer to that controversy, because

the Prime Minister when he spoke in the United Nations on the 3rd October, 1960, referred to this. And may I say that the echoes of that speech, that famous speech, will reverberate in the halls of the United Nations for a number of years to come? He said about this matter of controls *versus* disarmament as follows:

"There is an argument as to whether disarmament should precede control or whether control should precede disarmament. This is a strange argument, because it is perfectly clear that disarmament without controls is not a feasible proposition; it is even more clear that controls without disarmament have no meaning. The whole conception of controls comes in only because of disarmament."

He clinched the whole issue and he put it squarely before all the delegations in the United Nations, and this was our own resolution which had subsequently been merged into a resolution, you will recall, of the AICC also, for, that was the only thing that could be the basis for disarmament negotiations.

I hope that some time these negotiations will succeed. The Prime Minister has been pleased to say that at present, instead of disarmament there is greater piling up of armaments, but I hope that the Great Powers will really see to it that that holocaust which the world is fearing today will not come about.

The Prime Minister has been pleased to refer to the question of Angola in great detail. I only want to say this. Look at the enormous size of Angola and Mozambique. The territories of Angola and Mozambique are more than twenty times the size of Portugal. You will recall that I find occasion to remark some time ago that the size of Belgian Congo was about eighty times the size of Belgium. That is how these colonial Powers have been functioning. I do not want to

[Shri Kasliwal].

say a great deal about Angola but I want to say only this, namely that I hope that this House will join with me in sending a word of good cheer and encouragement to the people of Angola to keep on fighting for their liberation.

Finally, there is only one small thing I want to mention, and that is about who is the leader of all Africans in that territory. I hope that the Prime Minister will on a suitable occasion find it convenient to invite Mr. Jomo Kenyatta to this country.

श्री बाजराज्यो (बलरामपुर) : सभापति महोदय, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति और उसके सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार की नीति पर विचार करते हुए यह स्वाभाविक है कि हमारा ध्यान उन संकटों की ओर जाये जिनके कि परिणामस्वरूप विश्व में तनाव की स्थिति पैदा हो गई है और शान्ति के लिए खतरा उत्पन्न हो गया है। इस बात से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि विश्व-शान्ति में भारत का निहित स्वार्थ है। हमारे निर्माण के प्रयत्न तब तक पूर्ण सफल नहीं होंगे जब तक विश्व में शान्ति नहीं रहेगी और इसलिए अपने हितों की रक्षा करने हुए हम अपना प्रभाव विश्व शान्ति को बनाये रखने में डालें, इस बात की बड़ी आवश्यकता है। यह सन्तोष की बात है कि भारत सरकार अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में एक ऐसी नीति का पालन कर रही है जिससे विश्व शान्ति को बल मिलता है, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय तनाव कम होते हैं और जो परस्पर विरोधी राष्ट्र हैं उनको एक दूसरे के निकट लाने में हमारा देश सहायक हो सकता है।

14.47 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

आज सब का ध्यान बॉलन समस्या की ओर जाता है। हमें यह बात स्पष्ट रूप से कहनी चाहिए कि जर्मनी का बंटवारा कायम रहे, इसे हम पसन्द नहीं करते और

मुझे खुशी है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अणु-भाषण में इस बात का संकेत भी किया है। साम्राज्यवादी देश समस्याओं को हल करने का एक तरीका बंटवारे का निकालते हैं। लेकिन हमारा अपना अनुभव साक्षी है कि बंटवारे से समस्यायें हल नहीं होतीं बल्कि और भी उलझ जाती हैं। फ्रांस अल्जीरिया का बंटवारा करना चाहता है। हम उसके विरोधी हैं क्योंकि उससे अल्जीरिया के निवासियों की राष्ट्रीय भावनाएं पूर्ण नहीं होंगी। जर्मनी के लोग यदि चाहते हैं कि एक संयुक्त जर्मन राष्ट्र का निर्माण हो तो उनकी भावना का आदर किया जाना चाहिए। हम यह आशा करते थे कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता एक स्वतंत्र चुनाव के द्वारा जर्मनी को एक करने के सम्बन्ध में भी अपने विचार प्रकट करेंगे लेकिन ईस्ट जर्मनी के कम्युनिस्ट नेता और उनके संरक्षक तथा भारतीय समर्थक जर्मनी में स्वतंत्र चुनाव कराने से डरते हैं। इसका कारण ढूढना कोई कठिन बात नहीं है। लेकिन जर्मन समस्या का कोई लोकतांत्रिक हल हो सकता है तो वह यही है कि यूनाइटेड नेशंस (राष्ट्र संघ) की देखरेख में वहां स्वतंत्र चुनाव कराये जायें और यदि दोनों जर्मनी मिलना चाहते हैं और जर्मन राष्ट्र के रूप में खड़ा होना चाहते हैं तो उन्हें इस बात का पूर्ण अवसर दिया जाना चाहिए। इस के पश्चात् अगर जर्मनी चाहे तो किसी भी गुटबन्दी में मिलने का फैसला करे, यद्यपि मैं यह चाहूंगा कि जर्मनी को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय गुटबन्दी से अलग रहना चाहिए। यदि ऐसा समझौता किया जा सके कि स्वतंत्र चुनाव के बाद जो जर्मन राष्ट्र बनेगा वह न अमरीकी गुट में शामिल हो और न रूसी गुट में और दोनों गुट उसकी स्वतंत्रता और उसकी तटस्थता का सम्मान करें, तो यूरोप की बहुत सी समस्यायें हल हो सकती हैं।

यह अच्छी बात है कि अभी भी जर्मनी के प्रश्न पर बातचीत के दरवाजे पूरी तरह

से बन्द नहीं किये गये हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि समझौता-वार्ता की जो सम्भावना है, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी उसको बढ़ाने में काफी योगदान कर सकते हैं। अभी वह रुम की यात्रा करने वाले हैं। आगे उन्हें नये अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति के निमंत्रण पर संयुक्त राज्य जाना है। मुझे विश्वास है कि इस यात्रा का लाभ उठा कर वह ऐसे प्रयत्न करगे कि जर्मन बर्लिन के सवाल पर समझौता हो जाये और विश्व युद्ध के संकट से बच जाये।

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति का सब से अच्छा पहलू यह है कि उपनिवेशवाद धीरे-धीरे समाप्त होता जा रहा है। पश्चिम के राष्ट्र आजादी के आन्दोलनों से विवश हो कर अपने कदम पीछे हटाने के लिए मजबूर किये जा रहे हैं और दूसरी ओर बहुत बड़ी संख्या में ऐसे राष्ट्र अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर उदित हो रहे हैं, जो किसी गुट-बन्दी में शामिल नहीं हैं। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स जनरल असेम्बली की पिछली बैठक में ऐसे गुट-विहीन राष्ट्रों की शक्ति का सारे विश्व को अनुभव हुआ। छोटे-छोटे राष्ट्र विश्व की समस्याओं पर स्वतंत्र रूप से विचार करें और किसी के पिछलग्गू हो कर न रहें, यह शान्ति के लिये एक बड़ा चिन्ह है। भारत ऐसे राष्ट्रों की अगली पंक्ति में है, इसके लिये हमें गौरव होना चाहिए। जो लोग यह मांग करते हैं कि हम भी किसी के पिछलग्गू हो जायें, किसी गुट में शामिल हो जायें, किसी से सशर्त हथियार लेकर अपनी आजादी को सीमित कर दें, अपने राष्ट्रीय स्वाभिमान पर आघात करें, मैं नहीं समझता कि वे आज की देश की परिस्थिति स्थिति और विश्व की आज की स्थिति को देख कर ऐसी बात कहते हैं।

आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि ऐसे राष्ट्रों का मण्डल बनाया जाये, जो किसी गुट के सदस्य नहीं हैं, जो हर एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय

प्रश्न पर निर्भीकता से अपनी बात कह सकते हैं और जो सबकी मित्रता के लिये प्रयत्नशील हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ऐसे गुट-विहीन राष्ट्रों के सम्मेलन में भाग लेने के लिये जा रहे हैं। उन्होंने यह ठीक कहा कि यह सम्मेलन एक तीसरा गुट बनाने का कारण नहीं बनना चाहिए। किन्तु एक और बात भी ध्यान देने की है कि ऐसे सम्मेलन में किस सीमा तक हम उसके निर्णयों को प्रभावित कर सकते हैं, इस बात का हमें अन्दाज लगाना चाहिए।

काहिरा में जो बैठक हुई, जिसमें हमारे सेक्रेटरी-जनरल ने भाग लिया, उसकी जो खबरें अखबारों में छपी हैं, उनसे ऐसा लगता है कि दक्षिण-पूर्वी एशिया के देशों को तो हम बहुत दूर तक शायद अपने साथ ले जा सके हैं, लेकिन अफ्रीका के जो नये-नये देश आजाद हो रहे हैं, उनके साथ हमारा उतना निकट सम्पर्क नहीं है, जितना कि रहना चाहिए। हम उनको अपने साथ ले सकें, इस बात पर विशेष जोर देने की जरूरत है। गुट-विहीन राष्ट्रों का यह सम्मेलन शान्ति के पक्ष को बलवान बनायेगा, हमें यह आशा करनी चाहिए और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में एक ऐसी तीसरी आवाज पैदा होगी, जो शस्त्रों की शंका के बीच स्वतंत्रता की, आत्म-निर्णय के अधिकार की और समस्त मानव मात्र के प्रति समता के भाव की घोषणा करेगी, इस बात का विश्वास किया जा सकता है।

कुछ समस्यायें ऐसी हैं, जिनका हमारे देश के साथ सीधा सम्बन्ध है। स्वाभाविक है कि हम उनके ऊपर गम्भीरता से विचार करें। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने चीन के साथ हमारे सीमा-संघर्ष के सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ भी कहा, उससे किसी का समाधान नहीं हो सकता। मैं सेक्रेटरी-जनरल को

[श्री वाजपेयी]

पीकिंग में कम्यूनिस्ट-चीन के नेताओं के साथ वार्ता करने के लिये भेजे जाने का विरोधी हूँ। दोनों देशों के आफिसरों के मध्य जो बातचीत हुई, उसकी रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में कम्यूनिस्ट-चीन के नेताओं की प्रतिक्रिया क्या है, उसका पता लगाने के लिये भारत सरकार के सेक्रेटरी-जनरल पीकिंग की यात्रा करें और कम्यूनिस्ट-चीन के दरवाजे खटखटायें, यह भारत के स्वाभिमान के अनुकूल नहीं है। चीन से कोई जवाब नहीं मिला, चीन ने उस रिपोर्ट को प्रकाशित तक नहीं किया, क्या हम इसी से यह नहीं समझ सकते कि उसकी प्रतिक्रिया क्या है। क्या इसके लिये भारत के सेक्रेटरी-जनरल महोदय को पीकिंग की यात्रा करने के लिये भेजना जरूरी था? जब कम्यूनिस्ट-चीन के कोई नेता पीकिंग में नहीं मिले, तो वह शंघाई गये और उनसे बातचीत करके आये हमें कम्यूनिस्ट-चीन के नेताओं की मनोवृत्ति समझनी चाहिए। वे तो हमें इसी बात के लिये दोष दे रहे हैं कि हमने रिपोर्ट क्यों छपी और इससे यह भी पता लगता है कि चीन से समझौते की कोई आशा नहीं करनी चाहिए।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने "हम लड़ाई नहीं करेंगे", यह तो कह दिया, लेकिन अगर लड़ाई नहीं करेंगे, तो क्या करेंगे? चीन के अधिकार में जो भारत की भूमि चली गई है, वह कैसे वापस आयेगी, इसका भारत सरकार के पास कोई उत्तर नहीं है। इस प्रकार की निष्क्रियता की नीति न तो राष्ट्र के हितों का संरक्षण करती है, न जनता का मनोबल बढ़ाती है और न यह हमारे पड़ोसी देशों से हमारी शक्ति के प्रति विश्वास पैदा करती है। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम कोई सक्रिय नीति अपनायें और इसके लिये हम अपनी शक्ति देखें। आज की परिस्थिति में चीन के विशुद्ध क्या कदम उठाये जा सकते हैं,

इसका विचार करें और कोई कदम उठाने के लिये प्रयत्न करें।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : माननीय सदस्य बतायें।

श्री वाजपेयी : कुछ हमारे कांग्रेसी मित्र टोक रहे हैं कि सरकार क्या करे। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम सरकार सेक्रेटरी-जनरल जैसे व्यक्तियों को चीनी नेताओं के दरवाजे खटखटाने के लिये न भेजे। अगर वह कुछ नहीं कर सकती है, तो न करे, लेकिन भारत के स्वाभिमान को तो ठोकर न लगाये। यदि भारत की भूमि वह वापस नहीं ला सकती है, ...

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : ला सकती है।

श्री वाजपेयी : वह नहीं ला सकती है। लेकिन वह ऐसा कोई काम न करें, जिससे हमारा पक्ष कमजोर होता है, जनता का मनोबल टूटता है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सेक्रेटरी-जनरल को पीकिंग भेजने के सम्बन्ध में जो स्पष्टीकरण दिया है, वह बड़ा लचर है और उसमें दम नहीं है। यह कहना कि हम यह जानना चाहते थे कि चीन के नेताओं की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है, यह तो नई दिल्ली में चीन के राजदूत बैठे हुए हैं, उनसे जानी जा सकती थी। इसके लिए कम्यूनिस्ट चीन को चिट्ठी लिखी जा सकती थी। इसके लिए सेक्रेटरी जनरल को भेजने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी। हमारा कहना तो स्पष्ट है कि चीन को भारत के प्रदेश से खदेड़ने के लिए अगर सैनिक कार्रवाई भी आवश्यक है तो सैनिक कार्रवाई होनी चाहिए। हम युद्ध के हामी नहीं हैं लेकिन इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि हम अपनी भूमि को भी दुश्मनों से वापिस लेने के लिए युद्ध नहीं करेंगे। हम युद्ध के हामी नहीं हैं, इसका एक ही अर्थ हो सकता है कि हम किसी दूसरे की भूमि पर आक्रमण नहीं करेंगे। किन्तु आक्रमण का युद्ध और मुक्ति का युद्ध दोनों एक समान नहीं हैं। हम गोंगा में सैनिक भेज दें तो यह आक्रमण नहीं

होगा और हमारी शान्ति की नीति के अनुकूल होगा। अगर गांधी जी की अहिंसा में तलवार चलाने के लिए जगह थी तो प्रधान मंत्री की विश्व शान्ति की नीति में भारत की भूमि को आक्रमण से मुक्त करने के लिए सैनिक कार्रवाई भी शामिल होनी चाहिए, अन्यथा हम अपनी भूमि को विदेशियों के हाथों में छोड़ दें और शान्ति की बात करें तो उसे दुर्बलता समझा जायेगा और यह हमारे राष्ट्रीय हितों के विरुद्ध जाती है।

15 hrs.

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पाकिस्तान का भी उल्लेख किया है और उन्होंने इस बात को माना कि पाकिस्तान की नींव भारत के प्रति विरोध पर आधारित है। भारत के प्रति घृणा, यह पाकिस्तान के जन्म का कारण है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि अगर काश्मीर की समस्या हल हो जाये तो वहां के शासक ऐसे कोई और सवाल खड़े करेंगे जिन से दोनों देशों के बीच में तनातनी कायम रहे। मेरा निवेदन है कि उनका यह विश्लेषण बिल्कुल ठीक है। यह विश्लेषण अगर ठीक है तो फिर इसमें से यह अर्थ कैसे निकाला जा सकता है कि हम पाकिस्तान से मित्रता करने के लिए आवश्यकता से अधिक उदार हो जायें नहरी पानी समझौता किया गया इस आशा से कि भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच सद्भावना पैदा होगी, वेरूवाड़ी का इलाका दे दिया गया पाकिस्तान को इस आशा से कि दोनों देशों के सम्बन्ध सुधरेंगे। किन्तु इस सब का क्या परिणाम निकला? अनुभव बताता है कि पाकिस्तान हर एक अनुचित सुविधा प्राप्त करने के लिए नये-नये अड़ने खड़े करता है। इस स्थिति में क्या यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान के प्रति हम अपनी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करें? जिस दिन पाकिस्तान भारत के विरुद्ध शत्रुता छोड़ देगा, पाकिस्तान का अस्तित्व नहीं रहेगा। पाकिस्तान की नींव ही भारत के विरुद्ध घृणा पर आधारित है। जिस दिन वह भारत के विरुद्ध घृणा छोड़ देगा, यह विभाजन

की दीवार शायद टिकेगी नहीं क्योंकि राज्य अलग हो गये हैं, मगर जनता तो एक है और मजहब बदलने से कौमियत नहीं बदलती। हम ने कभी दो राष्ट्रों के मिद्दान्त को नहीं माना है।

श्री अ० सु० तारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : आज तो बड़े जोर से बोल रहे हैं।

(آج تو بڑے زور سے بول رہے ہیں -)

श्री वाजपेयी : वैसे तो हमारे तारिक साहब समझदारी की बात को सुनते हैं। लेकिन मुस्लिम कनवेंशन में जब वह गये थे तो उनको बोलने तक नहीं दिया गया।

श्री अ० सु० तारिक : वहीं से दानिशमन्दी हासिल की है।

(وہیں سے دانشمندی حاصل کی ہے -)

श्री वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस राजनीतिक विभाजन के बावजूद दोनों राज्यों की जनता एक है और इसलिए यह राजनीतिक विभाजन उस दिन नहीं रहेगा और न ही इसकी कोई आवश्यकता रह जायेगी जिस दिन भारत और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध सुधर जायेंगे : जिन नेताओं ने पाकिस्तान की मांग की, पाकिस्तान के लिए आन्दोलन किया, जो अंग्रेज के हाथ के खिलौने बने वे कभी भी यह नहीं चाहेंगे कि भारत और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध सुधरें।

जहां तक हमारा सवाल है मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी की इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि हम पाकिस्तान का भला चाहते हैं, पाकिस्तान से मित्रता चाहते हैं, पाकिस्तान से अपने सम्बन्धों को सुधारना चाहते हैं। लेकिन इसके लिए पाकिस्तान को अनुचित सुविधायें दी जायें, इसके हम हक में नहीं हैं। पाकिस्तान जैसी नीति अपनाता है, हमें भी वैसी नीति अपनानी चाहिये क्योंकि सम-सहयोग की नीति के बिना डग प्रकार के प्रश्नों का उत्तर नहीं दिया जा सकता है।

[श्री वाजपेयी:]

जहां तक पाकिस्तान को अमरीकी सहायता का सवाल है, प्रधान मंत्री जो ने जो कुछ कहा है, उसमें मेरा मन्नाष नहीं हुआ है। अमरीकी इरादे अच्छे होंगे, मगर एक बार अमरीका के हाथ में मे हथियार निकल गये तो अमरीका क्या कहता है यह हम नहीं देखेंगे। जिस के हाथ में हथियार पहुंच गये हैं, वह क्या कहता है, इसका हमें विचार करना चाहिए। हथियारों पर यह तो नहीं लिखा होता कि वे रूस की तरफ चलेंगे और भारत की तरफ नहीं चलेंगे। अमरीका में मिलने वाले हथियार भारत के विरोध में भी काम में लाये जा सकते हैं और यह बड़े खेद की बात है कि अमरीका के शासन में परिवर्तन होने के बाद भी पाकिस्तान को अधिक सैनिक सहायता दी जा रही है। डेमोक्रेटिक एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के आने से यह आशा की गई थी कि वह सैनिक सहायता देने के बजाये आर्थिक सहायता देने पर वन देगा। लेकिन हवाई जहाज तो अलग रहे, पाकिस्तान को सब-मैरीज दी जा रही है। पाकिस्तान की समुद्री सीमा तो किसी कम्युनिस्ट देश से नहीं लगती है, फिर पाकिस्तान को सब-मैरीज देने की क्या आवश्यकता है? ये सब-मैरीज हमारे खिलाफ काम में लाई जा सकती है। पाकिस्तान और पुर्तगाल जिस घृणित गठबन्धन में शामिल हैं, उसको भी हमको याद रखना चाहिए। गोआ में इस बात के प्रयत्न हो रहे हैं कि गोआ को भारत से अलग किया जाये गोआ एक अलग कालोनी बनाई जाये। हमें यह भी याद रखना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान और पुर्तगाल के बढ़ते हुए सम्बन्ध गोआ की मुक्ति में और भी रोड़े पैदा करेंगे।

प्रधान मंत्री अमरीका यात्रा कर रहे हैं और वह अमरीका को अल्टीमेटम दे दें, इसकी तो किसी ने मांग नहीं की और न ही इसकी आवश्यकता है। मगर अमरीकी नेताओं को यह बात स्पष्ट रूप से कही जानी चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे कर आप इस क्षेत्र में शान्ति और लोकतंत्र को मजबूत नहीं

करते। जिस देश में स्वयं लोकतंत्र नहीं है, वह लोकतंत्र को क्या मजबूत करेगा? अगर इस क्षेत्र में, अगर दक्षिण-पूर्व एशिया में, लोकतंत्र मजबूत हो सकता है तो ४४ करोड़ का भारत, लोकतंत्र को दृढ़ बनाने में अपना योगदान कर सकता है। डगमगाते हुए सिंहासनों और लड़खड़ाते हुए राज-मुकुटों को सैनिक सहायता दे कर अमरीका लोकतंत्र की रक्षा नहीं कर सकता। अमरीका को चाहिए कि वह दबाव डाले पाकिस्तान पर कि वह भारत के विरोध में अपनी नीति बदले और इस बात को अमरीका के नेताओं को साफ कहने की जरूरत है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी विदेश नीति जहां तक विश्वशान्ति की रक्षा का सवाल है, भारत की प्रतिष्ठा को बढ़ाने का सवाल है, एक दिशा में चल रही है। यह किसी व्यक्ति की या किसी एक पार्टी की नीति नहीं है, सारे देश की नीति है। लेकिन जहां तक भारत के हितों का सवाल है, उनकी रक्षा के लिए हमारी विदेश नीति को अधिक दृढ़, अधिक सक्रिय और अधिक पौषपूर्ण होने की आवश्यकता है।

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): The House is debating the international situation with the background of the triumph of man as symbolised the stupendous achievement of the Russian cosmonauts, but unfortunately mixed with angry words and threats over the issue of Berlin. As the Prime Minister pointed out, the debate can be roughly divided into two categories or groups—subjects or matters which interest us, and matters which directly affect us.

