

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRI ANSARUDDIN AHMED

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following letter has been received from Shri Ansaruddin Ahmed dated the 2nd December, 1961:

"I beg to state that I have been suffering from attacks of my old standing ailment, asthma, and my doctors have advised me not to undertake the long arduous journey to New Delhi in the cold weather and in the circumstances I would request you and my colleagues in the House to excuse my inability to attend the House and grant me leave of absence".

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri Ansaruddin Ahmed for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current Session?

(No hon. Member dissented)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

### MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Sir, I move:

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

During the last two weeks or so, there have been several discussions in this House and the other House on some aspects of our foreign policy. I would like not to cover the same ground as far as it is possible because that is unnecessary and perhaps rather boring to the House. Apart from what they have heard here, they have had access no doubt to what I said in the other House. If

necessity arises, I shall deal with any matter to which hon. Members may refer in the course of their speeches. In particular, we discussed the question of our border with China fairly fully the other day in this House and I am not going to deal with that question as such but there are two or three matters to which I should like to refer. One is the fact that in one of the replies of the Chinese Government, they have taken exception to the fact that while giving publicity to a large number of their letters, we have not published two or three of their communications and some reference to that has been made in the Indian press too, that is, derived from the Chinese objection. Well, Sir, we have received and, as a matter of fact, I am, with your permission, placing copies of these Chinese letters and replies, received subsequent to the publication of White Paper V on the Table of the House, and it has possibly been handed over to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3445/61.] The reason for these not being included was a simple one that two or three of them are quite recent, received after the publication of our White Paper or when it was in the press; one or two others related to charges of violation of Chinese air space and these were under enquiry by us. Whenever these charges come, naturally we have to enquire. We have to send them to the Defence Ministry and to Air Headquarters and they enquire rather carefully so that our answer may be based on full information. Therefore, there was some delay in placing them on the Table because we wanted to place those along with our answer. Now that the answer has been sent, it was sent two or three days ago—in the course of the last week, two or three messages were sent to them—I am placing all these papers on the Table of the House.

Hon. Members will find that they are in the main two kinds of communications received by us from the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Chinese Government. In the main, they are charges of violation of their air space or even their land space, and in the main again, they consider our aircraft flying over our territory which happens to be controlled by them as a violation of their air space which we are totally unable to accept. This is the kind of argument and this applies to some land space too. Our patrols go there and they raise objection to the fact that they have come into what is Chinese territory. We do not accept that. Sometimes their charges are completely baseless as nobody has gone but sometimes it is a fact that our patrols have gone and they went there because it is our territory and we can send them wherever we want. We cannot accept the fact that it is their territory even indirectly. Now, hon. Members will see these letters and papers which really do not raise any new point but rather in continuation of this verbal warfare that goes on. The first of letters is dated, I think, October 7, and is about air space violation, as far as I remember. Now, may I say how we get these letters? They are handed over to our Embassy in Peking who usually send the substance of that or sometimes the whole of that by telegram following it up with the actual document received or rather the actual document plus a translation in English; the actual document is in Chinese. So, the receipt of the actual document is sometimes delayed by a few days because it comes through the Diplomatic Bag; although we have received gist of it by telegram a few days' delay occurs, and if it is a complaint of this type an enquiry may have to be made which takes a little more time because enquiry is not only here in the Defence Ministry but sometimes locally from the local posts there. As I said, there are two types of papers, one deals with these charges of violation of air space or land space which according to them belong to them and

according to use one which they have occupied illegally. The other is general charges of anti-Chinese campaigns here, press or others. Sometimes they object to what I have said and sometimes to the press, and to one thing in particular they took strong exception, the publication in "India News", which our Embassy there publishes, a little leaflet, pamphlet, of the resolution of the All India Congress Committee, just the resolution about China. Now, what happened was that the Chinese press published a distorted version of that resolution, not the whole one, and there were comments on that in the Chinese press, strong comments against India and against our policy. Thereafter, our Embassy published the correct resolution in their "India News" which again has a limited circulation, it is circulated to the foreign Embassies in Peking and to some others. They took strong exception to this publication of the resolution of the All India Congress Committee in this "India News", and there are two letters dealing with that. They said "You do not permit our Embassy in Delhi, or you object when they publish something of this kind, and yet you publish it." Well, hon. Members will themselves read that and our reply to it.

Lately, in the last few days, apart from these letters, as our own press has referred to, there has been rather an intense anti-Indian campaign in the Chinese press. These campaigns there come on and go off as if one was turning a tap, they come and sometimes, after a few days of it, the tap is turned off and they stop. This is what is happening there. This was turned on and all the papers there suddenly came out with violent attacks on India. Now, those had been dealt with previously and no doubt will be dealt with but there is one aspect of it which grieves me very much. Policies may differ, even differ very greatly as they do, but there are certain criteria of good

conduct which till recent years were supposed to govern diplomatic relations. Unfortunately, the cold war has rather put an end to that but what grieves me is that a country like China which perhaps more than almost any other country has had a reputation for hundreds, and, if you like, even thousands of years in particular of extreme courtesy, politeness and, if I may use the word, cultured behaviour; should behave like this. They have done many good things and many bad things in their history but this reputation has persisted and it was to be expected because, as is often said, the two countries with this tremendous and long experience, continued experience of the past, have been India and China, and all these hundreds and thousands of years have conditioned these two countries. To see a country like that, famous for its cultured behaviour suddenly to forget all the lessons of its past and adopt this behaviour is painful. I am not referring to policies or isms or to anything of that kind; that is a different matter, but there are certain things which, I feel, are almost more important than external policies that a country adopts. Surely, what are the isms and the policies meant for? They are meant for the development of the individual, of the human being, of the country. That is the ultimate aim surely; otherwise, there will be no aim left at all except just conflict and when that aim itself is forgotten and something is done which goes against that basic aim of human society, then it is painful. And so, I have been grieved, and indeed, last year, in one of my communications to the Chinese Government, I brought this point out with some force, politely but with some force, how the Chinese Government was playing false to its own history, its own traditions, its own great reputation, the Chinese people. Well, there it is.

Now, Sir, the other matters are there; there are many matters all

over the world but I do not propose to go into detail unless hon. Member asks me any particular point. I have little doubt that most Members are concerned with the development of the situation in regard to Goa. The past history of this subject is well known here. It is not for me to repeat it but in the near past many things have happened, in India, of course, in regard to Goa and outside India in relation to Portuguese colonies. To deal with the latter first, in the last few months, the situation in Angola has been distressing in the extreme so much so that the matter has caused some kind of a mental upheaval and many Members of the United Nations and many countries or some countries which even supported Portugal in the past, have dissociated themselves from this. Among these countries is the United States, and if I may say so, it was not an easy matter for the United States to do this because they are supposed to be allies in the NATO. Nevertheless, they did it. It shows the impression which was rapidly spreading all over the world that Portuguese policies are something rather special in the way of repressive colonialism. As the House knows, the Portuguese Government claim that they have no colonies at all. They have discovered a sovereign remedy for dealing with the colonial question by passing a resolution or Government decree saying that they are no longer colonies but that they are part of Portugal. Therefore, the colonies end. This is really a perfectly extraordinary and remarkable way of dealing with a question like this and they put forward that argument when we talk about Goa and they put forward that argument in regard to Angola. Therefore, they have no colonies at all. The United Nations General Assembly did not accept that and passed a strong resolution about it, and in particular demanded from them reports on their colonies which they had refused to give because they said that they were not colonies at

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

all. Now, there has been this mounting situation in regard to the Portuguese possessions and today, oddly enough, Portugal is the biggest colonial Power in the world by virtue of the size of her colonies. I gave that background because that background does affect people's thinking even in regard to Goa. Some weeks ago, this matter was brought out forcefully at a Seminar held in Delhi and subsequently in Bombay in regard to Portuguese possessions. It dealt with the whole area of Portuguese possessions and many eminent African leaders came to Delhi and Bombay to attend this Seminar, and the way they looked at the Goan question not purely as a Goan question but part of the problem of Portuguese colonialism and almost connected with their own struggle under Portuguese colonialism in Africa did bring out this fact very powerfully. This was the background which undoubtedly affected the thinking of any people but it did not directly relate to the developments in Goa. Now, because of this general background as well as our experience for the last fourteen years with the Portuguese Government, I had said on more than one occasion that devoted as we were to the ways of peace and to the settlement of all problems by peaceful methods, in view of the attitude of the Portuguese Government and developments in Goa, we could not rule out the use of other methods or forceful methods in regard to Goa. Even so, I had always laid stress on the fact that we would try our utmost to get this problem solved peacefully. I said so and although I must say that my hope for a peaceful solution became dimmer and dimmer, nevertheless, I did hope, Sir; so I thought that perhaps the new turn that had been taken in the world, and in the United Nations, even in their great ally, the United States may induce them to change their rigid and highly obstructionist policy, that is, the Portuguese Government. Nevertheless I still hope and because of that

I went on laying stress on the fact of our peaceful settlement, not only because methods of peace are desirable but because any other methods leave a trail of bitterness behind, which is bad.