I should like to begin with matters which are of vital concern to us, which directly affect us, which have a bearing on our own lives. It would, therefore, be appropriate that I should begin with our neighbour Pakistan. One can fully endorse what the Prime Minister has said today with regard to Pakistan so that there is no misunderstanding in the mind of General Ayub Khan and his colleagues that this is only the policy of the

Prime Minister. But in order to drive home the point that that policy is the policy of the whole nation, I should like to make a few additions.

One had hoped, and the hopes were planted by the signing of boundary treaty with Pakistan and hopes which became to be nourished by the signing of the Indus Water Treaty which we entered into with so much sacrifice to ourselves, that there would be a gradual move and progress in the direction of normalisation of relations between our two countries. Unfortunately, these hopes have been blasted by the Hate India Hymn which General Ayub had been indulging in for the past few months. It should be of a little interest to find the reasons why he had chosen this particular moment to start this tirade against India. They are not far to look for. I can suggest three main reasons for this special pattern of behaviour on the part of Ayub Khan, who on the assumption of power protested very loudly his friendship for India. The first and foremost is what the Prime Minister has himself said that with the change in administration in the United States, there came a gradual acceptance of the policy of non-alignment and things began to move a bit further. Non-alignment came to acquire a degree of respectability gradually, again quoting the Prime Minister; on certain vital issues the policies of the United States came very near to the policies pursued by this country. This gaining of respectability for the policy of non-alignment, this was a kind of challenge to those who survive, whose very existence depended upon the cold war. General Ayub Khan is a creature and creation of cold war. It was but natural that he should try to do something to prevent this kind of development. This was reason No. 1.

There is another very important reason which compelled him to behave the way he has been behaving. He is a soldier and his mind reacts in a sol-

dierly manner. He regards this country as an adversary and "the difficulty of that adversary is my opportunity" comes to his mind naturally. With Chinese breach of faith with India, Ayub Khan's military mind began to think that with the entire northern border of India rendered sensitive and vulnerable, why not try to derive advantage by exploiting this deterioration of relations between India and China? This was the second reason and here the Chinese of course went a very long way in accommodating him. Very strange bed fellows—a communist regime and from what we hear all the while from this side, a fascist regime. They became bed fellows in order to spite India.

The third reason is something internal—that eternal strategem to which a dictator turns when his difficulties begin to grow at home. Try to find out somebody whom you can hold responsible when everything goes wrong at home. This has been the strategem of all dictators in every country in all times. Slowly, the people of Pakistan were getting tired with the new regime which had promised everything and given nothing. The novelty of the regime which made the trains run to schedule, which gave a face lift to the streets of Karachi began to wear out and people began to realise that the hanging or flogging of a few black marketers is not a substitute for planned development of a country. All this created a necessity once again of finding a whipping boy and who could play that role better than old India? These were the factors which compelled him to launch this campaign of hatred against India at this particular hour.

Having said this and expressed our disappointment that he should choose this method of dealing with this country and bringing disappointment. I am sure to millions of hearts in this country as well as in Pakistan that the hope of better relations had been

[Shri Nath Pai]

delayed, I do not say destroyed, because one refuses to believe that an Ayub Khan will be ruling Pakista : for all eternity. Ayub Khan has been saying very interesting things about our country and they need to be refuted. He has taken upon himself to tell us what a leader should be like. It is extraordinary that he should tell India how her leaders should behave. He has called Indian leadership childish, irresponsible. It is very funny indeed and a little intriguing. Indian leaders, whatever differences there may be, we should like to make it clear—are leaders by the choice of the people of India, free choice fully exercised. They are in today's position by the loyalty, by the affection and regard of their people. They have reached their present position by the defiance of a mighty foreign foe, by sustained a fight against that foe. What can we say to General Ayub Khan. When he mocks at our leadership we would like to remind him that had it not been for the struggle led by the Indian leaders. General Ayub Khan would have been a Brigadier clicking his heels before some British commander. We cannot forget it. Such a thing must not normally be said against the head of a State and we, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been exercising the greatest restraint. But matters have come to a head when a spade must be called a spade and what we deeply feel when these perennial insults are heaped on our country must be conveyed to those who have been indulging in this kind of game.

He blames us for not showing our faith in him and he promises that if we were to make a nice present of Kashmir he would be having no more quarrel—a point that has been laboured by the Prime Minister himself this morning. Let me acknowledge very frankly that many of us encounter and experience difficulty in showing faith in General Ayub Khan. Once again in the most polite terms possible, but none the less firm, we would like to tell him the reasons why we could not place faith in the words

he gives, pledges to us. How can anybody, a whole nation, take the risk of placing faith in the words of a man who in the morning swore by the holy Koran to uphold the Constitution of Pakistan but by the time the echoes of his pledge had died down and before the sun had set on that solemn occasion used his pistol to trample down the same Constitution and pulled down the man by whom he had sworn his loyalty? We do experience some difficulty in placing our faith in such a person.

General Ayub Khan has been talking of some imbalance in the military strength between our two countries coming. He asks us: why do you get worried, annoyed or excited if we try to rectify the little imbalance in the military strength? So far as that imbalance is concerned, militarily speaking the scale is weighted right now on his side. He wants to compete with us. We should be very happy to have a healthy competition. In that competition lies the happiness perhaps of a large majority of the people of Pakistan and India. Let there be a competition, not in getting more arms but in getting more liberty and more freedom and more human dignity and more planned progress for the people of Pakistan. Why not try to rectify that imbalance rather than on insulting India.

The *Hindustan Times* speaks of his speech the day before yesterday. During the Independence Day celebrations it is the normal custom to exchange greetings with sister nations. We were created together. Thanks largely to the efforts of the people of this country and of course the people of Pakistan. But many of them like Badshah Khan are in prisons in Shri Ayub Khan's Raj.

He has not even let pass such a solemn occasion like the Independence Day of Pakistan without hurling insults and abuses at our country. He had suggested a plebiscite. The point has been answered. I would like to ask one question. He wants plebiscite in Kashmir. Why? What about giving the people of Pakistan an opportunity to enjoy that right and

choose their own leader before he asks somebody else to give such a right to somebody else. We would like to welcome this. We are used to this kind of bluff, bluster and threats from the rulers of Pakistan. But there is one thing. We wholly endorse the statement made recently by the Prime Minister at a press conference regarding Kashmir. Gen. Ayub Khan and those who support him, willy-nilly, unwittingly, sometimes for their own selfish, narrow ends may note it. Kashmir may be kind of feather in his military cap. It is a piece of territory for him, but it is something far more vital and far more fundamental for us. It is the pivot round which turns the very conception of the democratic life which we planned for our people and for the future. Therefore, there cannot be any kind of bargaining on that. I am very happy to endorse it, reminding the House of the fact that the Praja-Socialist Party was the first in 1951 to claim that the issue of the accession of Kashmir to India has been settled once for all, when through most democratic process of the Constitution Assembly of Kashmir had given a verdict on that issue. There is no going back on it. We do not want to be panicky and once again we do not want to indulge in this kind of rebuff and counter-bluff.

But there is one thing: so that nobody is tempted into a kind of mad adventure in Kashmir or any other part of India, it is better to remind them that we are generally a non-aligned nation but we have not abdicated our sovereign rights to defend this country by procuring arms and armaments from wherever we choose, depending upon our ability to pay of course, since we do not beg for them and depending upon the suitability of the supplier;—the time delivery and such factors only will count. This needs to be said when we tell Gen. Ayub Khan our intention. We should not leave any doubt here.

There is only one thing in concluding this chapter, and it is this: very often, we find this kind of language, this firm kind of tone, being reflected these days in the speeches of the Prime Minister and some of the spokesmen of the Government or their representatives from the Ministry. The leadership of Pakistan should understand that kind of firmness. There should not be any doubt in their mind as to what we mean. I hope I would not like to end this by just this kind of note, but rather in the hope that Gen. Ayub Khan, with the common sense of the soldier, again, will try to draw the necessary inferences, abandoning this mad path of trying to browbeat India and try to realise that the ultimate good of the two peoples lies in offering the hand of co-operation. If he goes one step in that direction, of co-operation, I am sure this country is ready to go two steps.

Shall I now turn to another question, a very small, a worn-out question, as the Prime Minister says. He expressed his displeasure by saying that the same arguments are brought in and the same issues are raised. What can we do if he does not provide us with a solution? We do not like to bring the same issues if he is prepared to bring a solution and remove the causes of these issues being brought before the House. I want to turn to Goa. It is time that something is done to lift the issue of Goa out of the sickening, ritualism of referring to it in platitudinous and ceremonial terms on occasions like the Independence Day and the Republic Day. I know the argument from the Prime Minister. We heard it this morning and we heard it the day before yesterday; "though we might not have solved the problem of Goa, we have earned international prestige." Pardon my saying so. It is an extraordinary yardstick; it is an extraordinary criterion to measure the success of a country's foreign policy by the prestige it wins abroad. He has talked of patience. For 14

[Shri Nath Pai]
long years we have been patient with Portugal; if it has earned us prestige, then, by the same logic, one can say that if we wait for 28 long years, the prestige of India will be doubled because by waiting for 14 years we have won a degree of prestige! There is a proverb, may I say so, in all humility, to the effect that patience is good, tolerance is good, refusal to use arms is good, but our forefathers who thought of all these problems also have put this in a maxim:

न श्रेयः भक्तं तेजो न नित्यं श्रयसी क्षामा,
तस्मात् नित्यं क्षमा तात पंडितैरपवादिता ।

And there is a corollary to it:

एतावान् एव पु षो मदमपि यदत्रमी,
क्षमावान् निरमर्षश्च वै स्त्री न पुनः पुमान् ।

There is a time for forgiving; and there is a time for showing your anger; and those who can never get angry, come what may, who will go on pleading for patience,—that is not patience; that is acquiescence; that is passivity; that is an acceptance of defeat. There is a time for proper wrath, anger and expression of that. Why should we be fighting shy of it? The Prime Minister has told us that we remain committed to resisting aggression. But may I ask him: what is Portugal's occupation of Goa; if not aggression *ab initio*? It has been a continued aggression. It is a case of unredeemed aggression and if we accept that we are pledged to resist aggression, why not exercise our sovereign right to resist aggression in Goa? Apart from the prestige going higher and generally we have noted this—please excuse me—and we fail to see this: the prestige may be going higher day by day. We may see that a time might come when the prestige of India may be taller than the Himalayas and in that process India may be much smaller than it is. So, this thought of our prestige going higher

has to be abandoned. But then they accuse us that we want war. We do not want war, we want to remain peaceful. There is no question of war involved.

He raised the bogey—I am sorry to use the word—the bogey of NATO is not going to raise a small finger if India does what is expected of her, that is, to defend her territory, her own soil and her sovereignty. We saw little Dahomey having the courage to do it. What happened? Little Dahomey liquidated the Portuguese post on her coast. Not a single finger was raised by anybody and not an eyelid was beaten by anybody in Europe. There may be some murders; there may be some protests; but since we are right why should we be afraid? Yes, Sir. We will make bold to say,—knowing fully well that the charge of being adventurists will be levelled against us, knowing fully well that the unfair, unwarrantable, unfounded charge of war-mongering will be brought against us, nonetheless, we should face these charges and defend our own interest rather than being worried about the charges and forgo our vital interests. India will have to make up its mind rather than to make the ceremonial references to Goa assuring the people of Goa that our revolution is not complete so long as they are not a part of India. Have we not waited all this time and at what cost? If we use the legitimate means which are ours to use, I do not think anybody is going to bother a we bit.

Let me remind the House and the Prime Minister that there is a press called the Beaverbrook Press in Great Britain. Even when we took the step of police action in Hyderabad, the students in U. K. assembled and welcomed that step, but the evening edition of the Beaverbrook Press came out saying "Nehru invades Hyderabad." But did it make a difference to the reality? Nobody raised a finger. Well, Pakistan might have been screaming and howling about it, but nobody

would care if we did right thing in Goa. There is the repetition of the tragedy we heard in the morning. Therefore, I welcome that part of the statement which he made when he spoke on the Adjournment Motion this morning. I only hope that that is the considered policy: "If necessary we may vary our policy." I only plead that the time has come to vary that policy.

I wish now to come to another thing nearer home. The Prime Minister talked about Laos. To use a very favourite phrase of his, "broadly speaking," we support the way the Government of India has been approaching the Laos problem. But Laos must not be viewed in isolation, but as a development in South-East Asia. It was the Prime Minister who had conceived a future for South-East Asia, and he had used the words, "an area of peace." Of late, other problems perhaps have been engaging his mind and he is forgetting that this area, which was to help the world by remaining an area of peace, has become a hotbed of international intrigues. Laos is only an evidence of it. China is there; The Soviet Union is there; the USSR and in a small way the United Kingdom are all there, and where is the voice of peace? Where is the voice of Panchsheel? Where is the voice of non-alignment? It is a sad fact that we are being gradually edged out, pushed out, of the area. The initiative which provided the leadership is absent. This, I know the Prime Minister does not find perhaps very palatable. But it has got to be said. A vacuum is developing in the whole region of South-East Asia and this with due respect to the emissaries who are doing some difficult job there. The question has to be raised, and I tried to raise it during the debate on the Demands of his Ministry, whether the Prime Minister is giving that attention which South-East Asia deserves. Do we try to send our ablest men, our new cadres, who are fired with a vision and a missionary zeal? This is a thing which is very vital to India. The

Chinese, it must be said to their credit, are realising this; their ablest men are coming and their embassies are staffed with their idealists. How big are their embassies and what magnificent dividends are they bringing for China? Gradually, there is a growing disillusionment about India. One does not like to say because it is so hurtful, because it is not the defeat of his policy. The policy is O. K., but there is its implementation. Today there is no initiative. It is a national loss that is happening. Gradually we are witnessing the spectacle of these nations slowly slipping into the orbit of Chinese influence, gradually coming within Chinese periphery. China, with the dual policy of aid, trade and friendship and non-aggression treaty is slowly drawing these nations, because of the lack of activity and initiative on the part of India, into the vortex of her own influence. What do these treaties with Nepal, with Burma and with the other countries signify? We are being pushed out and gradually isolated. The reason is this, that this area does not receive that top priority in the thinking of the External Affairs Ministry which it should, and we are not trying to do all that we can do to private leadership.

There is another thing that needs to be considered. It is the problem of the Indians in other countries. I know the Prime Minister has made speeches, to which no exception can be taken, with regard to the problems of Indians in these areas. When he went as a messenger of goodwill from this country he told the Indians there that they should choose either to remain as Indians or to accept the citizenship of those nations where they happened to be. What has happened? Not many acted. The embassies did not act. Tomorrow, in five to ten years, we will be having a problem landed on our lap, something similar to the problem with which we are confronted in Ceylon and which has been there plaguing our relations with that friendly neighbour. We have got to see that our embassies there make

[Shri Nath Pai]
 it abundantly clear to the Indians there and a time limit must be specified during which they choose to accept either the citizenship of this country or the citizenship of the country in which they are living. It is not worthwhile spoiling the relations with Burma and with other countries. This will come in Africa too in a big way. Soon, Sir, in Tanganyika it will come, in Uganda it will come, in Kenya it will come. Are we going to spoil our relations with these newly liberated countries because of a few Indians there? I want that the legitimate interests of these Indians should be defended, but they must not be allowed to have the best of both worlds—they are Indians when it suits them and they want to be Kenyans or Burmans when it suits them. No, this must be discouraged. All these nations are going to judge our claim to be there their friends not by our protest against some foreign imperialism but the way in which we deal with the question of Indians in their country. It is very easy for us to strike a note of friendship when it means condemning France, condemning Belgium or condemning Britain. But the Kenyans of today want to know what the Prime Minister of India wants to tell to his own countrymen who are not always appearing as their best friends in the country. I do not want to say harsh things about my own compatriots, but we must look to the wider interest of the country as a whole and try to strike the proper note.

The Prime Minister was correct in trying to correct our record of help to Nepal. We are glad that record of help continues. We would like, Sir, that that help is increased during the Third Five Year Plan, and we keep on co-operating with Nepal in every possible way. There is one thing, however, which we cannot forget. How can this help bear the greatest kind of fruit for the people of Nepal unless the proper conditions are created in Nepal, unless there is democracy, unless the chosen representatives, the trusted leaders of

the people are there to use this help? One wonders what will be happening to the help, whether it will be meeting the same fate which falls to the help which some countries are receiving, whether that help is not going down the drains. We do not want that to happen to our help. We want to see a prosperous and strong Nepal standing as the guardian on our border. For that reason we deeply feel, and I think this again is a national sentiment and not a party feeling, that there is in Nepal the restoration of a form of Government which is a reflection of the will and the wishes of the people of Nepal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I should briefly like to turn my attention to one or two problems in conclusion. The Prime Minister has made, I think, a very correct analysis of the situation in Berlin. Berlin cannot be viewed in isolation or in a vacuum. Berlin's ultimate solution lies in an effort, in a dedicated and sincere effort in providing a solution to the problem of Central Europe and of Germany as a whole.

The Prime Minister said two things. I think he wanted to say one thing more but he left it unsaid. One thing he said was about the rights of the people of Berlin. The second thing, of course, was the right of the people of Berlin to be a part of Western Germany. There is nothing wrong in it. There are two Pakistans separated by the territory of India; but they are one nation. There is the question of UAR, consisting of Syria and Egypt, far removed by so much of territory; still it is one nation. So, the fact that Western Berlin is separated from Western Germany does not mean that the right of self-determination of the people of Western Berlin should be denied. This was the second aspect. Perhaps he wanted to say it when he referred to the rights of exit and entry, but left unsaid. But what is the solution?

Berlin is a hornet's nest and it is a very dangerous thing to try to kick it. We do not know what problems

will come out of it. But one thing perhaps is possible. A suggestion was earlier made by the Foreign Minister of Poland, Mr. Rapacki and that plan came to be supported by a large body of thinking opinion in Europe. Both sides will have to show courage. We are not trying to give any advice to anybody, as he rightly said, but we are expressing our views on a matter which is of vital concern, though not today directly, today indirectly, but tomorrow definitely directly to all of us. Have we tried to encourage this thinking that demilitarised, neutralist, independent, united Germany offers the best solution?

This will have to be, again as part of the solution for the whole of Germany, for the whole of Central Europe and for Europe. One can appreciate the fears entertained by the Poles and Czechs who have suffered. But it is equally essential to remember that the West Berliners have got a right of self-determination and that cannot be bartered away because of some hotch potch agreement. In this spirit only a solution is possible to the Berlin problem.

I would like to draw the Prime Minister's attention to the question of Algeria. The statement which he made today with regard to the question of Algeria is very largely satisfactory. None the less, one was a little hurt and unhappy at the way the Indian Delegation reacted to this question when it was raised at the Cairo Conference. And I think that they had very good reasons for it, they had powerful reasons, and the motive of the Government of India was to help facilitate the agreement between France and Algeria. We were much misunderstood there. Of course, with the question of Tunisia now coming, there will be better appraisal. The Prime Minister has stated that there is *de facto* recognition of Algeria. Here may I point out that the Avion talks failed not because of the obstinacy of Ferhat Abbas and his

colleagues, but principally because of the peculiar attitude France took to the whole issue of military base on Algerian leaders and, secondly, because of the peculiar claims of France on Algeria, an issue on which we share the views of the Algerian Sahara and its economic development? Here again, on both these issues, the Algerian nationalists were showing a spirit of accommodation and realism and it was France which wanted to sit very tight because of her superior military force. In the light of that, and in the light of that revolting spectacle of brute force by France in Bizerta, will not Government, will not the Prime Minister, think that it is better, it is more desirable that before he proceeds to Belgrade for the Summit Conference we confirm *de jure* recognition on the Algerian Government? This will be a very fitting thing, this will boost up the morale of Algeria and this may perhaps persuade France to come to term with them sooner than she is likely to do otherwise.