Now, in regard to the old French possessions in India, Chandernagore, Pondicherry, etc. although there has been delay in actually giving us *de jure* rights over that area, I mean the Pondicherry area—over Chandernagore of course we have had *de jure* rights—nevertheless, *de facto* possession was given to us, and that is a major thing, with the result that our relations with France have been kept at a fairly good level. In fact, the major thing about these relations with France is not the French possessions in India, but Algeria, something else which pains us. But generally speaking, looking at the future in perspective I have no doubt that the Algerian problem will be solved with the independence of Algeria, and I hope fairly soon. But the other fact which we are assured by our peaceful negotiations—and successful ones—about the French enclaves in India is that this has left a feeling of friendly relations with France, which I value very much, because it is not merely a question of this Government or that Government there. The French people have a very fine record in history, as all great countries have, good and bad of course, but broadly speaking, France has stood for freedom and liberty and all that goes with it, and we would infinitely prefer having these friendly relations with them—though we may differ even—than to have a trail of bitterness. Therefore, we said and repeated often that we wanted to make Pondicherry a window for French culture, because we attach importance to French culture; it is one of the great cultures of the world, part of Western culture, but it has a special aspect of it, which is typically French, the French language, a great thing. We wanted that and we have continued that policy.

Now, we had suggested to the Portuguese Government the same app-

roach. First of all we had not suggested it in any kind of formal communication, I mean, but this has been our declared policy often enough, that Goa would retain its individuality even when it joins the Indian Union. It has, after all, for four hundred years and more . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): But what is the Portuguese culture?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May be the hon. Member knows a lot about it, but anyhow what we have said is that we would allow Goa retain its individuality, because not only that was the right thing but, I believe, it was desired by the people living in Goa, whatever it may be, whether it pertains to religion, to language, to a hundred and one customs that have grown up. But apart from everything else it is just the feeling of having an individuality. It must be remembered, as I said, for four hundred years or so, it has had a separate existence. That is to say, we were not going to absorb it into a district or some such thing—it is a small area. That is what we had said. Of course, at a later stage, when the people of Goa want a change, it is up to them to change it, it is for them to decide, not for the Government of India to impose any decision on them, or the neighbouring States. We thought that was right and just and also because it would enable us to bring about this transition in a friendly and co-operative way.

Now, the hon. Member asked me what is Portuguese culture? Well, I really do not know what it is. I know a good deal about the absence of culture in reference to Portugal, on the positive side at the present time I mean. In the past I could mention

something the Portuguese had done, which is commendable, which shows a certain measure of—well, I would not use the word 'greatness' but anyhow—something creditable to them. But in the present they have been functioning as if they have completely refused to enter the twentieth century. Their thinking, their actions, everything belongs to not only the nineteenth century but to the remoter past, and that is the difficulty, and it is difficult thing to talk to them—we do not talk the same language—world pictures, world views are different. Anyhow it is about the past I am saying. But what I was aiming at was this. All along we have desired and worked for a peaceful settlement hoping that nothing else than the mere passage of time and the pressures that the world situation was creating would make them change. So far as one can see, it has not had it, these pressures had no great effect on them. But I cannot imagine—I am leaving the question of Goa for the moment—I cannot imagine—let us take Angola now—that they can hold on to Angola for long. The whole of Africa is not only in ferment but almost in flames, and the idea that all the other imperialists will go away from Africa, and Portuguese Mozambique and Angola will remain, it seems to me a little difficult to accept. So also Goa. One and all, and almost everybody in Western countries, even friends of Portugal have talked to me—of course there were many eminent statesmen; the only argument that they put forward—I mean, 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 years ago—was to the effect that Goa was bound to come back to India. "Why are you in a hurry? It is bound to come. Wait a little. Be patient. It is bound to come", they said. I am quoting this as coming from people who have been friends of Portugal in the Western countries. Other people said so but they, more definitely, and because of our own inclination to solve the problem peacefully we have acted with great restraint in spite of—as the House knows—the strong feelings in India, and the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] strong feelings in this House and the other House, and generally among the people of India. But apart from the last few years, when there has been mounting tension and mounting oppression in Goa, the last few months have seen particular developments of this kind, and we were feeling greatly distressed when to top all this came certain incidents—by themselves not very important but taken in this context they assumed a peculiar significance; and those incidents were the firing taking place from that island opposite Karwar, on Indian shipping, passenger ships, which had been passing all along on our waters, firing on our fishermen who have been fishing all along for a long time again, and one fisherman was killed, internally in Goa much greater repression and, according to the reports that we received, a degree of torture being applied to the people who were arrested. Then, almost daily, or every other day we receive reports now of raids on our Indian territory, small raids but nevertheless raids on our Indian territory, and shooting here and there—sometimes it hit somebody, sometimes not—but regular raids. Now all these things, conditioned as our mind was, as I told you, all these things brought matters to a crisis, and it seemed to us that we could not possibly tolerate these conditions continuing and the Portuguese Government feeling that they could do what they liked to terrorise the population there, and even terrorise the border areas on our side of the border.

We came to the conclusion soon after the firing on our ships that we must clear these waters and make them safe for our ships. It is the primary duty of the Government and we began to take steps to that end. But that seemed to us not quite enough and we did not quite know how the Portuguese would function, that is to say, how they would function within Goa or on our borders. So necessarily we had to take other

steps to guard our borders, to strengthen our borders, so that we might be in a position to meet any challenge of the Portuguese or any new development, and we sent some forces, armed forces, there and took other steps of this kind being prepared for every kind of emergency. That is the position, Sir.

Our patience is certainly exhausted. Yet we still hope that either the Portuguese by themselves or by the advice of their friends, their allies—they have their allies in NATO and maybe there are other alliances too—we hopes will desist from what they are doing and accept the natural culmination of all this which is their withdrawal from Goa. We can discuss the legalities and modalities later on but the physical handing over, as took place in Pondicherry, should be done.

Only yesterday again reports came to us of raid on some nearby villages outside their own territory. I should like to make it perfectly clear because it is possible that charges will be made against us that these are not *bona fide* occurrences but some kind of trumped up charges. I can assure the House that we have gone into this matter and there are two kinds of things. One is clear unprovoked raids, small raids but nevertheless raids, into our territories. The other is something slightly different; that is, some people have gone into Goa from our side, not officially, not in an armed way, and they have got into trouble and sometimes they have given some trouble too. And, thirdly, within Goa itself there is some trouble happening for which we are not liable; it is the Portuguese policy that leads to that. That is the position, Sir. Obviously, these circumstances I cannot go into in greater detail but meanwhile it appears that the Portuguese Government have addressed the Secretary-General of the United Nations. They have complained about us and asked that to be circulated among Members and presumably it will be circulated. It is for us to consider

whether we consider it worth-while to send a refutation of the charges they have made. It has not come to us—this document—so far as I know; that has gone straight to the General Assembly. That is not—may I make it clear—a reference to the Security Council; it is just a paper to be circulated and if we think it necessary; we might send another paper to be circulated.

One other matter I shall briefly refer to that is the Congo. In the Congo the United Nations authorities having exhausted their patience decided to clear up the streets and roads and main positions in Katanga, especially Elisabethville, and they decided that if this was not done, they would take military action. And they have done so. In this military action Indian forces are involved, Swedish forces and some others but in the main Indian forces. And from such accounts as we have received these forces have done their work with some thoroughness and have more or less cleared these places. The House may remember a very curious and significant statement that was made by Dr. O'Brien the Irishman, working there who was supported by the Irish Commander of all the forces there. That was a very serious charge.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Have we got the full text of that statement? Can it be circulated?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Dr. O'Brien's? We have only got it from the newspapers. I can send a cutting from the newspaper to the hon. Member if he likes. It is fairly full.