With these words, I should like to conclude by adding one or two things, particularly because there are many things in his statement which we would like to support. I know the amendment that will be moved from the Congress benches that "having taken into account the international situation, this House endorses the policy of the Government of India in regard to it". We should like to join it. But we would like the Government to bear in mind these pertinent weaknesses, these soft spots in that policy with regard to the neglect of our neighbours, with the regard to the necessity of taking once again the initiative of fostering freindship actively, not taking it for granted, that they will remain our friends because this is the land of Buddha, they will look to our friendship because we have Nehru to lead us, but making them think that we really think in terms of identity of interests because in their prosperity lies our prosperity.

With regard to the larger issue which I could not deal with, since the time

[Shri Nath Pai]
is over I do not want to go into it, But there is the plea about Goa of a more firm and more definite policy. With these reservations and qualifications we would like to extend our support to his foreign policy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Achar. Now onwards hon. Members should finish their remarks ordinarily within ten minutes or fifteen minutes at the most.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to support the amendment moved by Shri Venketrao Srinivasrao Naldurgkar which says:

"This House, having considered present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves the policy of the Government of India."

The previous speaker referred to this aspect of the question before he closed and I would like to say at the very outset that I fully support this amendment.

The previous speaker, Shri Nath Pai, comes from a place very near Goa, namely, Belgaum. I also happen to come from a place very near Belgaum and at the outset I would like to say a few words about that question before I touch upon some of the other points.

We do feel very much, specially people who are round about Goa, that Goa should merge in India. We hear a good number of stories, some of them true and probably some of them untrue, but the simple fact cannot be denied that the national movement there is being suppressed with an iron hand. Very recently we heard of the torture of a nationalist leader in Goa. Shrimati Violet Alva, our hon. Deputy Minister, who was nearabout there, made an appeal that the present policy probably has to be reviewed to some extent.

Only the other day this topic came up. We may not agree with all that

Shri Nath Pai has said, but one thing is certain that something has definitely to be done. It has to be considered whether we can actually have military action or like the police action against Hyderabad, as Shri Nath Pai put it, and whether that will come against our general policy of peace and of settlement of questions by negotiation. Of course, so far as that is concerned, we cannot go against the general policy, but we have to look at this problem from the point of view of achieving this merger. If nothing else, some of us feel that there must be greater political pressure on the powers that be to see that this small enclave of hardly 4 to 5 lakhs of people merges in our country. I would only appeal to the hon. Prime Minister that this question has to be viewed from a different point of view probably. He himself conceded in his opening remarks that the problem has probably to be reviewed. Some steps should be taken to see that this question is solved.

This discussion is taking place at a time when a critical situation has arisen in Germany, namely the problem of Berlin. The Communist Leader in the earlier part of the day referred to this problem and said that Berlin was captured by Russia and not either by Great Britain or by America or France. He seemed to think as if it were that it absolutely belongs to the U.S.S.R. and they could settle the problem as they want. We have to remember one most important aspect of the question. The Second World War was fought by all the Allies including Russia also with all their resources and Germany was defeated. No doubt, Germany was the cause of two great wars and it is necessary that all the powers should solve the problem in a way that we should not have another world war. From that point of view the German problem has to be solved. The Russians cannot think that they alone captured Berlin. It is with the resources of all the countries and of all the Allies, America, Great Britain, France and Russia that they

defeated Germany. It would not be proper to say that Russia can settle one-sidedly the problem as it likes.

The hon. Member who spoke before me posed a question whether this problem has to be solved by unification of the country and by neutralising Germany. Probably, that may be one of the best methods of solving the problem. But, the most vital question is that though 15 years ago, they went to war and defeated Germany, and won the war, they are not united on the question how this problem has to be solved.

One point I would like to mention in this connection. We find from the paper reports—to some extent it may be exaggerated—ever since 1949 or so, people from East Germany are migrating into West Germany. Not less than 4 million East Germans have come into West Germany. What is the cause of it? Even now, we are told, something like a thousand people are migrating into West Germany every day. When we look at this aspect of this question, the claim of Russia that they have done so well by East Germany cannot be accepted. If their Government is so good for the people, how is it that these people in East Germany are migrating in large numbers into West Germany? We are told that even recently people are coming. We know in India how a large number of refugees have come from East Pakistan or from West Pakistan into India. We can very well imagine what exactly the condition of the Germans is. It is rather a preposterous claim for any one country to claim that this question can be unilaterally settled. No doubt, it is a very difficult problem. But, it cannot be so easily solved. Recently, we had threats. When the Italian Prime Minister went to Russia, it was stated in the papers that Mr. Khrushchev said, a few bombs are sufficient to wipe out Italy or Britain or France. These are the threats that are delivered. Added to that, the Berlin question has been raised now,

when the U.S.S.R. has attained a very high degree of success in its space conquest. With all these threats behind and with the world problems being in a very critical situation, at this juncture, we find that we in India also are faced with a rather very serious problem. No doubt, so far as America is concerned, it is a global policy; in its fight against communism, it is giving military aid to Pakistan. But what is the consequence of it? If we look at this question from a historical point of view, even from the earlier times, we shall feel, and any Indian national will feel that it is a great disadvantage to us, almost a danger to us. We cannot forget the Muslim rule in this country for a considerable number of years. We cannot forget the earlier history, and we cannot forget the ill-feeling and the quarrels almost perpetually going on between the two countries. Our Prime Minister himself was pleased to say that it is almost hatred of this country, and it is not the question of the Kashmir problem even. When that is the situation, if America gives the latest arms to Pakistan, how are we to understand it? It is said that those arms cannot be used against India, because America has made it a condition; in fact, even Mr. Chester Bowles said the other day that if there was aggression America would come to the help of India. But if we look at the earlier events and see how these arms have been utilised by the Powers to whom America has given this military aid we feel that it is rather very illusory.

Let us take the case of Africa itself. All the NATO Powers have used this; for example, France has utilised this in Algeria. In Angola Portugal has used this. Pakistan also has utilised, it not only against the tribes but against Afghanistan. This is the situation so far as these arms are concerned. So, we have to consider this aspect of the question. Of course, the Prime Minister also has touched this subject, and he has said that so far as we are

[Shri Acher]

concerned, we have to consider this question.

I may submit with all respect that this important problem is agitating the minds of the people all over India. We may be growing economically, our Plans may succeed, and all that may be true, but if military strength also does not go along with that hand in hand, I do not know whether we shall be able to preserve our independence.

No doubt, very recently, very superior planes have been manufactured in Bangalore, as, for instance, the supersonic planes. But we are told that F-104 planes have been supplied to Pakistan, and as we can make out, as it is, it is very doubtful whether we could come up to that level. I am sure, however, that Government are taking all necessary steps for this purpose. All the same, it is doubtful whether our Army is equipped with arms equal to those which have recently been supplied to Pakistan by the United States. Since this is one of the most important questions, we have to consider this question, and I am sure that Government would have considered this matter very deeply and they would have taken the necessary steps to see that we also have got equal, if not superior, arms, to meet any contingency that may arise.

Shri Naldurgkar (Osmanabad): I have already moved an amendment approving the policy of the Government as far as our foreign relations are concerned.

The Berlin crisis will perhaps terminate in some undesirable results. The whole world situation no doubt has become explosive and we hope that at the present juncture, our Government's policy will again emerge as one of the most successful policies ever adopted by a nation in the world. In that context, our Prime Minister's participation at the Belgrade Conference will be viewed by all the world with more interest and we hope that

he will play a role for the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the whole world.

Various questions have been raised by hon. Members. From the beginning, our policy has been that we are desirous of the independence of other countries under colonial domination. We are for the independence of all nations in the world. That being so, wherever atrocities have been perpetrated by some colonial Powers on the people of those colonial territories, we have condemned them. Hence we also condemn the atrocities that are being committed by the Portuguese Government in Angola.

As far as the Algerian question is concerned, as I have already stated, our policy is to favour the independence of other nations.

Now I want to deal with the policy of our Government as far as our neighbours are concerned. Recently, Field Marshal Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan, delivered certain speeches. The tone of those speeches was rather threatening. But we want to inform Mr. Ayub Khan that we are not frightened by his threats but we defy them. No doubt, the United States of America has rendered military help to Pakistan. Recently, Mr. Bowles has also stated in America that if there is aggression by Pakistan against India, the United States would come to the help of India. That is true. Again, it is stated that the military help given to Pakistan will not be utilised for aggression against India. That is also true. That may be according to the agreement between Pakistan and America. But what is the guarantee thereof? If those military equipments and military aid are abruptly used against India by Pakistan, what guarantee can be given by the United States to India that they will not be used in that way? What restrictions have been placed upon the use of those weapons? Therefore, we want to know unequivocally from the United States as to who controls those weapons. If those military weapons are

under the control of the United States, then we can feel assured by the statements of Mr. Bowels here and abroad also. But as long as there is no such control, considering the nature of Pakistan and the policy she has been adopting towards India ever since the formation of Pakistan, there is a danger and fear that those military weapons supplied by America to Pakistan will be used against India. Therefore, I am of opinion that our policy towards Pakistan should be firm and specific.

16 hrs.

Till now we have been adhering to certain principles. We have solved the canal waters dispute with Pakistan. We have also solved our border problem with Pakistan. Our attitude in these matters has perhaps led Pakistan to believe that we follow a policy of appeasement, and therefore dispute after dispute is being created. As our Prime Minister has said, even leaving aside the question of Kashmir, there will be no end to the disputes with Pakistan. If they have that mentality, there will be no end to the creation of disputes. So, it is my submission that our policy towards Pakistan should be firm and specific.

Recently, F-104 planes have been supplied with missiles, and they are capable of flying at 1500 miles per hour. We have therefore to consider in what way we can equip our air force with such planes.

There must be a strong policy towards China also. China has already occupied our border areas, and her attitude seems to be adamant. Though our policy is one of peace and we want to solve all our problems peacefully, though we do not want to commit aggression on any one and have no territorial ambitions, still our policy should be such as to indicate clearly to China that to commit further aggression against India is to involve herself in danger.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he speaking for the approval of the policy or against it?

Shri Naldurgkar: In spite of the above suggestions, I am of the firm opinion that the policy adopted by our Government so far has been the right policy both in regard to these two neighbours and the international situation. I commend my amendment for the adoption of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Brajeshwar Prasad. But the time is ten minutes.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Goya): I would like to speak for 20 minutes today. I speak only on this subject. Further, I am not well today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is all right, but I would be accused of discrimination.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Further, I understand that the debate will continue till 5:30 p.m. today, for half an hour more.

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): He may be given 15 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That half an hour was not added for the hon. Member's sake.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I may be given at least 5 minutes more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right, 15 minutes.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: May I speak sitting? I am not well.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He might sit and speak.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we should purchase supersonic planes equipped with guided missiles from the Soviet Union and recognise the provisional Government of Algeria.

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

The freedom and territorial integrity of Laos can be protected if it is demilitarised which means the handing over of the defence portfolio to the UNO. The conflict between Russia and China in Laos cannot be resolved by a mere declaration of neutrality. The non-aligned nations will become a third force if they hand over their defence portfolios to the UNO. They will become much stronger than Russia and America if they do so. They cannot become a third force except by handing over the defence portfolio to the UNO, because then the non-aligned States cannot play any effective part on the stage of international politics for the whole world has become a no-man's land between Russia and America. The Government of India should recognise the East German Government, establish diplomatic relationship with her and attend the conference on Germany that is likely to be convened by the Soviet Prime Minister before the year comes to a close. Germany can be reunited on a democratic basis if the UNO is transformed into a world State. The mere withdrawal of foreign troops from East Germany, West Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland is not enough. The remilitarisation of West Germany bars the way to German reunification. But West Germany cannot be demilitarised unless Russia, West Europe, America and China resort to disarmament. Universal disarmament has become the condition precedent to German unification. The fate of Germany has become intertwined with the cause of world peace. Germany can be reunited on western terms if Russia withdraws from Eastern Europe as a result of either war and defeat or internal upheaval. But this condition is not likely to be fulfilled. America may withdraw from the old world but Russia cannot for it has become the largest, the strongest and the greatest power in the old world. It is as difficult for America to oust Russia from Eastern Germany as it is for Russia to oust the USA from Latin America. Germany can

be reunited on Russian terms if the USA withdraws from the old world as a result of either war and defeat or internal upheaval. But at the present moment, there are no signs of any impending American withdrawal. The States of Western Europe do not feel confident that they will be able to hold their own if Germany is reunited even on their own terms. My own feeling is that Germany even if it is reunited on western terms will join hands with the Soviet Union. The pull of Russia over Germany has become stronger than that of Western Europe which, however much prosperous it may be economically as a result of American aid, has become politically obsolete. Prussia will dominate over the whole of Germany if it is reunited and the Prussians will collaborate with the Russians and not with the westerners with whom they have got no spiritual kinship. Prussianism means totalitarianism and not democracy. It is in the interest of both peace and democracy that the Government of West Germany should take the initiative by publicly stating in the most authoritative manner possible that they do not stand for German reunification and that they would like to enter into a federal union with the countries of Western Europe. Western Europe can save itself from the ordeal of war and the tentacles of hegemony either by the establishment of a United States of Western Europe or by handing over the defence portfolio to the United Nations Organisation.

Neither the one nor the other seem to be possible now because ignorance, fear and jealousy stand as insuperable obstacles in the way. The third alternative is the liberation of the western Europe by Russia. The destiny of the heartland and the rimland is intertwined. I am not in favour of German unification on western terms because the aim of the western powers is to drive out Russia from Eastern Europe. Russian preoccupation with European problems provides breathing space to us. I am not in favour of German

unification on western terms because a re-united Germany may again become a menace to world peace.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member could speak so loudly, why should he have asked for permission to sit and speak?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I do not know how I am speaking. The Germans are responsible for the outbreak of two world wars.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Let the hon. Member speak in a low voice.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am not well. I do not know; I am feeling nervous. The third world war may break out if the Germans are united again. Twice within a century the German troops have entered Paris. There is hardly a country in Europe which has not suffered under German hands. It is in the interest of humanity to keep Germany dismembered if it cannot be united on Russian terms or if Europe cannot be disarmed or if West Germany cannot be integrated along with the countries of Western Europe into one political unit. In reality, neither West Germany nor the N.A.T.O. constitute a threat to Russia. The whole world has become a no-man's land between Russia and America. If a re-united Germany becomes a nuclear power it may become a threat to Russia. But Russia cannot be driven out from East Germany by any combination of western powers at the present moment. In future, China more than any other State may become a threat to Russia. All nation States will become a threat to one another if they all become thermo-nuclear powers which they are bound to become if the bipolar world is not immediately transformed into one world.

Assuming for the sake of argument that west Germany is a threat to Russia, this threat is in no way removed by any of the measures proposed to be taken by Russia. By concluding a separate peace treaty with East Germany the military power of West Germany is not weakened at all.

348(Ai)LSD—9.

The western powers are not going to attack Russia from West Berlin which constitutes the weakest link in the chain of western defence system. Nor the military strength of the western powers will be weakened if the East German Government denies to the westerners the right of ingress to and egress from West Berlin.

We must support Russia because without her support we cannot fulfil the main aim of our foreign policy which is to drive out America from the old world. (*Interruption*). The meaning of our policy of non-alignment is that America can be driven out from the old world without resorting to war—a point of view with which the Russians now agree to. There will be no America in the Afro-Eurasian land mass if the goal of disarmament is reached. We are opposed to all military alliances sponsored by either Russia or America. But in reality we are opposed to the SEATO and the CENTO which directly threaten us. We are opposed to the NATO because the SEATO and the CENTO are its offshoots. The Warsaw pact does not affect us in anyway whatsoever. There are American bases in the Afro-Asian land mass. There are no Russian bases in Africa and Asia. If the aim of our foreign policy would not have been to expel America from the old world we would not have opposed the NATO, the CENTO, the SEATO and the American bases.

In the thermo-nuclear age, the expulsion of America from the old world has become a historical necessity because the U.S.A. is the only obstacle in the way of the integration of the old world into one political unit which is the condition precedent to the establishment of a world State.

If we support Russia on the question of Berlin, Russia will support us on the question of Kashmir. If Pakistan attacks India, Russia should attack Pakistan. Pakistan can never attack India if Russia threatens to

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

attack Pakistan. America can never attack Russia if all the non-aligned nations rally round Russia on the question of West Berlin.

If Russia is weakened we will suffer and not the Americans. The days of Changez Khan, Timur, Nadir Shah and Ahmad Shah Abdali may come back once again. The whole region from the Urals to the Pacific Ocean and from the Arctic Ocean to the Himalayas is inhabited by tribal people. The same type of people live in the adjoining regions under Chinese control. For the first time in history the Russians and the Chinese have succeeded in bringing these people under their control.

Thanks to Russia and China that we enjoy the benefits of peace. It is not in our interest to weaken Russia and China. On all issues of conflict between Russia and America we must support the former if we do not want the return of the days of Chengez Khan, Timur, Nadir Shah and Ahmad Shah Abdali.

I support Russia on the question of Berlin because I am not in favour of the liberation of Eastern Europe from Russian control. Russia will advance towards Asia if it is driven out from Europe. I support Russia on the question of Berlin because I am opposed to the establishment of American hegemony over Eastern Europe. There is no third alternative. The nations of Eastern Europe can become free if and when a world government is established.

The United States of America is committing a blunder in collaborating with West Germany, for if any war breaks out on the question of West Berlin, the whole world may be wiped out.

Western Europe is utterly mistaken in opposing Russia on the question of German unification and of West Berlin for if a global war breaks out America will have to destroy Western Europe in order to prevent Western Europe

from being occupied by Russia which Russia can very easily do without encountering any military opposition from any European State.

China and Russia are much more important to India than all the other countries of the world put together, for India, China and Russia together will determine the course of international politics in future.

I stand for friendship between India and Pakistan not because Pakistan's hostility can do any harm to us if Russia is on our side but because hostility does not yield any political dividend in the thermo-nuclear age. Pakistan has got no political or military value. Pakistan will be ultimately integrated by either India or Russia or the Middle East. I will not be sorry if it is integrated by either Russia or the Middle East. The integration of Pakistan with India will create great difficulties in the way of the establishment of socialism.

The condition precedent to Indo-Pak friendship is either the establishment of democracy, socialism and secularism in Pakistan or the liquidation of the forces of democracy, socialism and secularism in India.

The champions of Indo-Pak entente in India and in the Western world are those who are opposed to socialism, democracy and secularism in India. They are hostile to China and Russia. The danger of the establishment of hegemony can be averted not by Indo-Pak entente but by handing over the defence portfolio to the United Nations Organisation.

The champions of Indo-Pak entente are those who want to drag India into the western camp with the object of augmenting American bargaining power *vis-a-vis* Russia.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri P. K. Deo. Since there are a large number of hon. Members who want to speak, hon. Members should be brief. The House has allotted six hours for this

discussion. We started at about 12.30. We will sit up to 5.30 to complete five hours and the hon. Prime Minister will reply tomorrow.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Does that mean that I must speak for one hour tomorrow?

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): Some hon. Members can be given opportunity tomorrow also, before the Prime Minister is called to reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Prime Minister has not stated that he will take only half an hour.

Shri Kalika Singh: Instead of sitting upto 5.30 we may sit upto 6 p.m. today.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): My time is being taken by this discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If hon. Members so desire, we can sit upto 6 p.m. The Prime Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow.

Shri P. K. Deo: Since we discussed this subject last time, our international climate has greatly deteriorated, and our Prime Minister did not hesitate to use the right expression, for characterising the gravity of the situation he said that the world has been put back to the shadows again and the clouds are still hovering in the background, pushing the world to a dangerous brink. Sir, in the name of disarmament we have seen that the pace of arms race and the pace of production of various atomic or nuclear war-heads and inter-continental ballistic missiles are on the increase. We have seen that with the creation of tension our neighbour is showing signs of increasing impatience. So, in this hour of peril a great responsibility has fallen on the shoulders of our Prime Minister to give proper guidance for the solution of these various problems.

Even though we are jubilant over the achievements of our cosmonauts in conquering space and in orbiting round the earth, I do not think the man's inventive power of preserving peace has kept pace with the various weapons of mass destruction.

Coming to the working of the United Nations Organisation, now is the time to re-think and re-apprise ourselves regarding its various activities, specially the social and economic activities. I think the most primary function of the United Nations Organisation is to find out settlement for the various disputes that have arisen between its members. In the present context we find that the United Nations with the Security Council and the present arrangement of veto power, and that privilege also being confined to very few nations—as has been pointed out by our able Prime Minister, even that veto power is being exercised by small countries like Formosa—it is not possible to think that our various problems in the United Nations could be solved. After all, the United Nations is the creature of the last world war. Now so many new nations are coming up and are becoming members of the United Nations. In this context, I think an entire revision of the charter of the United Nations is imminent. Unless and until this is done, I have got the genuine fear that in no time the United Nations will also follow the footsteps of the League of Nations.