Now, it is interesting, in that statement of Dr. O'Brien he pays a special tribute to the Indian forces there and he said that there had been a regular campaign, a smear campaign, in regard to Indian forces. We must not be troubled by this campaign because we hold that our forces are

functioning in a disciplined, orderly and decent manner wherever they go. This kind of campaign which came out in some newspapers in England and some countries in the continent of Europe was very painful although this was denied by some Governments but this statement of Dr. O'Brien who was functioning with them is certainly very pleasing to us. He is quite an independent person who had no reason to give us a certificate, if I may say so, about our forces. He has done so, and, what is more important, pointed out that the campaign was almost deliberately organised. Now, this is very unfortunate—the whole episode in the Congo. We function there as United Nations forces getting orders from the United Nations. We do not send orders to them. We get some news, not directly from our Commander—sometimes he may give us some news but not regularly—we get it from other sources, chiefly from New York, from our representative in the Security Council who is also a member of the Congo Advisory Committee. He sends us these news items as they come and to some extent we get them from our Ambassador to the Congolese Republic. As far as I can see there is no more to be done about it at this end except to carry on these operations and clear up all these obstacles and the difficulties that have arisen, the aim being an undivided Republic of Congo and the idea of secession of Katanga being put an end to.

For the moment I think I shall not take more time of the House but when points are raised by hon. Members, I hope to deal with them at a later stage.

*The question was proposed*

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

1. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy.'"

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move:

2. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion—

(i) that there should be a reappraisal by Government of its policies in regard to the Congo;

(ii) that in statements made by Indian representatives at the United Nations, there should be no room for doubt that India condemns unreservedly the Soviet Union for its resumption of nuclear tests;

(iii) that Government should seek to present at the U.N. forum on all appropriate occasions the facts of India's dispute with China on the border question including Chinese aggression; and

(iv) that Government should make representation to the British Government that attempts to persist in racial policies on its part might endanger India's connection with the Commonwealth'."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have an enquiry to make from you. The text of my amendment which I gave notice of contained the words "Portuguese colonial enslavers" and I find the words "colonial enslavers" missing from the text circulated. I would like to know the rule under which these two words have been deleted.

Sir, may I help you? Probably rule 190; if that is so, I shall give my arguments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 'Colonial enslavers' is not a happy expression. So under my instructions it has been deleted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would like you to reconsider it, Rule

190 says that "If in the opinion of the Chairman, any notice contains words, phrases or expressions which are argumentative . . . "Certainly, as far as my words are concerned, they are a mere description, not argumentative. Then it says, "unparliamentary"; nobody can say "colonial enslavers" is unparliamentary; then it says, "ironical"; certainly I have put it very bluntly and there is no irony in it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: "Verbose".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that. Then it says "irrelevant"; they are very relevant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You move the amendment as it is.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: "Verbose" is another word. Therefore, Sir, I would ask you to reconsider it. Then, it says "inappropriate". It is very appropriate. The U.N. resolution is there about colonialism. We are not against Portugal as such. We are against Portuguese colonialism.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, I would request you kindly to reconsider my suggestion and have both these words included.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are inappropriate. So, I have omitted them. You move your amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will move it, but what about those words?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are not necessary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I submit to your ruling, but . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am standing on my legs. Do you move it?



SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I move:

3. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the Government of India should take immediate armed action for the expulsion of the Portuguese from Goa, Daman and Diu so that these territories become part of the Republic of India before the next Republic Day'."

*The questions were proposed*

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard a detailed account of what is happening in Goa and in the territories round about Goa from the Prime Minister. Goa is the most immediate problem facing us today. This problem has been created by the failure on the part of the Portuguese Government to see the trends and impulses of the present-day world. The last fifteen or twenty years have witnessed colonialism crumbling fast. We have seen nation after nation rising and emerging from the colonial status. We have seen vast change in Asia. We have seen and are seeing Africa in ferment. The conference recently held in Delhi and the seminars held in India are evidence of the urge and determination of dependent peoples to attain independence and freedom. This subject was a prominent feature at Belgrade. Recently, the United Nations passed a resolution, 97 for and none against, saying that dependant peoples be granted independence without further delay. A 17-Member Sub-Committee was appointed to watch the progress. Now, the momentum which this urge, this movement for independence, has gained cannot be stopped by anyone today. Unfortunately, Portugal is still persisting in the course it has taken. It is obstinate. Portugal was one of the first few nations which set up colonies at long distances from

their own country, subjugated people and exploited them for a long time. In course of time, with the advance of civilisation, light dawned on colonial Powers and there were some Powers who saw reason, who showed statesmanship, and withdrew from the colonial areas. At one time, Western Governments were ruling about two-thirds of the non-Western territories. Now, this is the situation, but Portugal has not yet left Indian territory. The French very amicably transferred to us the territories occupied by them *de facto* several years ago and their legal instruments have received sanction from their legal department.