Coming to the home front, I feel gravely concerned by the preparedness for aggression by Pakistan. That has been further aggravated by the American aid of arms and supply of supersonic aircrafts. Even though Mr. Chester Bowles, the Under Secretary of the Kennedy Administration has assured us that the intention of the United States of America is farthest from doing any harm to India and is rather motivated from the apprehension of Communist encroachment in Asia, I feel that these pious intentions

[Shri P. K. Deo]

may not be binding on Pakistan. Secondly, I feel that after these arms are issued to Pakistan it is up to Pakistan to use them in any way she likes. As has been pointed out by some of the previous speakers, in the case of Portugal we have seen that arms being supplied by the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation are being used against the Portuguese colonies' demand for liberation. This morning we were enlightened by the fact that arms which were supplied to Pakistan by the United States of America were being used against the Afghans. I think it is high time that the hon. Prime Minister should say in the most categorical terms to the United States of America that such an action on the part of the United States of America in the present context is an unfriendly act towards India and that if the United States of America wants to prove her *bont fide* towards India she should supply similar arms and in equal number to this country. Most unhesitatingly we should accept them because every year we spend a good bit of our money on making these unproductive Defence purchases. Our hon. Prime Minister has pointed out on many an occasion that economic and industrial growth is the fundamental dimension of our defence. So I beg to submit that if we can save even a single pie on our purchase of Defence stores, that could very well be utilised for the economic and industrial growth of this country.

Our relationship with Pakistan which is already strained has been further complicated by the offer of the American President to negotiate for settling the Kashmir dispute if and when asked by our hon. Prime Minister. It should be told clearly to the American President that for all purposes Kashmir is an integral part of India, that this thing has been ratified by the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir about a decade ago, that there is absolutely no dispute over this fact and that he need not bother over this question. I think the American Presi-

dent will very well appreciate the constitutional and legal aspects of Kashmir's accession to this country unlike our Chinese neighbours.

It is most unfortunate that China which had all along supported India's stand on the question of Kashmir has given a new twist to this question by agreeing with Pakistan about the demarcation of their so-called common frontier. By that China not only creates a peculiar problem but at the same time accepts Pakistan's authority over portions of Kashmir which for all purposes are a part of India. That has been supported by the Chinese authorities on more than one occasion.

So far as our relationship with China is concerned, I think the thing has been hanging fire for such a long time. With all the humility that I can command I beg to submit that we have developed complacency, or I should say a callous indifference towards this question and the attention that it deserves is wanting from our Government. We have seen in the case of China that they are having inconsistent views regarding Kashmir.

Regarding our eastern frontier with China, even though China has accepted the Dipu pass as the China-Burma-India tri-junction in the map enclosed with the Sino-Burmese treaty still, they claim that the India China border in that sector is much to the south of the Dipu pass and that it lies along the foothill of the Himalayas. We have seen that even though they have accepted the watershed theory and the Mac Mahon line which runs on the crest of Himalayas as the border of North Burma and China, they have rejected the same theory so far as their relationship with India is concerned. In this context, I beg to submit that China can understand only the language of strength. It is no use negotiating. I cannot understand why the Secretary General from our Government should go all the way to Peking on his way back from Mongolia

to open a new chapter of discussion or negotiation with the Chinese authority when their mind is so clear. I think it is hightime that the entire job should be entrusted to our gallant jawans and they should be asked to push out the Chinese intruders from the Indian soil and give them a destructive blow.

Regarding the question of Berlin, I beg to state that this division of Germany is the outcome of the Second World war. Much water has flown in the mean time. Possession of the various nuclear war-heads is not the monopoly of any individual nation. To examine the question of Berlin and of Germany from the context of German militarism is absolutely wrong. Any sane thinking person would think that the two Germanies should be united and the German people should be given a free hand to have a say on their future. The western powers as well as the so-called eastern powers like the U.S.S.R. have been showing unnecessary interest in this question which is so vital to the Germans themselves. This matter should be left to Germany to decide the issue.

Coming to the neutral summit, in these clouds, the only silver lining is visible in the success of the neutral summit which is going to be held in Belgrade and which our Prime Minister is going to attend. I join with the nation in wishing success to this conference. I beg to submit that neutrality is not a passive thing. Neutrality stands for certain principles and objectives. If neutrality is to be effective all the neutral nations with a united voice should give a clear verdict, a clear opinion on all controversial matters. If they want a lasting peace, if they want that the suppression of humanity should end, they should all be united. There is no fear in having a neutral bloc. We have seen that in the case of Tibet, there has been suppression of humanity, but the performance of our delegates in the United Nations, of abstention when

the question of Tibet was discussed, was very poor and far from satisfactory. I do not think that there should be similar recurrence of this state of affairs. I feel that the neutral Summit will produce something substantial, which will ensure world peace for all times to come and which will prove the astrologers' calculation of the Ides of February to be false.

श्री बजराल सिंह (फ़िरोज़ाबाद) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं जोमो कैन्याटा की रिहाई पर भारत की जनता की ओर से केनिया की जनता को बधाई सन्देश भेजता हूँ। अफ्रीका में उपनिवेशवाद के अन्त के साथ साथ एक ऐसी नयी भावना उदय हो रही है, जिस से विश्व को शान्ति मिल सकती है। लेकिन इस नई भावना के उदय होने में जितना योग भारत के गणतंत्रीय नेताओं को देना चाहिए था, उतना उन्होंने नहीं दिया है, यह अफ़सोस की बात है। इस संदर्भ में हम देखते हैं कि अल्जीरिया की सरकार को अभी तक मान्यता नहीं दी जा रही है और आज भी प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने केवल यही कहा है कि वास्तव में उस को मान्यता दी हुई है और कानूनी रूप में उन्हें मान्यता शायद बाद में मिल सकेगी। हमें अफ़सोस है कि यह नीति हिन्दुस्तान की परम्पराओं के अनुकूल नहीं है।

इसी प्रकार से जो अन्य उपनिवेश अफ्रीका में कायम हैं, उन को समाप्त करने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने कोई सक्रिय सहयोग नहीं दिया है, यह बड़े अफ़सोस की बात है। हम खुद एक उपनिवेश रह चुके हैं और हम ने उपनिवेश के दुखों और कष्टों को सहा है। इस अवस्था में हम समझ सकते हैं कि दुनिया के जो राष्ट्र अभी भी उपनिवेश बने हुए हैं, उन की जनता कितने दुखों और कष्टों को सह रही होगी। इस कारण हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को उपनिवेशों की जनता का अग्रग्राहने के नाते यह चाहिए था कि जितने भी

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

उपनिवेश आज दुनिया में कायम है, उन को समाप्त करने के लिए, जहां जहां गुलामी कायम है, उस का अन्त करने के लिए वह सर्व-प्रथम कदम उठाती। मुझे अफ़सोस है कि उस उद्देश्य और लक्ष्य को हम ने पूरा नहीं किया।

कांगों में जो कुछ हुआ, उस में स्थिति को सुधारने के लिये हम ने थोड़ा सा योग देने की कोशिश की, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य रहा कि वह काम हमारी अपनी इच्छाओं के मुताबिक पूरा नहीं हो सका। अंगोला और मोजम्बीक में आज जो कुछ हो रहा है, वह हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के लिये गोआ के गुलाम रहते बेहद दुःखपूर्ण है। अंगोला और मोजम्बीक के साथ हमें गोआ की याद आती है। गोआ के सम्बन्ध में हम सदा घोषणा करते रहे हैं कि वह हमारा अभिन्न अंग है, किन्तु अभिन्न अंग होते हुए भी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार उस को आज़ाद कराने में कोई सक्रिय कार्यवाही नहीं कर सकी है, यह बहुत ही अफ़सोस की बात रही है।

अब दादरा और नगर हवेली हिन्दुस्तान में पूरी तरह से, वास्तविक रूप से और कानूनी तौर से भी, मिल चुके हैं। तो इस में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिए कि गोआ वास्तविक रूप से और कानूनी रूप से हमारा अभिन्न अंग बने। इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहा जाता है कि यह हमारी नीति नहीं है कि हम दूसरों पर हमला करें। यह एक सही नीति है। हमें किसी पर भी आक्रमण नहीं करना चाहिए और न हम करेंगे, लेकिन अगर कोई हमारी बैठक में बैठ जाये तो उस को वहां से निकालना कोई हमला करना नहीं है। जो बाहर का आदमी हमारे घर में घुस आया है, उस को निकाल कर बाहर कर देना कोई हमला करना नहीं है। यही बात गोआ के बारे में लागू होती है। जब गोआ को हम अपना अभिन्न अंग मानते हैं, तो वहां के विदेशी शासकों को ताकत से, शक्तिपूर्वक निकाल देना आक्रमण नहीं माना जायेगा। यह अपना क्षेत्र दूसरों से खाली कराना

माना जायेगा। अगर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को शक्ति से पाटुगोज़ को गोआ से निकालने में दिक्कत हो, तो उस को ऐसी नीति अपनानी होगी कि हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिकों को गोआ-वासियों की सहायता करने के लिये, उन को मुक्त करने के लिये सत्याग्रह करने की आज्ञा दी जाये। लेकिन अभी तक उस नीति को नहीं अपनाया गया है। सरकार और चाहे कुछ करे या न करे, लेकिन एक बात तो उसे तुरन्त करनी चाहिए और वह यह कि गोआ के जो नागरिक हिन्दुस्तान में रहते हैं, १९६२ के चुनाव में उन को मत देने का अधिकार मिले। इस समय उन को हमारे अन्दरूनी चुनावों में मत देने का अधिकार नहीं है। जब तक हम उन्हें मत देने का अधिकार नहीं देते हैं, तब तक हमारी यह घोषणा की गोआ हमारा एक अभिन्न अंग है, गोआ की जनता और हम एक हैं, कोई माने नहीं रखती है। अगर ऐसा नहीं होता तो प्रधान मंत्री की इस नीति-घोषणा की पृष्ठभूमि में कि वह गोआ के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति में परिवर्तन लाने जा रहे हैं, कोई अन्तर नहीं पड़ता है। सब से पहले प्रधान मंत्री को यह सोचना होगा कि गोआ के जो नागरिक हिन्दुस्तान के विभिन्न हिस्सों में रह रहे हैं उन्हें दूसरे हिन्दुस्तानियों की तरह सन् १९६२ के चुनाव में खड़े होने की और मत देने की इजाजत हो। अगर इस तरह का अधिकार उनको दिया जाता है, तब फिर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की नीति में गोआ-सम्बन्धी नीति में कुछ परिवर्तन हुआ माना जाएगा।

दुनिया के सामने आज बहुत बड़े बड़े सवाल हल होने को गड़े हैं। निश्शस्त्रीकरण का सवाल है, बर्लिन का सवाल है, बैलग्रेड सम्मेलन भी हो रहा है? ये सब ऐसे सवाल हैं जिनके शान्तिपूर्ण हल पर दुनिया की शान्ति निर्भर करती है और दुनिया की शान्ति ही नहीं बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान का भविष्य भी निर्भर करता है। बर्लिन का सवाल एक ऐसा पेचीदा सवाल

है जिसका कोई हल निकालना आवश्यक है। अगर दुनिया में किसी सवाल को ले कर लड़ाई छिड़ती है तो उस लड़ाई से न सिर्फ दुनिया का नुकसान होगा बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान का भी नुकसान हो सकता है। लेकिन जहाँ तक बैलग्रेड सम्मेलन का ताल्लुक है जिसमें हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी शामिल होने जा रहे हैं, उसको मैं बहुत अधिक महत्व देता हूँ। मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ और इसके साथ साथ यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस सम्मेलन में किसी तृतीय शक्ति के, तृतीय गुट के निर्माण के बारे में कोई निर्णय नहीं किया जाता है तो यह सम्मेलन एक हंसी मात्र बन कर रह जाएगा। आखिर यह तृतीय शक्ति, यह तृतीय गुट किसी पर हमला करने के लिए नहीं होगा। दूसरे दो गुटों की तरह, अमरीकन गुट की तरह या रशियन गुट की तरह, यह एक दूसरे को दबाने के लिए, डराने के लिए या किसी पर हमला बोलने के लिए नहीं होगा बल्कि ऐसे राष्ट्रों का यह गुट होगा, जिन को नान-एलाईड राष्ट्र कहा जाता है, तटस्थ राष्ट्र कहा जाता है, जो किसी गुट में शामिल नहीं हैं बल्कि केवल दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रखने के लिए होगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय इस पर विचार करे कि क्या आज दुनिया को आवश्यकता नहीं है कि बैलग्रेड सम्मेलन में इस तरह की काल दी जाए, इस तरह की घोषणा की जाए कि दुनिया के वे राष्ट्र जो किसी गुट में शामिल नहीं हैं, उनको ऐसी नीति अपनानी चाहिये कि वे कभी किसी पर हमला नहीं करेंगे, दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रखने के लिए सब कुछ करेंगे और अपने उद्देश्य को पूरा करने के लिए वे एक तृतीय शक्ति का निर्माण करेगेतीसरे गुट का निर्माण करेंगे। जब तक इस तरह की घोषणा नहीं की जाती, इस तरह की नीति निश्चित नहीं की जाती, इस सिद्धान्त को नहीं अपनाया जाता तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि इन राष्ट्रों के इच्छा होने से जिन को कि नान-एलाईड राष्ट्र कहा जाता है, उनके इच्छा होने से, तथा सम्मेलन में बैठने से कोई निश्चित फायदा नहीं हो सकता। मैं चाहता हूँ

कि अब इस तरह की घोषणा की जाए कि तृतीय शक्ति का निर्माण हो रहा है, किसी पर आक्रमण या हमला करने के लिए नहीं, किसी को हानि पहुंचाने के लिए नहीं बल्कि दुनिया में शान्ति कायम रखने के लिए। जो राष्ट्र किसी गुट में शामिल नहीं है और जो वहाँ एकत्र हो रहे हैं वे अगर इस तरह की नीति-घोषणा बैलग्रेड में करने में समर्थ होते हैं तो मैं विश्वासपूर्वक कह सकता हूँ कि दुनिया से लड़ाई को खत्म करने में, इस तरह की तृतीय शक्ति काफी हद तक अपना योगदान दे सकेगी।

हम अपने घर की नीति को जब देखते हैं तो पाते हैं कि पाकिस्तान में लड़ाई की आवाज उठाई जा रही है। जनरल अयूब खां जिन का कभी जनतंत्र से कोई वास्ता नहीं रहा है और जिन को आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ने का या उसका स्वाद चखने का कोई मौका नहीं मिला है, आज कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के नेता और नागरिक, किस तरह नेतृत्व की आवाज बोली जाती है, इसको जानते नहीं हैं। हमें अफसोस होता है, आश्चर्य होता है कि हमारा अपना यद्दीसी देश जिस की जनता न सिर्फ हमारी मित्र है बल्कि भाई है, जिसका खून हमारे खून से मिला हुआ है, जिसके नागरिक और हमारे नागरिक सदियों तक इकट्ठा रहे हैं, जिन के रिश्ते खून के हैं, इस तरह की भाषा बोलता है। इससे पता चलता है कि वहाँ के शासकों का हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति कैसा रवैया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनरल अयूब कुछ भी कहते रहें लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की कभी इस तरह की भाषा नहीं होगी कि जिससे यह ध्वनि निकलती हो कि हम पाकिस्तान की तरफ बुरी निगाह से देखते हैं या उसे नुकसान पहुंचाना चाहते हैं। हम भला चाहते हैं पाकिस्तान का और चाहते हैं कि उसके साथ हमारे मैत्रीपूर्ण

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

सम्बन्ध कायम हों। हम उसके साथ मित्रतापूर्वक रहना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि वह उन्नति करे। लेकिन हमें यह भी नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान के शासक हमेशा इस तरह का नारा बुलन्द करते रहें हैं अपनी सत्ता को कायम रखने के लिए। इस संदर्भ में मुझे अफ़सोस होता है यह जान कर कि सवा चार साल हो गए हैं सन् १९५७ के चुनावों को सम्पन्न हुए इस असें में काश्मीर की समस्या को उठाया नहीं गया है लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री और रक्षा मंत्री ज्यों ज्यों चुनाव नज़दीक आ रहे हैं, बार बार इस सवाल को उठा रहे हैं और कह रहे हैं जनता को डराने के लिए कि अगर कांग्रेस को ऊपर नहीं पहुंचाया जाएगा तो काश्मीर खतरे में है। सवा चार साल तक तो काश्मीर खतरे में नहीं था आज उनके लिए काश्मीर खतरे में हो गया है। यह कौन सी नीति है? हिन्दुस्तान के नेताओं को पाकिस्तान के शासकों की नीति की नक़ल नहीं करनी चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तान की जो परम्परा है, वह अलग है, उसकी जो पृष्ठभूमि है वह अलग है, उसके जो सोचने का तरीका रहा है वह अलग रहा है, उसकी आत्मा अलग रही है। पाकिस्तान की नक़ल करके न हम दुनिया में जिन्दा रह सकते हैं और न ही हम अपनी परम्पराओं को आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के प्रति काफी मजबूत होने की ज़रूरत तो है लेकिन पाकिस्तान की गीदड़ भभकियों से डरने की ज़रूरत नहीं है। पाकिस्तान के शासक हमेशा ही गीदड़ भभकियां देते आए हैं। उन से हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का कोई नुक़सान नहीं हुआ है और न ही भविष्य में हो सकता है।

चीन के साथ हमारी सीमा के बारे में भी यहां काफी कुछ कहा गया है। पिछली दफा जब बहस हुई थी तब से हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के सम्बन्धों में कोई विशेष बात देखने को नहीं मिली है। वे वैसे ही हैं। इसके अलावा जो अहलकारों की टीम मुकर्रर हुई थी उसने

रिपोर्ट पेश की। उस रिपोर्ट पर चीनकी कोई प्रतिक्रिया नहीं हुई है। लेकिन उसकी जो चुप्पी है वह इस बात की सूचक है कि चीन किसी भी जायज़ बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। जब चीन किसी जायज़ बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है तो मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों नहीं आप उस मांग को पेश करते हैं कि जब हमारे माल के रिकार्ड साबित करते हैं कि सरदार राम सिंह जो सन् १९५० में लद्दाख में हंगरि रेवेन्यू आफिसर थे उन्होंने यह साबित कर दिया कि सन् १९५० में यानी आजादी के तीन साल बाद भी वह मनसर गांव से मालगुजारी वसूल करके लाए थे, तो क्यों मनसर गांव के लिए नहीं कहा जाता है और क्यों नहीं कहा जाता है कि मैकमेहन रेखा से ७० मील ऊपर हमारी सीमा पहुंचती है। अगर मनसर गांव तक सीमा को हम सम्भालते हैं तो हमारा एक लाख वर्गमील क्षेत्रफल जो चीन के कब्जे में है हमें वापिस मिलना चाहिये मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी की इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि चीन के साथ अपने मसले को हल करने के लिए हम लड़ाई नहीं करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन मैं इस बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि हम आजकी परिस्थितियों में जब कि तिव्वत की आजादी का हनन हो चुका है, चीन ने उसकी आजादी को छीन लिया है, मैकमेहन रेखा को मानें। चीन और भारत की सीमा रेखा वही हो सकती है जिसमें मनसर गांव शामिल होता है, जहां से पूर्ववाहिनी ब्रह्मपुत्र चलती है पूर्व की तरफ जैसे जैसे वह चलती जाती है, वही हिन्दुस्तान और चीन की सीमा रेखा हो सकती है। हमें दुनिया में प्रचार करना चाहिये, दुनिया को यह बताना चाहिये कि हमारा क्या केस है। मैं नहीं समझ पाया हूँ कि कौन सा संकट है, कौन सी कठिनाई सामने आरही है यह बताने में कि सन् १९५० में मनसर गांव से सरदार राम सिंह जो हमारे डिप्टी कलैक्टर थे, उन्होंने मनसर गांवसे २५० रुपये मालगुजारीके वसूल किए थे और उन्होंने इस बात को साबित

भी कर दिया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अब समय आ गया है जब कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार और कुछ नहीं कर सकती है तो उसे कम से कम यह घोषणा तो कर ही देनी चाहिये कि हमारी और चीन की सीमा जब से तिब्बत की आजादी खत्म हो चुकी है, मैकमेहन रेखा नहीं है बल्कि वह रेखा है जहाँ से ब्रह्मपुत्र निकलती है और पूर्व की तरफ चलती जाती है और जहाँ तक पूर्व की तरफ वह चलती जाएगी, वही हमारी सीमा रेखा है। मैं यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान चीन के किसी हिस्से को अपने में मिलाये। मगर मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर फिर से ऐसी स्थिति कायम की जा सके जिससे तिब्बत की आजादी कायम हो सके, तिब्बत आजाद हो सके, तब मैं मैकमेहन रेखा को मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ। तब मैकमेहन रेखा भारत और चीन की सीमा रेखा मानी जा सकती है। आज दुनिया की कोई शक्ति नहीं है और न ही कोई दिखाई देती है जो तिब्बत की आजादी को वापिस ला सके और उसको आजादी दिला सके। अगर उसको वापिस आजादी नहीं दिलाई जा सकती है और चीन और भारत के बीच कोई वफर नहीं रहा है, कोई दीवार नहीं रही है तो फिर कोई बजह नहीं है कि जो वास्तविक सीमा रेखा है, उस पर हम दृढ़ न रहें। अब वक्त आ गया है जब हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री को जोर के साथ चीन को यह बतला देना चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा रेखा मैकमेहन रेखा नहीं है बल्कि वह है जहाँ से ब्रह्मपुत्र निकलती है और पूर्व की तरफ बहती है।

नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। उसके साथ हमारे बहुत अच्छे सम्बन्ध रहे हैं। सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध भी उसके साथ हमारे हैं। हमने उसकी योजना को चलाने में सहायता दी है। इसके बाद भी नेपाल के शासकों को यह पता न लगा हो कि हम उनको सहायता दे रहे हैं तो यह बड़ी ही दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण स्थिति है। नेपाल हमारा

पड़ोसी है, उसके साथ हमारे सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध रहे हैं, उनकी और हमारी सम्भवतः भाषा भी एक तरह की है लेकिन जब तक नेपाल जनतन्त्र को फिर से नहीं पनपाता है, वहाँ की जनता को अपनी राय व्यक्त करने का अधिकार नहीं मिलता है, तब तक नेपाल उन्नति अच्छी तरह से नहीं कर सकता है, हिन्दुस्तान और नेपाल के सम्बन्ध अच्छे नहीं हो सकते हैं। मैं यह साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा कोई इरादा नहीं है कि हम नेपाल के अन्दरूनी मामलात में दखल दें। लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार नेपाल के शासकों को बड़े विनम्र शब्दों में बताये कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की यह आकांक्षा है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत से मँम्बर साहिबान बोलने वाले हैं, इसलिये वह खत्म करें।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम जैसे लोगों के साथ हमेशा इस तरह से होता रहा है कि जबकि हमें बीस और पच्चीस मिनट मिलने चाहिये, दस मिनट ही मिलते हैं और उस वक्त बुलाया जाता है जब दस मिनट की लिमिट फिक्स कर दी जाती है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : हर एक को तो पच्चीस मिनट नहीं मिल सकते हैं। आपको कभी कुर्बानी करनी ही पड़ेगी।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : यह मेरा दुर्भाग्य है कि इस लोक सभा में मुझे हमेशा कुर्बानी करनी पड़ती है। इसके लिये मैं आपको दोष नहीं देता। सिर्फ मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कांग्रेस के माननीय सदस्य बार बार बोलते हैं उनको कुछ कहना तो होता नहीं है सिवाय इसके कि वे यह कह दें कि जो कुछ सरकार की तरफ से कहा गया है, उसका वे समर्थन करते हैं। समर्थन करना हो तो वे घर में भी कर सकते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : तो उनको मैं न बुलाऊँ ?

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : यह मैं नहीं कहता हूँ। उनको जरूर अवसर प्राप्त दें। लेकिन मैं इतना अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो एक अच्छा दृष्टिकोण उपस्थित करना चाहता हो, उसको पूरा अवसर ऐसा करने का दिया जाना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : इसी बहस में पांच मिनट चले जायेंगे।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : मैं अभी खत्म किये दे रहा हूँ।

मैं अन्तिम बात मंगोलिया के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ, प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने बहुत अच्छे शब्द कहे। लेकिन दुःख के साथ यह बात पूछनी पड़ती है उनसे कि क्या उनको पता नहीं था कि मंगोलिया के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध बहुत अच्छे रहे हैं ? उनसे हमारे सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध रहे हैं, ऐतिहासिक संबंध रहे हैं। ऐसे देश को, जिसके साथ हमारे सांस्कृतिक और ऐतिहासिक सम्बन्ध बहुत अच्छे रहे हैं, उन्होंने राष्ट्र संघ में बिठाने के लिये क्या काम किया ? चीन को राष्ट्र संघ में बिठाने के लिये हमने कार्रवाई की। बहुत अच्छी बात की, भले ही चीन हम पर हमला करने वाला हो। लेकिन वास्तविक स्थिति से हमें आंखें नहीं मूंदनी चाहियें। मंगोलिया को राष्ट्र संघ में बिठाने के बारे में हमारी पालिसी क्या है, यह स्पष्ट होना चाहिये। यह बात स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये कि हम अल्जीरिया को मान्यता देने के लिये तैयार हैं या नहीं। हम उन राष्ट्रों के साथ जो नये नये उग रहे हैं बेलग्रेड सम्मेलन में खड़े होने के लिये तैयार हैं या नहीं। हम दुनिया में एक पाजिटिव तृतीय शक्ति का निर्माण करेंगे, पाजिटिव तृतीय गुट का निर्माण करेंगे, जिससे दुनिया से हमेशा के लिये लड़ाई खत्म हो जाय—ऐसी घोषणा होना सरकार की ओर से अत्यन्त आवश्यक है।

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Sir, the speaker preceding me was pleased to remark that it was only the monopoly of the persons sitting in the Opposition benches to offer their views in these debates.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Till yesterday, you were also here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Congress Members have also to go to their constituencies.... (Interruptions).

Shri Mahanty: In all humility, may I submit that since the last so many years the Socialist Party of India could not forge a foreign policy which was fundamentally different from the foreign policy being pursued by the Congress Party at the moment.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I am sorry to say that the hon. Member never tried to understand me.

Shri Mahanty: The entire attention of the socialist party was directed against the English language and giving the McMahon line a different Indianised name. With all humility, I say again that the foreign policy of a country is not a partisan policy; it represents the maximum national agreement. Otherwise it cannot function. Even though we function within the ambit of a broad maximum national agreement, our nuances, shades, idioms and emphasis may be different and I believe that in these benches also there may be such slight differences. But there is no need to dramatise over all those differences because they do not lead us anywhere.

This morning the various speakers have strung that note of unity. The fact has to be remembered that India is not a military power. Whatever might have been our feelings in this regard, India is not a military power nor is India economically a very prosperous country. Its economic strength is very much limited by its own circumstances. If that is the fact, the most vituperative of the foreign policy critics would agree that it is

only on account of the foreign policy that has been pursued by the Prime Minister that India has reached a status in the comity of nations and a new dignity has been conferred on it; so much so that in the past years India had been invited to the summit conference as a big power. Therefore, in all humility, I may mention again that there may be no yardstick to judge the success or failure of a particular foreign policy, it being so abstract in its nature, still it can be said with a justifiable amount of confidence that our foreign policy by and large has achieved a great success. But when we come nearer home, we find that there are certain outstanding problems in the solution of which we have been frustrated time and again. I would like to begin with China. Those who advocate that it is easy just to march the Indian army into the Himalayan frontier to drive the Chinese out, I believe, do not take certain basic facts into consideration. Apart from the fact that the terrain is difficult, that the logistics leave much to be desired and the climate and the altitude make it almost impossible, which our Javans may be able to cope with perhaps, there is another far more fundamental fact and that is, whether in the present context of time, India can involve herself in a war with a country which is going to be our neighbour and which has been conditioned so by geography and history. Therefore, even though I personally discount the suggestion of marching troops into the Himalayan frontiers—though it may be good heroics to suggest so—which are infested with an amount of practical difficulties, the fact remains that other ways must have been pursued by the Government of India to seek a solution of these problems.

I venture to say that of late the Chinese diplomacy has again gained much advantage to that country. For instance, the pattern has been to negotiate border agreements with India's neighbours and in all these border agreements a residue of dispute is

being left. There is what is known as the trijunction in the case of the Sino-Burmese border treaty. The Diphu pass has been delimited as a trijunction but the exact location of that pass has not been determined and it has been left to Burma and India to determine where the Diphu pass lies. It has been India's case that the Diphu pass lies five miles north from where it has been delimited. I do not know if that contention has been accepted by the Government of Burma. Similarly, in the case of the Sino-Nepalese border treaties also, a residue of disputes is being left and all these border agreements are being increasingly used to drive a wedge between India and her good neighbours.

One had expected to learn from the hon. Prime Minister as to what steps have been taken to resolve these disputes which are not of our own creation but which are the creation of Chinese machiavellianism. And on top of that, we hear that Pakistan is soon to negotiate a border treaty with China and we do not know what residue of dispute will be debited to India's account to settle and solve. Therefore, I believe that even though for many reasons, we may not advocate a linguistic and militaristic policy, still, this matter has to be pursued at the diplomatic level. For those who ask, how long this will continue, my answer would be this: this is going to last for centuries.

Coming to Pakistan, I was one among those who had all along advocated that no piecemeal treaty should be signed with Pakistan: until we reach an overall agreement with that country, there will be no purpose in signing piecemeal treaties. I venture to say that our prophecies have proved correct. We had signed the Indus water treaty costing Rs. 80 crores in valuable foreign exchange for which our industries are thirsting today. We had sacrificed the water of the eastern rivers for a decade, while our deserts

[Shri Mahanty]

of Rajasthan are thirsting for irrigation. We had done that in the name of friendship with Pakistan, which we valued more than irrigating our fields or saving Rs. 80 crores of foreign exchange. We agreed to transfer Berubari, and I remember the Prime Minister's candid confession that he had to do it in the name of Indo-Pakistan friendship even though it had involved a human problem.

17 hrs.

Sir, we had done all that, but since we did not achieve an overall agreement with Pakistan regarding all our outstanding disputes, Pakistan utilised our charitable disposition, our goodness, for its own manoeuvres, and today one can hear the sabre rattlings in Pakistan getting a little more nastier, the language used getting a little more filthier and the war psychosis being created there a little more disturbing. In that context, one is apt to lose one's sense of perspective and that is also precisely happening in this country. You can notice from the trend of the speeches in this House as well as in the writings in the newspapers outside that today we have almost forgotten that 13,000 square miles of our country is under Chinese occupation. Today, somehow or other Pakistan has loomed as the devil of the drama which is going to frustrate all the national aspirations of our country. It is not a question of choice between China and Pakistan. Here are the facts. Here we are faced with Pakistan, and as it has been rightly said, Pakistan's entire politics having been based on a concept of hatred, it is not going to relax its relations with India and it is going to utilise that hatred as a sort of spring board for its own political brinkmanship.

On the other hand, China's ambition, according to my thinking, is not to gain those mountainous territories but to push out India from the power and prestige that it enjoys in Asia and the Middle East.

Then again, there is Portugal. It has been suggested that by merely sending our unarmed civilians to Goa we will be able to redeem it. But, Sir, the fact is being forgotten that Portugal is a member of the NATO alliance, and in any case of aggression the entire NATO alliance will be invoked. Again, it may be asked whether it is aggression. I am told that in international law what is aggression is yet to be defined. I remember, in one of those gruelling debates on aggression when the entire international forum was asked to define what aggression meant, one of the representatives, I think, of Brazil had to say: Aggression is like the feelings, when a charming lady enters a drawing room, whose presence you can feel but which you cannot exactly define. Therefore, whether the marching of unarmed Indian civilians into Goa is an aggression or not is a legal question and perhaps it will be debated in an appropriate forum. But the very fact that the marching into Goa of unarmed Indian civilians will invoke the entire NATO alliance and that its consequences may not be very desirable.

Shri Nath Pai: Rubbish.

Shri Mahanty: It may be rubbish. After all, I have waited in vain for the heroic leaders of the Praja Socialist Party to take an initiative in the matter and march into Goa without making speeches in this House.

Shri Nath Pai: It is all rubbish, I repeat.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Mahanty: I am not yielding.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Nothing is rubbish which is said here by any hon. Member.

Shri Tangamani: Two years ago some volunteers marched into Goa and some of them were killed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It appears just now that all the Members gathered here. . . .

Shri Mahanty: Apart from the fact that the Praja Socialist leader should not forget normal courtesies in moments of agitation, what I was saying was this. I was saying that apart from making heroic speeches they should march into the Goan territory, now Portuguese territory, and redeem that country, instead of calling it rubbish. After all, it is known. . . .

Shri Nath Pai: Would you yield now?

Shri Mahanty: I am not yielding.

Shri Nath Pai: You dare not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But now he has to yield to the bell.

Shri Mahanty: I was saying that it is a legalistic question. Whatever may be the heroics, the legalistic question cannot be escaped as to whether it is aggression or not; because, Goa is not a Portuguese colony. Portugal claims it as a part of metropolitan Portugal. Therefore, any kind of occupation of Portuguese territory by India is unfortunately going to be construed as aggression by them and various consequences will follow from the NATO alliance. If it is rubbish, I am sorry that it was rubbish, but I could not offer any better fare to my hon. friend. Therefore, in all humility I say these are problems of great magnitude. This does not permit any kind of controversy because, irrespective of party considerations, we are determined to see that all these problems are solved.

Shri Nath Pai rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That speech is over now.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda (Visakhapatnam): I rise to support the policy of the Government. At the outset, I would like to offer my congratulations to our respected and beloved Prime Minister on the reunion

of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. I have not used the words "merger" or "accession" but "reunion" advisedly. It is this re-union which has made Lisbon think again, and only two days ago there was a message in *The Statesman* which I would like to quote with your permission. It reads:

"Portuguese Foreign Ministry officials said yesterday, according to AFP, that India's plan to 'annex the Portuguese enclaves of Dadra and Nagar Haveli' was a 'pure and simple violation' of the verdict by the International Court at The Hague, which 'recognized' Portuguese sovereignty over the two territories.

The Portuguese Foreign Minister said India's action was 'unilateral and immaterial'. He added: 'Each country is free to make whatever laws it likes. But in order to be tenable in the eyes of interested parties these decisions must conform strictly to universally recognized international law'.

Observers here thought Lisbon would once again have resort to international law to 'oppose the annexation of the enclaves'."

It is quite clear that Lisbon would once again take up the matter to the International Court of Justice. Here I have a suggestion to make for whatever it may be worth. Since they would be doing propaganda in that sphere, I would suggest that the sarp-panch and panch of these two areas be sent on a delegation to Europe, particularly into the State where the International Court of Justice is situated, to tell the public of Europe and America that they were Indians first and Indians last and that there was only a re-union and there is no question of annexation. By doing so, public opinion will resist any such move by Lisbon.

Now many countries have been freed in Africa and aid has been given to

[Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda]

them by various countries. I would very much like to see India paying more attention to Africa and giving them more aid. More delegations, cultural delegations and goodwill delegations should go from here to Africa to tell them that we are with them and how happy we are that they have gained freedom.

Now Mr. Kenyatta, the famous African leader, has just come out of the prison. If some day, later on, he is invited to India, I am sure India will give him a rousing welcome. So many hon. Members have spoken about Algeria. On that I would like to say that we should give them moral support. Moral support is a great thing. There is that government functioning from Cairo. If we cannot actively help them, we should at least give moral support to the Government there. The Congress Committee had appointed Shri Dhebar to go into this question and I read in the papers that Shri Dhebar also felt that some recognition should be given to the Government functioning from Cairo.

Sir, you will have no occasion to ring the bell when I am concerned because I believe in brevity.

Non-alignment has brought rich dividends to this country and that is entirely due to our dynamic hon. Prime Minister. May I say that the reunion of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is yet another feather in his great cap?

So many hon. Members have spoken about Pakistan and I would also like to put my own point of view. Pakistan went with the beggar's bowl to America. On the one hand she went with the beggar's bowl and on the other she was blackmailing America with the threat that if the aid given to India was not stopped and if more aid was not given to Pakistan, the whole of Pakistan would become Communist. This is what President Ayub Khan did in America. It is a very undignified thing to do. It is by no

means a graceful act to say that here we are begging of you for aid and at the same time saying, "If you give aid to India, we would turn Communist". This is nothing short of blackmail.

I have a feeling that even if the Kashmir question is settled to his liking, the next move by him would be that he would want a corridor running from West Pakistan to Dacca through the Punjab and the Gangetic plains of Uttar Pradesh. He would never stop at asking for things, and every time he would say that this would improve the relations between India and Pakistan. These have been his pet words. I am concerned with India's appeasement policy towards Pakistan. The more we give the more they want. It is high time that we put a full stop and just said 'No' to whatever they want.

As far as India is concerned, India has not begged for aid. It is because of the respect which the world has for this country that aid is being given. It is on honourable terms that aid is being given to India, not like Pakistan which went there begging for aid and for help.

President Ayub Khan reminds me of two other dictators, Adolf Hitler and Mussolini. These dictators when they started off their careers played to the gallery. They had to feed public imagination with all sorts of things. But a time came when they were drunk with power and their armaments and the balloon went up. They started off with the idea of just playing to the gallery and trying to keep public imagination going. That was for some time. But that story was repeated too often. Finally it resulted in a world war. Similar would be the case with Pakistan. They are feeding their people, the younger generation, with one and the only thing, that is, hatred towards India and towards anything that India does. It is allright for the present. The slogan goes down quite well. The younger generation is fed on it.

But a time will come when some maniac will get up and throw a bomb on one of our cities. It always happens that when a dictator's armoury of all sorts of things that he could say comes to an end, he has nothing further to give to the public and some unfortunate things happen. If the balloon goes up, so far as India is concerned, it will be a great calamity. I think we should leave no stone unturned to take that into consideration and be ready for any eventuality. Whatever may happen we should be ready on our frontiers and always be hundred per cent fully armed and fully ready to meet any such possibility.

We owe everything to our Captain, that is, Nehru. His motto has been: "तो धर्मस्ततो जयः"

With these few words and thanking you for having been given an opportunity at long last, I resume my seat.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Pandit Brijesh.

Shrimati Mafida Ahmed (Jorhat): Sir, I hope you will do justice to the lady Members also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am very sorry if I have not done that, but now I shall be very careful, and if that is justice, I shall call the hon. Member after Pandit Brijesh has concluded.

पंडित ब्रज नारायण "ब्रजेश" (शिवपुरी) : "कृष्ण वन्दे जगद्गुरुं" उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति के सम्बन्ध में बड़े लम्बे समय से सम्मानित सदस्यों ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किये हैं और सुझाव भी दिये हैं। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि विदेशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध किस प्रकार के होने चाहियें। इस दिशा में हमने जिस शब्दावली का निर्धारण किया है उसके लिये कोई बुद्धिमान आदमी विरोध नहीं करेगा। संसार में शान्ति रहे, सब मिल कर परस्पर सहयोग के साथ कार्य करें और कोई किसी के साथ

छीना झपटी न करे, इसके विरोध में कौन बोलेगा ? भाषा अलग चीज है और क्रिया अलग चीज है। राजनीति में निरी साधुता की भाषा और साधुता की क्रिया से कभी सफलता प्राप्त नहीं हो सकती है। यदि हम निरे साधू ही हैं तो हमें बर्तीकारण्य में बैठ कर यम, नियम, आसन, प्राणायाम, प्रत्याहार धारण कर ध्यानमें समाधिस्थ हो जाना चाहिए। संसार में यदि जीवित रहना है तो हमें व्यवहार-क्षेत्र में आना पड़ेगा और किस के साथ किस प्रकार का व्यवहार करना चाहिए इस नीति को हमें समझ लेना पड़ेगा। हमारे यहां ("शाटयम् सदा दुर्जनं, प्रीतिः साधुजने नयोनपजने विद्वत् नमे चाजिवम्"), आदि वाक्यों के द्वारा व्यवहार शास्त्र को सामने रक्खा गया है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की सबसे बड़ी असफलता का कारण यह ही है कि हम सर्वत्र एक सा व्यवहार करने की चेष्टा करते हैं। हमने एक सा व्यवहार करने के कारण जो अपने थे उन्हें तो शत्रु बनाया है लेकिन जो हमारे शत्रु नहीं थे उन्हें भी अपना शत्रु बना कर खड़ा कर लिया है। यदि इस दिशामें सावधानी के साथ व्यवहार किया गया होता और पाकिस्तान को हमने आरम्भ में ही समझ लिया होता जो कि हम आज समझ रहे हैं तो आज की स्थिति न होती। हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री जी आज बता रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान का जन्म घृणा पर हुआ है। यदि यह बात आरम्भ में ही समझ ली गई होती जबकि हमने द्विराष्ट्रवाद के सिद्धान्त को मान कर भारतवर्ष का बंटवारा किया और पाकिस्तान को जन्म दे दिया, यदि उस अवसर पर हमने सावधानी बर्ती होती और भारत के विभाजन की मांग के विरुद्ध दृढ़तापूर्वक खड़े रहते, "सत्यमेव जयते नानृतम्", के सिद्धान्त का यदि हमने पूर्णतया मालन किया होता तो न पाकिस्तान होता और न उसके द्वारा यह सिर दर्द हमारे सिर पर आता। आज एक समूचा देश एक सूत्र के साथ खड़ा होकर परस्पर सद्भावना के साथ कार्य कर रहा होता और यह चीन की जो भयानक स्थिति

[पंडित ब्रज नारायण "ब्रजेश"]