Now, Sir, Portugal is bound to go, but not with good grace. Can we imagine what would be the state of mind of the people residing in Goa? They must be aware of what has happened and what is happening in Asia and Africa. They must also be knowing the history of colonialism and they must also be knowing that a colonial Power was thrown out first by America. Now, they must also be knowing what has happened in the rest of India. They must also be knowing how we have got our freedom. Now, these are the urges, these would be the feelings of the people residing in Goa. What has their Government done for them? Their Government has suppressed them. Their Government has been guilty of repression. There is a reign of terror prevailing there and the people there have suffered all kinds of privations, arrests, torture and so on. Now, Sir, that is not all. Although the people there desire that they should share with us our future, they should share with us our fortune, they should share with us the industrial enterprises and they should share with us our democratic processes, they are prevented by the Portuguese rule, from achieving their objects. Now, this is not all. As the Prime Minister said this morning, they cross the boundaries of Goan territory. They

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]  
perpetrate raids. They treat the seas as if they are their own and they want to rule the Indian seas. They fire on our people. They fire on our seamen and they fire on the officers of our ships.

Now, Sir, this is a situation which could never be tolerated. We have waited for about fifteen years. That is a long period. We had hoped that better counsels would prevail with Portugal, that countries which have influence with Portugal would exercise persuasion and would succeed. These fifteen years are a long period. Portugal is still adamant. On the 30th November of last year the head of their Government, Dr. Salazar, made a speech in Lisbon deriding liberation movements, and made it quite clear that they were not going to yield to the pressure of world public opinion. Now, Sir, although the world has condemned the happenings in Angola and the world knows the happenings in Goa, Portugal is still unyielding. Sir, we have not used force so far. The use of force may not be resorted to as far as possible. But there is the question of national honour, there is the question of national security. We cannot jeopardise our national security, we cannot sacrifice our national honour and it may be that at a time when the aggression becomes acute or a certain situation arises which compels the use of force, force may be used by our Government.

Sir, Portugal thinks that she can stem the tide of this world movement in favour of independence by certain devices. Portugal has invented the device of changing the name of colonial relationship from colony to Portuguese State or Portuguese province. It is incontestable that this Goan territory is Indian territory. Our people are living there and Portugal has got to go. Portugal has taken some moral support from, and has used, NATO as a political leverage

in support of her policies. But it must be remembered that what have happened in Goa, what have happened in Angola—these misdoings—are opposed to all concepts of human rights. The very idea of colonialism is opposed to the principles of the Charter. This colonialism is an evil. It is a hateful idea, and Mahatma Gandhi once said that we must not surrender to evil and to basic evil. Therefore, the question that arises is, when colonialism is dead, how long Portugal will continue and will not leave the territory of India. That, Sir, is the question which arises at the present moment. We could negotiate, but negotiation is not possible unless and until the other side is prepared to negotiate. There is no area of compromise between us and Portugal so long as Portugal does not give up her claim to the territory of India. Sir, we cannot allow aggression to go unopposed. The only claim to the territory of Goa which is urged by Portugal is a Papal Bull. That is a fantasy which no one will entertain today. Sir, in this intransigence, in this wilfull blindness to what is going on and in refusal to see the currents of the times, Portugal has got only one equal and one rival, and that is the Union of South Africa. Portugal will be outstripped by events and it will not be possible for Portugal to retain any colonial territory anywhere in the world.

Sir, on this question the whole country agrees with the approach of the Government, and the whole country will support any action which the Government may take. Generally the policy of non-alignment which our Government has pursued ever since we attained independence was the only policy which we could pursue. Our feeling is that that is the policy which is consistent with the Charter. That is the policy which could hold the United Nations together, and that is why we adopted that policy and pursued it. This policy is gaining increasing acceptance by the countries of the world,

by the peoples of the world, and it is now being much better understood than it was before. We believe in one world, not a divided world, and that is why we pursue this policy.