हमारे सामने आई है यह भी नहीं आने पाती पाकिस्तान का हमने निर्माण किया। कांग्रेस पार्टी की वैदेशिक नीति आरम्भ में ही सदीप रही जिसके कि कारण पाकिस्तान का निर्माण हुआ। उसके पश्चात जो व्यवहार हम कर रहे हैं उस व्यवहार का परिणाम यह है कि वह आगे बढ़ता जा रहा है और उसकी उस दुर्नीति को सामने रख कर चीन भी हमारे ऊपर बढ़ कर आया जा रहा है अन्यथा चीन से हमारे सम्बन्ध खराब नहीं थे लेकिन चीन ने भी हमारी सीमाओं का अतिक्रमण किया और आक्रमण कर दिया। चीन ने यह देखा कि हिन्दुस्तान की नीति हमेशा दबने की है, हमेशा जब कोई गुण्डागर्दी करता है, जब कोई श्रुत करता है और जब कोई भयंकर स्वरु सामने रखता है तब यह सरकार दब जाती है। यह दबने की प्रवृत्ति, कुछ स्वभाव इस प्रकार का बन गया है। चीन ने जब यह देखा कि भारत सरकार पाकिस्तान से दबी चली आ रही है तो उसने सोचा कि फिर हमारा यह क्या बिगाड़ लेंगे ? इसके अतिरिक्त भारत के पास सम्पूर्ण शस्त्रास्त्र भी नहीं हैं और इसलिए चीन ने भी हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण कर दिया। एक तरफ हम पाकिस्तान को प्रसन्न करने की तरफ चल रहे हैं और अब हमारे सामने चीन को भी प्रसन्न करने का प्रश्न खड़ा हो गया है। अब यह तो वही हालत हुई कि "चौबे जी छब्बे बनने जा रहे थे, दुबे गाँठ के भी न रहे।" कोढ़ में खाज हो गयी। एक बीमारी से निबट नहीं पाये ये कि दूसरा रोग हमारे सिर पर आ गया।

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में हम सफल हो रहे हैं या असफल, यह देखने के लिए हमें अपने देश की स्थिति की तरफ ध्यान देना पड़ेगा। यदि हम को लाभ नहीं हो रहा है तो संसार यदि वाहवाही भी करे तो उस वाहवाही से हमारा कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। हम को लाभ होना चाहिए। हमारे देश को लाभ होना चाहिए। अब हमारे देश को तो लाभ

हो नहीं रहा है और हमारा देश शत्रुओं के जाल में फंसता जा रहा है। इतना ही नहीं पाकिस्तान से जो साधन, संधि इत्यादि कर रहे हैं उससे जो हमें हानि हो रही है सो अलग। हम यह नहीं देख रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान निरन्तर यहां जहर भर कर हमारे घर में भेजता जा रहा है। आसाम में नित्यप्रति अभी भी हजारों की संख्या में लोग चले आ रहे हैं। क्या हमारी सरकार और उसके जिम्मेदार अधिकारी इतना भी चैक नहीं कर सकते कि हमारे घर में कैसे बाहर से राष्ट्र विरोधी तत्व आ रहे हैं। इसमें हिन्दू-मुस्लिम के भेद का प्रश्न नहीं है लेकिन हो यह रहा है कि जो अराजक और राष्ट्र विरोधी तत्व पहले से हमारे देश में थे और अब धीरे धीरे शान्त होते जाते हैं या जिनमें राष्ट्रीयता की भावना उत्पन्न होती जाती है, उनमें यह वाहुर से आने वाले लोग पुनः जहर भरने की चेष्टा कर रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान से वह लोग इसके वास्ते टूँड होकर आते हैं और वह यहां आकर हमारे देश के वायु मण्डल को विषाक्त बनाते हैं और हम उसे भी थाम नहीं सकते, रोक नहीं सकते हैं तब हम अपनी वैदेशिक नीति में सफल हुए हैं यह हम कैसे कह सकते हैं ? हमें गम्भीरतापूर्वक यह देखना पड़ेगा कि हमारे देश को लाभ हो रहा है अथवा नहीं हो रहा है। आज संसार में जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय चक्र तीव्रता से घूम रहा है और संसार की दो बड़ी शक्तियाँ तीव्र गति से संघर्ष की और जा रही हैं, उन को रोकने के लिये नीतिमत्ता और बुद्धिमानी से काम करना चाहिए। इस में सन्देह नहीं कि बर्लिन का प्रश्न एक बर्लिन प्रश्न हो गया है, एक जलता हुआ प्रश्न बन गया है। हम ने उस प्रश्न के समाधान के लिये प्रयत्न करना है, किन्तु स्वयं उस में अस्मिंभूत नहीं हो जाना है। संसार को लड़ने से बचाया जाये, इस के लिये प्रयत्न करना है, लेकिन उस में स्वयं हम ही न फंस जायें, इसके लिये हमें सावधान रहना चाहिये। संसार में

हम को अपनी शान्ति की आवाज बलन्द करनी चाहिए और साथ ही संसार के भिन्न राष्ट्रों से अपना सम्पर्क साधने की भी जरूरत है ।

अफ्रीका के जो देश स्वतंत्र हुए हैं, उन का ग्रुप बनने जा रहा है, उस की लीडरशिप लेने में हमें हिचकना नहीं चाहिए । यदि हमारे उद्देश्य पवित्र हैं, यदि हम ने संसार में सत्य का प्रतिपादन करना है, यदि हमने संसार में शान्ति बनाए रखने के लिये प्रयत्न करना है, तो फिर हमारी ओर से कोई ग्रुप नहीं बनता है, तो कोई डर नहीं है और अगर बनता है, तो भी कोई डर नहीं है । यदि हमारी नीयत साफ़ है, हमारा स्वभाव और कृति शुद्ध है, तो फिर डर की कोई बात नहीं है । अगर हमारा हृदय और कृति शुद्ध न हो, अगर हमारे हृदय में विकार हो, तो हम कोई ग्रुप बनायें, या न बनायें, उस से कोई प्रभाव पड़ने वाला नहीं है। इस लिये संसार में तृतीय शक्ति का निर्माण इन दोनों शक्तियों को थापने के लिये आवश्यक है और इस दिशा में प्रयत्न होना चाहिए ।

इस के पश्चात् मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम एक राष्ट्र के साथ एक तरह का व्यवहार करें और दूसरे के साथ दूसरी तरह का, यह उचित नहीं है । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब सरकार एक राष्ट्र के साथ अपने दौत्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित करती है, तो दूसरे के साथ क्यों नहीं करती है । जब सरकार एक कोरिया से सम्बन्ध स्थापित करती है, तो दूसरे ने क्या बिगाड़ा है कि उस के साथ दूसरा व्यवहार किया जाता है । इसी प्रकार उत्तरी और दक्षिणी वियतनाम, इन दोनों राष्ट्रों से हमारा सम्बन्ध होना चाहिये । मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इसरायल के साथ, जब कि वह एक राज्य बन गया है, दौत्य सम्बन्ध क्यों स्थापित नहीं किया जाता है । इसरायल के साथ दौत्य सम्बन्ध और व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने में क्या हानि

होती है, प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने अभी तक इस सम्बन्ध में प्रकाश नहीं डाला है । मैं समझत हूँ कि इस विषय में हमारे हृदय में जो सन्देह है, उन को दूर किया जाना चाहिये । आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि सब दिशाओं से हम को जो भी लाभ हो सके, वह उठाना चाहिये ।

जो महान् सम्मेलन हो रहा है और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी जो वहाँ पधार रहे हैं, वह एक स्वागत-योग्य बात है । मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह एक बड़ी मूझ-बूझ का काम किया है कि जो एशिया के प्रतिनिधि वहाँ जाने वाले हैं, उन सब को यहाँ निमंत्रित किया है कि वे जाते समय या लौटते समय यहाँ आयें के इस तरह अधिक से अधिक लोगों के साथ सम्पर्क साधना और अपने मैत्री-सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना बुद्धिमानी का कार्य है । इस तरह की बुद्धिमानी के कार्य अवश्य किये जाने चाहियें और संसार में अधिक से अधिक सहानुभूति प्राप्त करने की चेष्टा करनी चाहिये । मैं समझता हूँ कि इस दिशा में प्रधान मंत्री महोदय बड़ी सावधानी के साथ तो काम कर रहे हैं, लेकिन उन से भारत वर्ष से क्या लाभ मिल रहा है, इस को अवश्य ध्यान में रखना चाहिये, क्योंकि संसार के लोग केवल झूठी प्रशंसा कर के अपना लाभ उठाने के लिये हमारा उपयोग न कर लें । हमें इस के लिये सतर्क और सावधान रहना चाहिये ।

जहाँ तक पाकिस्तान का सम्बन्ध है, वह तो "शटे शाइयम् सामाचरेत्" की नीति को मानेगा । जिन की प्रकृति खराब हो जाती है, वे सज्जनता की बातों और सज्जनता के व्यवहार से नहीं मानते । न चीन मानेगा, न पाकिस्तान मानेगा । इस के लिये देश को मुदूढ़, सशस्त्र, और बलवान बनाने की आवश्यकता है । मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हमारी तटस्थता की नीति सतर्क तटस्थता की नीति होगी, सावधान तटस्थता की नीति होगी और इस में सतर्कता बरती जायेगी ।

[पंडित ब्रज नाथण "ब्रजेश"]

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना वक्तव्य समाप्त करता हूँ ।

Shrimati Mafida Ahmed: This debate is taking place at a very crucial juncture of world affairs, and this House is now discussing the policy of the Government of India in relation to the international situation. This is the first time when you have been kind enough to permit me to participate in the foreign affairs debate, and I am thankful to you for the same.

Since several Members have dealt with the world situation in a comprehensive way, I would like to be very brief in my observations, and as I am having the first opportunity to speak on foreign affairs, I want to deal with the aspect of non-alignment which is the very essence of our foreign policy, and which has raised the status of India in the comity of nations of the world. There was a time when India's neutral and non-alignment policy was looked upon with suspicion by the big Powers. No one understood the practicability and sincerity of this point of view, but today we find that India's non-alignment policy has become infectious. Soon after her Independence Indonesia was the first country which fully appreciated our foreign policy and adopted it for herself also. In a short span of time, this family of non-aligned nations grew and today it covers many countries of Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America. It is an achievement which world history will record in golden letters. It would be a matter of pride for the Indian generations to come that one of their elders, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, was the architect, the maker and founder of this new concept of foreign policy which seeks friendly relations with all countries, judges all international issues on their own respective merits and advocates the principle of 'live and let live'.

I am somewhat amused to see Pakistan's reaction to the non-alignment policy of India. This is the only South-East Asian country which has chosen most dramatically to condemn India's foreign policy, a country which till 1947 constituted a part of the big Indian family. It is a great pity that mere geographical division of the country has made the leaders of Pakistan so lopsided as to forget completely their ancient past.

Now I come to the significant psychological change of the big Powers which is another landmark of India's foreign policy. There was a time when only the views and attitudes of the big Powers mattered. If anybody carefully observes the changing international scene, he would find that there have always been trouble spots during the last decades and whenever there were troubles, small countries, particularly, the Asian nations, did not count at all. It is a matter of great satisfaction for us that small nations, particularly the Asian countries count today in all the deliberations of the big Powers, whether inside or outside the United Nations. Asia is not at present treated in a cavalier way as she was until 15 years ago after when the destinies of the defeated nations were to be the Second World War settled, then only the Big Four met. The small nations who suffered immensely the horrors of war were not consulted. This was the situation in 1945. Today out of hundred and odd members of the United Nations, something like sixty are small nations. Whenever they combine together, they can sway the deliberations of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Whether it is trouble in Laos, whether it is trouble in Congo, whether it is the issue of disarmament or any other matter, the small nations' voice is recognised and the Big Powers are always anxious to carry their voice with them. For this new change in the relations between the Big Powers

and the small nations, credit no doubt goes to our Prime Minister who gave the first call to the world that small nations would not brook indifference and that their voice should be heard.

Now I come to the issue which is really agitating the minds of the people of India. After reading about the great drama of sycophancy and political meanness enacted by President Ayub Khan in America, I feel it was the mission of an inexperienced country. I should like to record that at least America did behave like an experienced and great country on this occasion. There was a great shock in the American press, public and political circles that President Ayub Khan should go to the extent of telling the Government and people of the United States what should be their foreign policy, what should be their attitude towards India and so on. In fact, President Ayub Khan told the people of America what he would do if he were the President of the USA. I would like to leave it to the people of America to observe the social impact which President Ayub Khan made by his recent visit. But I am most distressed, however, at his irresponsible utterances on Kashmir and America's economic aid to India. President Ayub Khan is trying to solve the Kashmir issue by an anti-Indian slanderous campaign.

After outbursts of anti-Indian propaganda and crossing all limits of democratic decency, the President of Pakistan, in his Independence Day broadcast, termed India as Pakistan's great neighbour and expressed Pakistan's desire for peace and friendly relations with India, and to have an honourable settlement over Kashmir. He speaks both of peaceful and warlike means of settlement, and I am confident the Government of India is alert about everything concerning Kashmir, and is ready for a settlement whichever way Pakistan might choose to have it.

In recent months, the President of Pakistan has made so many statements

about Kashmir. He threatened the United States that he might be inclined to turn towards China if USA did not support Pakistan in its dispute with India over Kashmir. A few months back we heard of Pakistan's intention to have border talks with China. The so-called border problem which Pakistan wants to talk about with China is about a territory which really belongs to India. Pakistan is in illegal possession of it, and sooner or later Pakistan has to surrender it to India, if her professions to the adherence of the United Nations Resolution have any tangible meaning. I wonder if in international law, a usurper can have any authority to talk with a potential usurper about a stretch of territory which belongs to India.

17.31 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Our Government is protesting against it. Protest is one way of reflecting our reaction against the intention of Pakistan, but I would urge upon the Government to think of additional ways in which these illegitimate talks can be prevented. I take this opportunity to tell the Government and people of Pakistan that whatever may be their sinister objective, the projected talks will take President Ayub Khan far, far away from his professions of having friendly relations with India.

I also want to make it clear that President Ayub Khan need not think that any section of the population of this country has the slightest sympathy with his concern over Kashmir. Forty million Muslims stand solidly behind their great leader, the Prime Minister of India, over this issue, and would make any sacrifice which the country expects of them to make.

Not only has the President of Pakistan been shouting for a settlement of the Kashmir dispute either by war or peaceful means, but he is dumping all the latest weapons from that great Power, America. President Ayub

[Shrimati Mafida Ahmed]

Khan firmly indicated to an American journalist in Rawalpindi in June last that "the USA should be mindful of the fact that if Pakistan's territory was violated, she would spend her time in dealing with the enemy rather than putting American weapons in cotton wool." We are shocked that, in spite of these hot words from the head of a hostile country, neither the US Government has put any restraint over Pakistan, nor our Government has sought any assurance from the US Government in this regard. Only, the US Government have gone on repeating that the arms supplied by them would be used only against Communist aggression.

We however appreciate that in spite of President Ayub Khan's browbeating America's economic aid continues to come to India. The new Government of the United States, the Kennedy Administration, has shown much imagination and boldness in reorienting its foreign aid policy, and I do hope that the US Government will have similar boldness to assure the Government and the People of India that the Government of U.S. will definitely intervene if Pakistan uses their arms against India.

श्री अ० म० तारिक (जन्म तथा काश्मीर):

मि० स्पीकर, मैं सब से पहले वजीर आजम को उस तकरीर पर मुबारकवाद देना चाहता हूँ जो उन्होंने पिछले दिनों काश्मीर में की। उस तकरीर में उन्होंने साफ तौर से यह बातला दिया है और कह दिया है कि काश्मीर का आखिरी फैसला हो चुका है। अब काश्मीर के मामले पर और पाकिस्तान के साथ किसी मजिद बात चीत की गुंजाइश नहीं है। यकीनन काश्मीर और हिन्दुस्तान के इलहाक का फैसला आखिरी है और इस फैसले को हम ने ही नहीं, दुनिया के तमाम बड़े बड़े मुल्कों ने और खुद अकबर मुतहदाने तसलीम किया है। ४ फरवरी, १९४८ के दिन यू० एन० ओ०

में जो बहस हुई उस में अमरीकी नुमाइन्दे ने इन अल्फाज के साथ हिन्दुस्तान के साथ काश्मीर के इलहाक को तसलीम किया है :

"With the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India this foreign sovereignty went over to India and is exercised by India and that is why India happens to be here as a petitioner."

यह है यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में अमरीकी नुमाइन्दे की राय काश्मीर के इलहाक के बारे में। इस के साथ ही जब खुद हुकूमत अमरीका के नुमाइन्दे की यह राय है, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ हिन्दुस्तान के वजीर आजम से कि वह क्या बातें थीं, वह क्या नये हालात थे जिनकी बिना पर पाकिस्तान के द्र फील्ड मार्शल अय्यूब खान और अमरीका के सद्र ने या अमरीका के नायक सद्र ने यह यकीन दिलाया है कि जब हिन्दुस्तान का वजीर आजम उन से मिलने के लिये न्यूयार्क या वाशिंगटन जायेगा तो वह उस को मशवरा देंगे कि वह फील्ड मार्शल अय्यूब खान के साथ एक दफा फिर कौगिश करे काश्मीर के मामले को मुलजाने को। मैं यह समझता हूँ और निहायत दयानतदारी से समझता हूँ, कि यह अमरीका की हिन्दुस्तान के साथ दोस्ताना हरकत नहीं है, बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दरूनी और खारजी मामलान के साथ बेजा मदाखिलत है। मैं वजीर आजम से यह तबक्को रक्वूंगा कि जब वह मि० कनेडी से या उन के दोस्तों से बातचीत करेंगे दुनिया के मामलान पर तब वह इन मामले पर आखिरी फैसला बता देंगे कि वह काश्मीर के मामले में किसी बाहरी ताकत का कोई मशवरा कबूल करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। हां, अगर वाकई अमरीका के सथावतता या वहाँ के प्रेजिडेंट यह चाहते हैं कि दुनिया में अमन हो, अगर वह यह चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के ताल्लुकात बेहतर हों, तो वह अपने दोस्त पाकिस्तान को यह मशवरा दे सकते हैं, और वही उन का सही मशवरा

होगा, वही एस्लाकी मस्वरा होगा, वही कानूनी मस्वरा होगा, कि पाकिस्तान मकबूजा काश्मीर से अपनी फौजों हटा ले क्योंकि वह इलाका कानूनी तौर पर और एस्लाकी तौर पर हिन्दुस्तान का है ।

मैं आप की तबज्जह उन चन्द हालात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूं । जब मार्शल अयूब खां के दौराने कयाम हमारे सामने आये हैं । जब एक प्रेस कॉन्फेन्स में फील्ड मार्शल अयूब खां से पूछा गया कि काश्मीर के मामले पर वे क्या करेंगे तो उन्होंने फीरी तौर पर यह जवाब दिया कि फौजों एक दूसरे के सामने खड़ी हैं और किसी वक्त कोई भी हालात सामने आ सकते हैं । इन तमाम हालात के पेशे नजर, जो फील्ड मार्शल अयूब खां खुद अमरीका में कहते हैं उस के वावजूद अमरीका की हुकूमत नये नये हथियारात, नये नये सामाने जंग पाकिस्तान को मुहय्या करे और साथ ही साथ हम से यह कहे कि अगर पाकिस्तान ने आप पर हमला किया तो हम आप की मदद को आयेगे, मैं समझता हूं कि यह दोस्ती नहीं है बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ एक खास स्किस्म की दरपर्दा दुश्मनी है ।

मैं इस के अलावा आप की तबज्जह उस स्टेटमेंट की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूं जो मि० जानसन ने दिया था जब फील्ड मार्शल अयूब खां अमरीका टेक्सास के इलाके में गये थे । मार्शल अयूब का हाथ पकड़ कर उन्होंने ने कहा था कि यह बहुत बड़े बहादुर आदमी हैं, जवान आदमी हैं और उन से यह कहा कि "मैं आप की जवां मर्दी पर आप को मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूं । पिछले १४ सालों में जिस तरह आप ने तरक्की की है और जिस तरह आप जिन्दा रहे हैं जबकि आप की सरहदों पर चीन, रूस और हिन्दुस्तान हैं ।" इस से साफ जाहिर है कि मि० जानसन ने जहन में क्या चीज थी कि जब उन्होंने ने यह कहा कि हम पाकिस्तान को सिर्फ इस लिये हथियार देते हैं कि वह कफ़ा निज्म के खिलाफ अगर कभी

मौका आये तो उन को इस्तेमाल करे । लेकिन इन दो मुल्कों के साथ हिन्दुस्तान को ला देना इस बात को जाहिर करता है कि वह हिन्दुस्तान को भी पाकिस्तान का दुश्मन तबज्जुर करता है और अखलाकी तौर पर पाकिस्तान को इस लिये मदद देता है कि वह इस तमाम चीज को जब चाहे काश्मीर के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल करे । उस वक्त हुकूमत अमरीका को चलाने वाले कहां थे जब इन हथियारों का इस्तेमाल पाकिस्तान ने अफगानों पर किया, जब खुद पख्तूनित्तान में रहने वाले मुजाहिदीन पर बम फेंके गये ? उस वक्त हुकूमत अमरीका ने कोई मदाखिलत नहीं की और पाकिस्तान से बिल्कुल कुछ नहीं कहा ।

जहां तक इस चीज का ताल्लुक है कि पाकिस्तान यह सब कुछ क्यों करता है, उस के बारे में मुबह वजीर आजम ने ठीक तरह से फरमाया कि यह बदकिस्मती है, पाकिस्तान के लोगों की कि वहां की मौजूदा हुकूमत ऐसे लोगों के हाथ में है जिन का कभी पाकिस्तान की सियासी जिन्दगी मे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था । ये लोग आजादी मे पहले साबिका अंग्रेजों के यार वफादार थे, उन के साथी थे और हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को कुचलने में इन्हीं फौजी वर्दियों में उन का साथ देते थे । और आज अपने एस्तदार को बढ़ाने के लिये पाकिस्तान की आवाज को, पाकिस्तान के लोगों की आवाज को दबा कर एक खास किरूम का नारा फैला कर और पाकिस्तान के लोगों के जजबत को मुश्तईल कर के अपनी हुकूमत को कायम रखना चाहते हैं । वाकई अगर वह लोग इस बात के ख्वाहा हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का फंसला हो तो उन को चाहिये कि वह मकबूजा काश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान के हवाले करें और यही एक आखिरी सूरत होगी हमारे और उन के फंसले की ।

मैं वजीर आजम की तबज्जह उस जमाने के अमरीकी अखबारों की तरफ भी दिलाना चाहता हूं, जिन की बहुत सी कटिंग मेरे पास

[श्री ए० एम० तारिक]

हैं और जिन्होंने फिर से इस बात का रोना शुरू किया है कि साहब, क्यों न काश्मीर और पाकिस्तान का फैसला हो, आखिर काश्मीर में भी मुस्लिम अक्सरियत है और पाकिस्तान में मुस्लिम अक्सरियत है? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह वहाँ के लोगों की इखलाकी और सियासी बददयान्ती है। वह जानते हैं कि काश्मीर और हिन्दुस्तान का इलहाक मुसलमानों की अक्सरियत की वजह से नहीं हुआ है बल्कि इस वजह से हुआ है कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के उसूलों में यकीन रखते हैं और हम इस बात को जानते हैं कि काश्मीर हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान का साथ रहा है, और हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों ने काश्मीर की जंग आजादी में हमेशा काश्मीर का साथ दिया, जब कि पाकिस्तान के लोगों ने मुस्लिम लीग ने और मिस्टर जिन्ना ने उसकी मुखालिफत की। यह सवाल अक्सरियत का नहीं है, अक्सरियत और अक्लियत की वजह से कौमों के फैसले नहीं होते।

मैं वजीर आजम से एक और दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ जिसकी तरफ मेरे दोस्त श्री नाथपाई ने उनकी तवज्जह दिलायी है। वह है अल्जीरिया का मसला। यकीनन हमें वहाँ के मुजाहिदों की कद्र करना चाहिए और वहाँ की आरजी हुकूमत को वहाँ की जायज हुकूमत तसलीम करना चाहिए। इससे हम अरब मुल्कों में एक खास किस्म की मकबूलियत ही हासिल नहीं करेंगे बल्कि यह हमारा इखलाकी फर्ज भी है। पाकिस्तान ने उस हुकूमत को तसलीम किया है, लेकिन मैं आपको यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि अरब मुल्क उससे खुश नहीं हैं। वे जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान की यह सयासी चाल हिन्दुस्तान को अरब मुल्कों में बदनाम करने के लिए है वरना और तमाम मामलों में फ्रांस और पाकिस्तान दोनों साथ साथ रहे हैं। जहाँ तक अरब मुमालिक की आजादी और खुशहली का ताल्लुक है पाकिस्तान ने कभी उनका

साथ नहीं दिया, बल्कि उसने सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान को अरब मुमालिक में एक खास तरीके से बदनाम करने के लिए और एक खास तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान को एक्सप्लाइट करने के लिए अल्जीरिया की आरजी हुकूमत को तसलीम किया है। हमें यह चाहिए और फौरी तौर पर यह चाहिए कि हम अल्जीरिया की हुकूमत को तसलीम करें।

इसके साथ ही मैं सिर्फ एक मिनट में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। सेक्रेटरी जनरल की काफी नुक्ताचीनी की गयी उनके पीकिंग के दौरे के सिलसिले में। हिन्दुस्तान की यह हमेशा पालिसी रही है कि हम तमाम ऐसे अमूर को, तमाम ऐसे मसलों को, जिन पर हम किसी दूसरे मुल्क के साथ एक राय न हो, दोस्ताना तरीके से तै करें। यह कहना कि सेक्रेटरी जनरल पीकिंग में और चीन के दूसरे इलाकों में वहाँ की हुकूमत के दरवाजे खटखटाते रहे हैं दुरुस्त नहीं है, बल्कि इखलाकी तौर पर उनका यह फर्ज था कि जब वह चीन में थे, वह चीन के लोगों से मिलते, उनसे बातचीत करते और मालूम करते कि चीन ने क्या फैसला किया है उस रिपोर्ट के बारे में।

इन चन्द अल्फाज के साथ मैं वजीर आजम की खारिजा पालिसी की ताईद करता हूँ।

[مستور اسپیکر - میں سب سے

پہلے وزیر اعظم کو اس تقریر پر مبارکباد دینا چاہتا ہوں جو انہوں نے پچھلے دنوں کشمیر میں کی - اس تقریر سے انہوں نے صاف طور سے یہ بتلا دیا ہے اور کہہ دیا ہے کہ کشمیر کا آخری فیصلہ ہو چکا ہے - اب کشمیر کے معاملہ میں اور پاکستان

کے ساتھ کسی مزید بات چیت کی گنجائش نہیں ہے۔ - یقیناً کشمیر ہندوستان کے الحاق کا فیصلہ آخری ہے اور اس فیصلے کو ہم نے ہی نہیں دنیا کے تمام بڑے بڑے ملکوں نے اور خود اقوام متحدہ نے تسلیم کیا ہے۔ - ۴ فروری ۱۹۴۸ء کے دن یو۔ این۔ او۔ میں جو بحث ہوئی اس میں امریکی نمائندے نے ان الفاظ نے ساتھ ہندوستان کے ساتھ کشمیر کے الحاق کو تسلیم کیا ہے۔ -

"With the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India this foreign sovereignty went over to India and is exercised by India and that is why India happens to be here as a petitioner."

یہ ہے یونائیٹڈ نیشن میں امریکی نمائندے کی رائے کشمیر کے الحاق کے بارے میں۔ اس کے ساتھ ہی جب خود حکومت امریکہ کے نمائندے کی یہ رائے ہے۔ - میں یہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں ہندوستان کے وزیر اعظم سے کہ وہ کیا باتیں تھیں۔ وہ کیا نئے حالات تھے جن کی بنا پر پاکستان کے صدر فیلق مارشل ایوب خان اور امریکہ کے صدر نے یا امریکہ کے نائب صدر نے یہ یقین دلاہا ہے کہ جب ہندوستان کے وزیر اعظم ان سے ملنے کے لئے نیویارک یا واشنگٹن جائے گا تو وہ اس کو مشورہ دیں گے کہ وہ فیلق مارشل ایوب خان کے ساتھ پھر یک دفعہ کوشی کرے کشمیر کے مسئلہ کو سنبھالنے کی۔ -

یہ سمجھنا ہوں۔ اور نہایت دیانت داری سے سمجھنا ہوں۔ کہ یہ امریکہ کی ہندوستان کے ساتھ دوستانہ حرکت نہیں ہے۔ بلکہ ہندوستان کے اندرونی اور خارجی معاملات کے ساتھ بیجا مداخلت ہے۔ - میں وزیر اعظم سے یہ توقع رکھوں گا کہ جب وہ مسٹر کینیڈی سے یا ان کے درستوں سے بات چیت کریں گے دنیا کے معاملات پر تب وہ اس معاملہ پر آخری فیصلہ بتا دیں گے کہ وہ کشمیر کے معاملہ میں کسی باہری طاقت کا کوئی مشورہ قبول کرنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں۔ - اگر واقعی امریکہ کے سیاست دان یا وہاں کے پریزیڈنٹ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ دنیا میں امن ہو۔ - اگر وہ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے تعلقات بہتر ہوں تو وہ اپنے دوست پاکستان کو یہ مشورہ دے سکتے ہیں۔ اور وہی ان کا صحیح مشورہ ہوگا۔ وہی اخلاقی مشورہ ہوگا۔ وہی قانونی مشورہ ہوگا۔ کہ پاکستان مقبوضہ کشمیر سے اپنی فوجیں ہٹا لے کیونکہ وہ علاقہ قانونی طور پر ارد اخلاقی طور پر ہندوستان کا ہے۔ -

میں آپ کی توجہ ان چند حالات کی طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں جو مارشل ایوب خان کے دوران قہام ہمارے سامنے آئے ہیں۔ جب ایک پریس کانفرنس میں فیلق مارشل ایوب خان

[شری ع - م - طارق]

سے یہ پوچھا گیا کہ کاشمیر کے معاملہ پر وہ کیا کریں گے تو انہوں نے فوری طور پر یہ جواب دیا کہ فوجیں ایک دوسرے کے سامنے کھڑی ہیں اور کسی وقت کوئی بھی حالات سامنے آ سکتے ہیں - ان تمام حالات کے پیسہ نظر - جو فیڈا مارشل ایوب خان خود امریکہ میں کہتے ہیں اس کے باوجود امریکہ کی حکومت نئے نئے ہتھیارات، نئے نئے سامان جنگ پاکستان کو مہیا کرے اور ساتھ ہی ہم سے یہ ہے کہ اگر پاکستان نے آپ پر حملہ کیا تو ہم آپ کی مدد کو آئیں گے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ دوستی نہیں ہے بلکہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ ایک خاص قسم کی درپردہ دشمنی ہے -

میں اس کے علاوہ آپ کی توجہ اس اسٹیٹینٹ کی طرف بھی دلانا چاہتا ہوں جو مسٹر جانسن نے دیا جب فیڈا مارشل ایوب خان امریکہ میں ٹیکسس کے علاقہ میں گئے تھے - مارشل ایوب کا ہاتھ پکڑ کر انہوں نے کہا تھا کہ یہ بہت بڑے بہادر آدمی ہیں - جوان آدمی ہیں اور ان سے یہ کہا کہ میں آپ کی جوان سردی پر آپ کو مبارکباد دینا چاہتا ہوں - پچھلے ۱۲ سالوں میں جس طرح آپ نے ترقی کی ہے اور جس طرح آپ زندہ رہے ہیں جب کہ آپ کی سرحدوں پر چین، روس اور ہندوستان ہیں - اس

سے صاف ظاہر ہے کہ مسٹر جانسن کے ذہن میں کیا چیز تھی جب انہوں نے یہ کہا کہ ہم پاکستان کو صرف اس لئے ہتھیار دیتے ہیں کہ وہ کھائیونزم کے خلاف اگر کبھی موقع آئے تو ان کو استعمال کرے - لیکن ان دو ملکوں کے ساتھ ہندوستان کو لا دینا اس بات کو ظاہر کرتا ہے کہ وہ ہندوستان کو بھی پاکستان کا دشمن تصور کرتا ہے اور اخلاقی طور پر پاکستان کو اس لئے مدد دیتا ہے کہ وہ اس تمام چیز کو جب چاہے کاشمیر کے خلاف استعمال کرے - اس وقت حکومت امریکہ کو چلانے والے کہاں تھے - جب ان ہتھیاروں کا استعمال پاکستان نے افغانستان پر کیا - جب خود پھتونیستان میں رہنے والے مجاہدین پر بم پھینکے گئے - اس وقت حکومت امریکہ نے کوئی مداخلت نہیں کی اور پاکستان سے بالکل کچھ نہیں کہا -

جہاں تک اس چیز کا تعلق ہے کہ پاکستان یہ سب کچھ کیوں کرتا ہے - اس کے بارے میں صبح وزیراعظم نے تھوڑکے طرح سے فرمایا کہ یہ بد قسمتی ہے پاکستان کے لوگوں کی کہ جہاں کی موجودہ حکومت ایسے اوٹوں کے ہاتھ میں ہے جن کا کبھی پاکستان کی سیاسی زندگی سے کوئی تعلق نہیں تھا - یہ لوگ آزادی سے پہلے سابقہ انگریزوں کے پیار و فادار تھے - ان کے ساتھی تو اب ہندوستان کی آزادی کو

کچلنے میں انہیں فوجی وردیوں میں ان کا ساتھ دیتے تھے - اور آج اپنے اقتدار کو بوجھانے کے لئے پاکستان کی آواز کو - پاکستان کے لوگوں کی آواز کو دبا کر ایک خاص قسم کا نعرہ پھیلا کر اور اور پاکستان کے لوگوں کے جذبات کو مشتعل کر کے اپنی حکومت قائم رکھنا چاہتے ہیں - واقعی اگر یہ لوگ اس بات کے خواہاں ہیں کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کا فیصہ ہو تو ان کو چاہئے کہ وہ مقبوضہ کشمیر کو ہندوستان کے حوالے کریں اور وہی ایک آخری صورت ہوگی ہمارے اور ان کے فیصلے کی -

میں وزیراعظم کی توجہ اس زمانے کے امریکی اخباروں کی طرف بھی دلانا چاہتا ہوں جن کی بہت سی کٹنگ میرے پاس ہیں - اور جنہوں نے پھر سے اس بات کا رونا شروع کیا ہے کہ کیوں صاحب - کیوں نہ کشمیر اور پاکستان کا فیصلہ ہو - آخر کشمیر میں بھی مسام اکثریت ہے اور پاکستان میں بھی مسلم اکثریت ہے -

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ وہاں کے لوگوں کی اخلاقی اور سیاسی بددیانتی ہے - وہ جانتے ہیں کہ کشمیر اور ہندوستان کا الحاق مسلمانوں کی اکثریت کی وجہ سے نہیں ہوا بلکہ اس وجہ سے ہوا کہ ہم ہندوستان کے

اصولوں میں یقین رکھتے ہیں اور ہم اس بات کو جانتے ہیں کہ کشمیر ہمیشہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ رہا ہے - اور ہندوستان کے لوگوں نے کشمیر کی جنگ آزادی میں ہمیشہ کشمیر کا ساتھ دیا - جب کہ پاکستان کے لوگوں نے - مسلم لیگ نے اور مسٹر جناح نے اس کی مخالفت کی - یہ سوال اکثریت کا نہیں ہے - اکثریت اور اقلیت کی وجہ سے قوموں کے فیصلے نہیں ہوتے -

میں وزیراعظم سے ایک اور درخواست کرنا چاہتا ہوں جس کی طرف میرے دوست شری ناتھ پائی نے ان کی توجہ دلائی ہے - وہ ہے الجھریا کا مسئلہ - یقیناً ہمیں وہاں کے مجاہدوں کی قدر کرنا چاہئے اور وہاں کی عرضی حکومت کو وہاں کی جائز حکومت تسلیم کرنا چاہئے - اس سے ہم عرب ملکوں میں ایک خاص قسم کی مقبولیت ہی حاصل نہیں کریں گے بلکہ یہ ہمارا اخلاقی فرض بھی ہے - پاکستان نے اس حکومت کو تسلیم کیا ہے - لیکن میں آپ کو یقین دلانا ہوں کہ عرب ملک اس سے خوش نہیں ہیں - وہ جانتے ہیں کہ پاکستان کی یہ سیاسی چال ہندوستان کو عرب ملکوں میں بدنام کرنے کے لئے ہے ورنہ اور تمام معاملوں میں فرانس اور پاکستان دونوں ساتھ ساتھ رہے ہیں -

[شری ع - م - طارق]

جہاں تک عرب ممالک کی آزادی اور خوش حالی کا تعلق ہے پاکستان نے کبھی ان کا ساتھ نہیں دیا۔ بلکہ اس نے صرف ہندوستان کو عرب ممالک میں ایک خاص طریقے سے بدنام کرنے کے لئے اور ایک خاص طریقے سے ہندوستان کو ایکس پلانٹ کرنے کے لئے اس نے الجیبریا کی عارضی حکومت کو تسلیم کیا ہے۔ ہمیں یہ چاہئے اور فوری طور پر یہ چاہئے کہ ہم الجیبریا کی حکومت کو تسلیم کریں۔

اس کے ساتھ ہی میں صرف ایک ملت میں ایک بات اور کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ سیکویٹری جنرل کی کافی نکتہ چیلی کی گئی ان کے پیکنگ کے دورے کے سلسلہ میں۔ ہندوستان کی یہ ہمیشہ پالیسی رہی ہے کہ ہم تمام ایسے امور کو۔ تمام ایسے مسئلوں کو جن پر ہم کسی دوسرے ملک کے ساتھ ایک رائے نہ ہوں۔ دوستانہ طریقے سے طے کریں۔ یہ کہنا کہ سیکویٹری جنرل پیکنگ میں اور چین کے دوسرے علاقوں میں وہاں کی حکومت کے دروازے کھٹکتاتے رہے ہیں درست نہیں ہے۔ بلکہ اخلاقی طور پر ان کا یہ فرض تھا کہ جب وہ چین میں تھے۔ وہ چین کے لوگوں سے ملتے۔ ان سے بات چیت کرتے اور معلوم کرتے کہ چین نے کہا فیصلہ کیا ہے اس رپورٹ کے بارے میں۔

ان چند الفاظ کے ساتھ میں وزیر اعظم کی خارجہ پالیسی کی تائید کرتا ہوں۔

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, last night on Independence Day, at 9:30 p.m., there was the programme of European music in the All-India Radio, and the first and second items were musical compositions which have been composed and sung in the Vienna orchestra. The composer was a gentleman who had come to India and the first musical composition was in praise of the Prime Minister of India. The second was about the Plans of India. It thrilled one's ear to hear powerful German music sung by 50 musicians, and I went on musing in my own mind whether we have that same note of thrill in our external regions of friendship. We have created friends in South East Asia, we have created friends in the Arab world, we have created friends in the Afro-Asian world, whether the same thrill of praise is being sung in praise of India in favour of India, that praise which was sung for the last so many years.

But today where do we stand? It is Nehru's brilliant, great star of non-alignment with the powers of the world, which has been founded on the ancient philosophy of India, on the foundation of Buddhism and Hinduism, that is there. Is that resplendent star of Nehru's non-alignment remaining still, or is it ascending or is it moving downwards? That is the question which you and I have to put, because Nehru alone cannot think for India, nor his Foreign Office. The Parliament of the Republic of India will have to come into this picture. Nehru has done his best for the last 15 years. He is an ageing man, but is still in very good health. But how long are you to preserve his paramount position in the world affairs?

We summoned a big conference in regard to Holland against Holland to help Indonesia. We stood by Nasser on the Suez issue and against the

British and even the British Tories have not forgiven us for that. We have championed the cause of China, an unpopular cause. We do not care what dividends are being paid to us. China has stabbed us in the back, occupied our territory and have come with their planes many times into our territory. That is most unpardonable. They have thus stabbed us on our back. We do not care about the results. But we must state our position. We have been the centre of moral gravity between Asia and Africa.

Our officials are handling our policies. They have got the vision, but they have not got the liberal spirit. Some of them were under the British. They cannot change overnight. Look at the small nation of Yugoslavia. Five years ago, when I was in Belgrade for a few days, a lady asked me: "What about all of us joining together?" I almost forgot her remark. I recalled it only when the Belgrade Conference was coming on. I used to see her in the gallery almost daily, more than the wife of any Ambassador. She was then in Belgrade, the wife of the right hand man of Tito, his secretary Dr. Vilfan. The Yugoslavs have been working on the Plan for the last five years. We have been caught napping. The Belgrade Conference is coming. We are grateful to the Prime Minister because he is going there. He is going with an official delegation. Where are the Members of Parliament and the public of India who can lobby for a conference? We send even Members of Parliament—forgive me for saying so—who cannot influence the next door neighbour or somebody sitting in the front or behind. How are they expected to change the fate of nations? We cannot do that.

I had the humble privilege of being with the Prime Minister on the plane to U.N. I saw U.N. last year. I was not a delegate, but I saw it as an ordinary man going to that forum. I also saw how we carry on the name of our Prime Minister and Shri Krishna Menon, but not on our delegations.

Our delegates must be warm-hearted fellows who can influence others. I am glad my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai referred to this point. Today the Americans have changed their policy. The British never allow women to go even to their naval ships. But the Americans, in Delhi last week—the Chairman, Chester Bowles—allowed the wives of Ambassadors to take part. America is changing, but India is not changing. We carry on our foreign policy on the back of our Prime Minister. How long can we carry on like that. We want men who can push along themselves with Africans, the Asians and the others.

I was in Africa. I spent two weeks there, and I demanded of the Indian Mission there to show me the house of Kenyatta. I went there and found that the poor daughter of Kenyatta and his wife were building a house for themselves. I wanted to know how much money was donated by the Indians. The most fabulous houses I have ever seen built in any part of the world are there owned by Indians. Is it not right of the African to ask: "Where is my house? Where is my patronage?" The most beautiful houses I saw there were of Europeans or Asians. I looked with my eyes open. Is not the African entitled to ask, where his house was? Only yesterday, a lady, the wife of a former Indian Ambassador, said: "Oh! the Africans are uneducated". These are the wives of our Ambassadors who represent our country! We want the wives of our Ambassadors also to be good women who, though they do not take a drink or smoke a cigarette, can talk on behalf of the country and can give a good lead.