Sir, on the question of the Congo, we gave the best proof of our faith in the United Nations. That was the testing time. We responded to the call of the United Nations when it asked for aid for the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council was a time when countries which had sent contingents were withdrawing them. It was at that time that we sent our combat forces. Later we sent our aeroplanes and our airmen. We did so because we believed that that was a very crucial time for the United Nations, and it was essential that the United Nations must be helped. We believe that she must be helped by every Member and we have helped the United Nations on similar occasions before. This assistance that we have given to the United Nations is proof of the faith that we have in the United Nations and in the Charter of the United Nations. It is highly regrettable that there is a complaint, and there is some evidence too, that there are some nations which are not implementing the resolutions of the Security Council. The position there is that according to the Security Council's resolutions foreign elements, foreign mercenaries should be evicted. There should be no disruption, there should be no secession, and the United Nations personnel should prevent civil war, should help the legal Government in maintaining law and order. Now, Sir, what

1 P.M. we have heard about the Report of Mr. O'Brien—that has appeared in the papers—gives food for thought, and requires some probing into. We hope that the conditions in the Congo will improve and that the United Nations operations will expeditiously reach a successful termination. We must bear in mind the enormous expenses which the United Nations organisation has to incur.

Now, Sir, so far as China is concerned, the matter has been . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: All right. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I wish we had taken up Goa separately because this by itself constitutes a very important and burning subject for all of us in Parliament to discuss. Besides, over this there is such a broad measure of agreement in the country and on all sides of the House that we would not like to disturb this agreement by bringing in other elements over which we may disagree. Sir, we do not know what the Indian troops have taken with them there—weapons and other tangibles—but I know, going round the country and also feeling the pulse of our people, that they have taken with them the fervent wishes and all the goodwill that our people are capable of giving. Now, the only thing for the Government to do, after having taken this significant step, is to give marching orders. The time is past when we could remain silent, hold our patience and see that some day the Portuguese would listen to reason. The time has come now far us to act, and it is necessary to act in the language which the Portuguese imperialists will understand. I say, delay is harmful to us because delay means more preparation on the part of the Portuguese colonialists there. Already we have got reports that they have poured in large European contingents in Goa, Diu and Daman. They include a large number of foreign legionaries, German and French mercenaries with experience of fighting in Viet Nam, Algeria and the Congo. We know how the roads are being mined, how preparations are being made to inflict heavy casualties on the Indian troops if and when they enter Goa.

Now, Sir, we should not evolve a policy which in the end would mean the liberation of Goa at a very heavy cost to us, at causing very great

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

casualties on our side. After all we must remember that all these years, the Portuguese have been equipped with NATO arms—NATO arms are modern arms—arms supplied by the United States of America and Britain—let there be no mistake about it—and other imperialist countries. Now, if we allow these things to go on, more troops will be brought in, more equipment will be brought in, which means that we are creating odds against us more than they are today. Such an attitude on the part of the Government may be understandable if the Government thought that with every passing day, Dr. Salazar will become more and more reasonable. I do not think so. Perhaps, the Government thinks that now there is a little indication of that, that as a result of the good offices or advice of the United States and Britain, probably Salazar will see reason to do something which may be to the satisfaction of this Government. I say, Sir, in all humility and with all respect to the Prime Minister, that he should shed all such illusions. I do not accept his suggestion that the United States has dissociated itself. If it were so, then the NATO Council could have a meeting and the Portuguese could have been called to order. A little lifting of the finger of the United States of America will silence the Salazar regime because everybody knows how Salazar has been built up and fed. On the contrary, we find the State Department issuing statements, advising India gratuitously, that the thing should be settled peacefully and that we should go on cooing like a dove. Now, what were they doing all these years when the Portuguese under the NATO Powers, with NATO weapons, with NATO authority and with NATO moral backing were building up military forces on our soil? What were the Americans and the British doing at that time? And they have come all the way now to give a little, wise advice to the Prime Minister to learn how to behave in this situation. We reject such advice. They have forfeited their right to

give us any advice. Who are they to advise us to do or not to do a thing? If today they have developed some other accent when they speak publicly, it is because imperialist and colonial Powers generally, the Portuguese in particular, have been so isolated from the world public opinion, in world public opinion, in the councils of the nations, that even the United States of America dare not speak in the old way. This is the position.

As far as our little British friends are concerned, I shall come to them a little later. Trust them not. In the old days, when we as students were told that the sun never set in the British Empire our reply was that it was because even God did not trust the British in the dark. That was our reply. Therefore, trust not the British. It is no use because we know where the Portuguese are getting the backing from. Now, what is the guarantee that they will not try to involve us in the Security Council or the United Nations proceedings? I know that the Soviet Union is in the Security Council. It will be on our side. But the American and other Western Powers would try to give support to Portugal. What is the guarantee that they will not do so? On the contrary, the demand for the circulation of the note against India is the beginning to involve us into all kinds of obstructive and injurious proceedings of the United Nations. What step the Government have taken to prevent such a thing? I request the Prime Minister that he should tell the United Nations that they had no business to circulate the charge-sheet or the statement that the Portuguese authorities had submitted to them. The United Nations have no jurisdiction over this matter which is between a people fighting for their independence, trying to complete the process of independence, and the colonial slavery which you consider to be inappropriate to be mentioned in the Resolution; it is an internal domestic matter of national revolution, of struggle for political independence. It is not a sort of war between two States at all in that way.