In Africa we shall be turned out in the next ten years if we do not change our policy today. And what does my countryman say? There was an M.L.C. in Mombasa who told me "Oh! Mahatma Gandhi? He fought for us, not for the Africans." He fought for the independence of the Indians". I asked: "What? Has history changed now?" Another man says "you have to go back to India if you talk like

[Shri Joachim Alva]

this. You will, at any rate, do dis-service to us". I said "shall I close my eyes? What? Shall I speak untruth?" we have no place there.

The British race is a very clever race. They will make terms with the Kenya people and we shall be out. Should we keep quiet? We went as third class citizens to Africa, but today we are super-Brahmins and super-citizens. Unless we change this policy today, we have no place there. I feel that today in the Congress party—I have to speak out very frankly here—we have to be shaken up. Our delegations to the United Nations compose of people who cannot influence their neighbours. How do you expect them to change the fate of nations?

I asked one of our Ambassadors at U.N. whom I entertained and on whom I spent Rs. 300, 'could I look you up, could I talk to you?' He immediately replied: I have to see what my diary says; I have to see whether my lady secretary has fixed up any appointment for me. I never looked him up again because I entertained him and still he did not have the courtesy to behave properly. Yet, he was the representative of a big country. Now, how can we carry on in this way? We have to speak high of our Ambassadors. But how can such things go on? I can go and ask the Prime Minister "Sir, give me an appointment". He will look into the diary and give me time either today or, maybe, a month later. In any case, he will immediately tell me "I will give you such and such time on such and such date". But not so this friend, whom I have referred to. These are the things happening around us.

We have to change them, and change them in a big way. The Prime Minister, or the Minister of Foreign Affairs, has to be supported by a vigorous and dynamic Foreign Office. One foreign office official alone cannot discharge all these functions. These have to be linked up with the public opinion of India through Parliament. Where are the men lobbying? Where are the gentlemen and ladies who can lobby,

who can talk to the Africans on equal terms? He must be able to sit on the ground and the African will fall like a friend, but only if we talk to him nicely. But we are not prepared to talk in that way.

The Muslims and the Aga Khan, in East Africa are following a better policy than us. The four Asians Muslims boycotted the KADU Government in Africa. I was there on the opening day. I talked to the Governor. The KADU was sitting there and the KANU was sitting there; just as the old British pattern here; nothing more, nothing less. The Africans shouted just as we are now shouting. The police came; yet, they shouted against the Government. The four Asian Muslims were not ready to carry on with the KADU Government formed a few months ago. In the KADU Government who are there? The Asian Indians and Hindus. I am neither a Hindu nor a Muslim. I am talking as an Indian and I say that the Africans know what they need. What a policy is this?

The Aga Khan runs two papers there, the Nation and its African counter part in *Swahli* language. The Aga Khan said that the paper in *Swahli* is run and put to bed by Africans themselves. Now if you have got Africans to run a paper in African language for Africans, do you think that the Africans cannot take care of themselves? The British in India sometimes talked in the same way: you cannot run the Government; therefore, we are running the Government on your behalf until you are in a position to run your Government. Today Africa has got a population of 120 million blacks, as against 5 million whites. Today Africa is in the throes of freedom and has got 27 members in the United Nations. How many of them can we claim as our own friends? Are they in our pockets? We do not want them to be in our pockets. We want them in our hearts.

One of my west German journalist friends asked me "Oh! you love the East Germans?" I said, "Excuse me,

I love both the Germans. My heart is big enough" to which he had no answer. Now, this is the way we must get along with people. We must have Ambassadors who will be able to discharge their responsibilities with courage. One Ambassador kept me waiting for one hour, but the British Ambassador came in and called on me. I am sorry, I have to mention this. That British Ambassador is one of the ablest Ambassadors I have ever met, the grandson and a relation of Macaulay and Trevellyn. He said, "I am going to call on you". I said, "Please do not mind, I can take care of myself". I am mentioning this so that people will know here as to how our representatives are functioning abroad.

Here we must remember that for fifteen years our Prime Minister has carried his countrymen on his back and across his mind. He cannot carry them for ever. Who will next carry them? What will be the next change? Are we going to allow this leadership to pass into the hands of other countries? No. We must take the leadership upon ourselves. We must have the moral leadership; not of armies, not of guns, not of supersonic aircrafts, but the moral leadership. If the moral leadership gets out of our hand, then we will have no place in the world and we shall have to step down.

Let me now come to China. China has been very unfair to us. In this great foreign affairs debate today, not one member of this House has stated that there have been many aerial incursions over this country.

In 1956 I was the first man to say that Pakistan would be armed by the end of next year and qualitatively and quantitatively it would be the biggest air power in Asia. The *Hindustan Times* frontpaged that statement of mine in its issue of November 24, 1956. I said that qualitatively and quantitatively Pakistan would be the highest power in Asia and everything else would be next.

Now comes China. China is manufacturing big planes with the aid of

Russia. When I asked the Chinese last time I went there, "Please show me a military camp", they took me to a stage show saying, "This is the military camp". Now they will not show anything to you. No one would show it. But our country is an open country. Today the Chinese have been very unkind to us. I have been to that country. Some of my hon. friends would not listen to me on the last occasion when I spoke about China. My own partymen would not listen. But facts are facts. The Chinese today are obsessed with America. This thing is sitting on their heads like a big volcano. They hit back like mad dogs. But must they hit back at India which has stood with them through all these years? Must they hit out and occupy our territory? Occupation of our territory is one thing, but their planes are going to fly over the country. Are they going to fly over the Parliament of India? We shall neither underestimate nor over-estimate this danger. As realists we have to take a very firm view; otherwise we are gone.

My last point is about Pakistan. I want to know as to what happened after the hon. Prime Minister went to the U.N. Before going to the U.N., he went to Pakistan and signed the Canal Waters Treaty. We are interested in happy relations. We shall not have the old British triangle, the triangle of the British, the Hindus and the Muslims—three people and one triangle. In the present triangle, the Britishers are nicely out. They have become our friends and now the Americans have stepped in. The Americans seem to say, "Money on this side and planes on that side; fight among yourselves". On the last debate, I paid President Kennedy a tribute because I was present in America last year at the time of their elections. He is a very great, liberal statesman. But we shall not depend on any nation. We have to help ourselves. I have seen with these very eyes how we fought among ourselves at the Simla Conference, at the Wavell Conference. I have seen how the late Mohammed Ali Jinnah called us in

[Shri Joachim Alva].
and threw us out; how the Simla Conference failed; how this country was divided into two parts. I also saw Master Tara Singh there. That chapter is over. But are we going to have it in the international field? Are we going to be dependent on the goodwill of America? We are grateful to America for the enormous help that she has given. We are also grateful to the Soviet Union for being the first and the only big power to say, "We stand by you in the matter of Kashmir" and not the Chinese whose cause we had advocated in the United Nations. They never said a word about Kashmir. This is a very dangerous position.

I was the only M.P. present at the airport when General Ayub Khan came here. I went there as a journalist and as a student of international affairs. I found that President Ayub Khan made a great impression. Thereafter we took up the Canal Waters Treaty. The hon. Prime Minister went there. He came back a very tired and exhausted man. I say him in the plane very, very tired. He went immediately to U.N. and was caught up with U.N. affairs. But what happened after that? Where did the change come in? I think that is a cause which we have to examine. Can we depend on statements made by other Ministers which can bring these two countries perhaps to war? We are not in a very happy position.

We have got the Kashmir problem on the one side, the Naga problem on the other side and we cannot proceed on the Goa front. These are the three things. Today we can pat ourselves and say, "Everything is happy; everything is green and rosy in our garden". It is not so. As realists and as guardians of the security and independence of this land, let us hold it on tight. Let our foreign policy have guts. The foreign policy has great moral guts, but let it be discharged by men and women who can deliver the goods abroad in the right spirit and not left to mere officials. It must be

left to them perhaps. Perhaps a day will come when more and more of them will come. The little country of Yugoslavia said, "We chopped off everybody's head". But wherever you go, in every country and in every capital, you will find that Yugoslavia's ambassadors are almost the best and are almost in the front rank. Every Ambassador sent out is a man of front rank ability. Why can such a little country like Yugoslavia do it? We have to consider all our tools. We are not in a very happy position. May God always preserve us!

On the 15th August, 1947, there was a great rainbow at 5 o'clock on our skies in Delhi. That was a happy sign though there was bloodshed in Lahore. We hope that we will overcome our difficulties. But these are very grave matters. We are today at a very grave turn of history and we do hope we shall overcome them if probably the right thing is done.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Mohammed Imam. We will sit for ten minutes more.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug): I will need a little more time. Usually the time allotted is 15 or 20 minutes. I am the only spokesman of my Party.

Mr. Speaker: We have allotted six hours for this. I have tried to give opportunity to every section.

Shri Mohammed Imam: I think the hon. Prime Minister said that he would need only half an hour. Perhaps another half an hour will be available tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker: Where is the half an hour?

Shri Kalika Singh: That may be for others also.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may go on. We will finish.

18 hrs.

Shri Mohammed Imam: Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of speaking on the Foreign Affairs debate last

time, when I said that the communist bloc are practising and they have adopted a new form of imperialism. In pursuance of this policy, the Russian bloc has built a big empire, call it a communist empire in Eastern Europe wherein more than a dozen countries have become its satellites. East Germany is the latest victim. Similarly, another communist country, China, has been making an attempt to build another empire of its own in South-East Asia. I said last time how India's northern borders have become vulnerable after the Chinese aggression. Secondly, China has been trying to build up a communistic fort wall around India and also create a hostile atmosphere. Its latest intervention in the affairs of Laos is very significant. Laos was a neutral country. One day, we find communist intervention which led to civil war and which practically threatened a minor world war. Of course, negotiations have been going on. Why I am referring to this is, China, as a mighty communist power, wants to have a hand and wants to get domination and communist domination in every country in the east and South-East Asia. It is in pursuance of that policy that China illegally and unjustifiably has encroached on the northern borders of India, which encroachment has made the northern borders very vulnerable.

This House and the Government of India and the people of India have shown a good deal of concern over this, and they have asked the Prime Minister and the Government to be very firm. It is true, the Government and the Prime Minister were firm. But, of late, they have begun to show signs of appeasement. Formerly, it was stated by the Prime Minister that he would not negotiate with the Prime Minister of Chinese unless the aggression was vacated. Suddenly, he agreed to meet the Chinese Prime Minister in India in disregard of his own previous announcement. This invitation to the Prime Minister of China was resented to by a good number of persons in this House. Especially, I remember

my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani protesting that he ought not to have been invited and stating that he would refuse to shake hands with a man whose hands are smeared with blood. Anyhow, all the efforts made, the setting up of the official teams and the various approaches have failed to bring in accord. All our efforts have resulted in a deadlock and I do not see any tangible evidence of this deadlock being resolved. There is a feeling among us that the Government, especially the Prime Minister has been adopting an appeasement policy. It is a policy of appeasing the Chinese. I may give two or three instances.

For example, the President in his last Address to Parliament stated that India would have only a peaceful approach to this problem. Again, he stated that we should wait till China persuaded herself to come to an agreement. That means to say that the initiative should lie with China to come to a peaceful agreement. Again, today, we heard the Prime Minister stating that the Secretary-General without any invitation approached the Chinese authorities; many people have pointed out that this was a humiliating affair and that the Prime Minister ought not to have sent his Secretary-General who is practically his envoy, because that means that we are begging the question, and we are showing our humility and our weakness.

So, I beg to submit that the Government and the Prime Minister give us the feeling that their latest policy towards China seems to be a policy of appeasement and not a definite and determined policy. The Prime Minister today stated, let us wait and if it is a question of war, let there be war; that is how I understand it. He said that he would not hesitate to take up arms against China.

It has been pointed out by many speakers that China is not an ordinary country. It has been building up arms, and it may even manufacture atom bombs. And what is more, it has a strategic position. It has been trying

[Shri Mohammed Imam]

to convert all the countries around India into a communist bloc. So, I do not know what the situation will be after some time, especially when India is wedded to the non-alignment policy. I submit that at least India should take over the leadership of South Asia and other Asian countries.

Yesterday, I met some friends who had toured in the Philippines, who had visited Laos, Saigon, Malaya and other places whose representatives said, "We are helpless; there is nobody to guide us; there is nobody to lead us. We are thrown as under, and it looks as if we are at the mercy of the Chinese, and there is nobody who can bring us together; that is our fate; we look to India as the biggest country in Asia, and we look to the Prime Minister as the most interested person in peace to rally us round him, to guide us, to shelter us and to lead us, but this leadership is wanting." You know, Sir, that the Prime Minister has not shown much interest in the affairs of the countries of South-East Asia, whereas he has shown a good deal of interest in the Western countries.

The Prime Minister has even shown his concern regarding Cuba, and he had his own remarks to pass whether they were invited or not, in respect of Cuba which was threatened by communists, Cuba which is nearly 50 miles from America; and perhaps, unasked, he gave his opinion, and he showed his concern, which created a good deal of resentment in America, and which brought a good deal of criticism. But the Prime Minister has not shown any concern or any interest or any anxiety about maintaining the peace and integrity of the countries in the East and round about India, especially the South-East Asian countries, except for the fact that he has sent the Defence Minister to take part in the Geneva Conference on Laos. That is the unfortunate position. That is the feeling in all the countries in South-East Asia, that India is not properly leading those countries which are looking forward to be led. That is why I said

that if there is going to be a war in three or four years, I do not know what the position will be. India's position will be very vulnerable. Action must be swift and immediate. If you are interested in taking back all these territories, please do it at once, as soon as possible. But if the policy is one of reconciliation and if we are afraid and do not think of it but continue a wavering policy, the consequences will be very dangerous to the future of India and the safety of India.

That was why last time I suggested that our non-alignment policy would not be impaired if India led all other South-East Asian countries and formed a compact and that India should lead all those countries which are democratically-minded; all the democratic countries must come together for their own safety and for their own future.

Now I come to the most important question that has been troubling the world. All the attention of the world is rivetted on Berlin and West Germany. I crave your indulgence for a few minutes because it is an important subject and I was in West Germany recently when I had occasion to study the situation in West Berlin and in West Germany. Mr. Khrushchev, the Russian Prime Minister, talks of peace; he talks of disarmament and of *panchsheel*. But I must submit that his attitude is far from conducive to attaining peace. His attitude is far from establishing peace in this world. There was the break-up of the Summit conference on some flimsy ground; various other summit conferences also broke up. Again his attitude in the U.N. General Assembly, his undemocratic expressions and 'famous' gestures on that occasion, widened the gulf between East and West. Again, he has been displaying his might through nuclear weapons and space ships. He has said that he is in a position to make a bomb which can generate the power of 100 million tons T.N.T. All these factors would not contribute to peace.

I might just mention that Russia was once an ally of the West. America, France, Britain and Russia together subjugated Germany. Germany had to atone for it. She has suffered. The Occupation Powers divided Germany into four parts. West Germany came to the western bloc and East Germany went to the eastern bloc i.e. Russia. The unfortunate part of it is that the City of Berlin, which is considered to be a city of parks, lakes and forest, which is an island in the midst of East Germany, was also divided. The Allies took care to see that they had the right of access to West Berlin. But at that time, I think it was far from the intention of the Western Powers to settle there permanently or to absorb it permanently in their zones or countries. It must be said to the credit of the American and western people that though they were responsible for bombing and ruination, they rendered financial aid and helped to rebuild the whole of West Germany and West Berlin so much so that now the prosperity, people's happiness and rate of production are much more than what they were before the war.

As against a prosperous West Germany, we find a dismal East Germany where the people are quite happy. East Berlin has to be restored. While the western allies were busy rebuilding West Germany, Russia was busy building an iron curtain all round East Germany and depriving them of their freedom and liberty. The result is—and I have seen it with my own eyes—daily there is an influx of refugees from 500 to 1,000 into West Berlin. These refugees are given all help in West Berlin. Till now nearly three million people have migrated from East Germany. It is said that the only country which has declined in population in this census is East Germany and East Berlin, and its population had gone down by more than four or five million after occupation by Russia.

Now, it is claimed by Communists that they are quite happy. If all the

inhabitants are happy in East Germany and East Berlin, if there is milk and honey over flowing and if it is a heaven for them, I cannot understand why there should be this wholesale and huge migration into West Berlin and West Germany. It is quite obvious they are not happy, and what is more, they are anxious for a reunion among themselves.

As I said, Germany was divided as a temporary measure, just to bring down the military might of old Germany. After that purpose had been achieved, it is the duty of the Powers concerned to work for the reunion of entire Germany. Germany was once a great nation. It lost a portion of its territory during the First World War. Now it is losing East Germany which was originally called Central Germany. Their ambition is that they should be united again. It is the ambition of every one who has lived under one umbrella and one administration, to come together. So, the right-thinking persons should try to create conditions for these people to come together, not to keep them under pressure and subject them to coercion. So, this should be the endeavour of the neutral nations. I think, the Prime Minister is also very anxious about it.

I know the Prime Minister condemns colonialism. He does not want the domination of one country over another. I wish in the same way he condemns Communist colonialism. East Germany is nothing but a colony of Russia. The domination of one country over another always prolongs the agony and unhappiness of its people. This must be realised by all. I want the Prime Minister to condemn this Communist colonialism or imperialism as much as he condemns Western colonialism. After all, Western colonialism is of minor importance when compared to Communist colonialism. Many of these colonies have been released and liberated, but here once a country becomes a satellite, it remains so always. So, let all the occupying forces be withdrawn. Let it be left to East and West Germany

[Shri Mohammed Imam]

to settle their problem. Let a plebiscite be held, let them be given the right of self-determination. If they want to re-unite, let them join; if they want to remain separate, let them remain separate States. Let them adopt such form of Government as they deem fit. That is the right attitude, and that is the attitude that should be adopted by the Prime Minister when he attends this neutral nations conference.

Now I come to Pakistan. I know the recent attitude of Ayub Khan has raised the indignation of the Prime Minister. It has justly roused the indignation of many Members of this House. His remarks in America were unnecessary and uncalled for. Sir, I am a Muslim and as an Indian Muslim, I must tell Ayub Khan and the Pakistani people that more than American arms and American money, it is the friendship of India that is going to protect Pakistan; it is the goodwill of India which will protect Pakistan and help Pakistan to prosper. It is true that once the Indian nation was divided and two countries have been formed in a land which was once only one land. People may be divided; there may be two countries by different denominations. But the Pakistan people must realise that as long as the world lasts, India and Pakistan must live together side by side and when it is the case it is to the interest of Pakistan and of its posterity and future that that country should live in a spirit of amity and goodwill with India.

Nobody feels more unhappy than us that the relationship between India and Pakistan is strained. 50 million Muslims have decided for them and for their children to remain in India. Ayub Khan must understand that Pakistan was not built by Pakistanis alone. Pakistan was built not merely by the Muslims of Pakistan but by most of the Muslims who are now in India who unfortunately advocated the creation of Pakistan but fortunately they are here. Whatever it may be, he owes a debt and he is under an

obligation to the Muslims remaining in India so that he does not create a situation wherein it will reflect on us who are here. He owes an obligation to us to live in friendship and amity and brotherhood. Otherwise, he will be committing a breach of faith to all these who helped in his ideas. When Ayub Khan came to power it was thought that he might be better person to attain peace than his predecessors. In the initial stages we were also heartened as he took a broad and reasonable attitude. Feroze Khan Noon also took a reasonable attitude. We thought that the situation would improve and they would see reason. But where was the need for him to go to America and blaspheme India? I think it is not gentlemanly nor is it tactful. Is his propaganda in America beneficial and advantageous to Pakistan? The future of Pakistan is safe if he has direct dealings with India. Though I am in the Opposition, I must say that the Muslims in India have no better friend than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I know he has got soft feelings towards Pakistan; he wants to help it. We are brothers. Let us quarrel among ourselves but let us solve our problems by direct approach. We were once old citizens of a country though we are now divided. Whatever may be our feelings, is neighbours we help each other in times of distress. Instead, his going to far off America and invoking their aid, the aid of President Kennedy. This is very bad. It is distressing. As I said, he may receive American aid, but that American aid will not help him. It will land him in further troubles. So, the only way in which he can ensure the future of Pakistan is by earning the goodwill and friendship of India.

Let us work together for mutual benefit. Let us try to live together. It is through exchanging blessings and help that we can prosper and not by exchanging curses. So, I am sure President Ayub Khan will realise the folly and I would advise him not to approach foreign powers because, let

him remember that after all, we must both live together. If anything, let us fight among ourselves; let him fight with our Prime Minister and let us come to a solution. But, on the other hand, if he looks to foreign powers and other things, I can tell him through this House that Pakistan will be doomed and disrupted.

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): I may be permitted to start my speech so that I may continue tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Let us see. The House now stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18.28 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, August 17, 1961/Sravana 26 1883 (Saka).