In that connection, Sir, I was anxiously awaiting as to what the Prime Minister had to say to the statement the Finance Minister made very unwisely at the Seminar on Portuguese colonies in Delhi. He said that any armed action would be "invasion" and an "act of war". On both accounts, the Finance Minister was hopelessly wrong. And I tell you, Sir, these remarks provided ammunition to the Salazar regime. And now what will happen if Salazar goes before the United Nations and plead on the strength of the Finance Minister's statement made at a seminar here in the Capital of India as against the Prime Minister's statement, to make out a case that India is engaged in an act of war and committing an invasion? Sir, we small men are hauled up for everything, but the great ones in Government are never hauled up for even making such fantastic, invalid, wrong, provocative and harmful statements, to the advantage of the enemy. I would like to hear the Prime Minister. I am glad that the next day the Prime Minister repudiated indirectly this kind of statement, without naming him, in a Bombay speech. I stand for what the Prime Minister said. But I think that in such a matter it becomes the duty of the head of the Government to make a public repudiation of the statements like the one which the Finance Minister made in order to set the records straight, so that others do not take advantage of such a statement when a situation might arise when there will be any such argumentation over such matters. He did a great disservice to the country, I say. I also went to that Seminar. I heard the Prime Minister. I was sorry that I could not go to the other Seminar. I would have been sorrier still if I had been present there.

This is the position. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is the matter. Everything has been done, I take it. Portugal will not see reason, I take it. With every passing day, Portugal will be more aggressive and we have

seen how Portugal behaved in the case of Angola and other places. Therefore, we have no reason to think that suddenly they will be good boys in the case of India. If that is so, then it follows from the assessment of the situation that the sooner we strike the better, the sooner we act the better, the sooner we take steps to expel these Portuguese occupiers of our territory, enslavers of our people into the Arabian Sea the better for us, the better for them, the better for every one. The world opinion today is absolutely on our side. Let there be no mistake about it. The international opinion is united. Militarily Portugal is not in a position to resist the act of this kind, and the Prime Minister was right when he said somewhere that within 48 hours we could take Goa. Why then should we not take it? Why ask our troops to stand on the frontiers and mark time? It is not at all necessary. Finish with the job quickly. Therefore, my amendment is there to the effect that by the 26th of January next year we must haul down the flag of Portuguese colonialism and unfurl the banner of Indian independence, the State flag of India, on the soil occupied by the Portuguese in Goa, Daman and Diu.

Now, I have said this much about the Portuguese situation. I do not wish to say very much, but I would caution the Prime Minister. Even if I am a very young person, I would caution him about what the Americans and the British said because double talk in international politics is their very breath of life. Therefore, we should be extremely cautious. We want to see Portugal expelled. I wish the Prime Minister had not said all that, about what would be the status of Portugal, Portuguese possessions whatever they are, after Portuguese were expelled. Why should we say that we shall consult the Portuguese were expelled. Why should after hoisting our flag we shall sit together with the people of Goa, Daman and Diu and decide as to which part of which civilisation they would like to have or what kind of entity

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]  
they would like? We need not go by the analogy of what happened in Pondicherry and other places. In this case we are dealing with an entirely different situation. That is why I say that even historically speaking there is little that one knows about the Portuguese civilisation. If you had in mind the French civilisation, it is renaissance, the ideals of fraternity, equality, liberty and so on. Let us not begin to write the future of the people who would be coming to India, people of that occupied part of the Indian Union, right now. I think the Prime Minister used this word in order to give in a little, perhaps, for world consumption. I do not think it is necessary to say such a thing at this stage.

Then, Sir, let me come to another aspect, Dr. O'Brien's case. I am very glad that the Prime Minister mentioned the revelations made by Dr. O'Brien. Quite right. We have been saying this in this House, but, Sir, how long must we wait to get the full story from the Government of India as to the circumstances in which Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal was sacked, was made to resign? It is a pity, Sir, that we had to wait till an Irish gentleman resigned from the Foreign Service and told the world the whole truth as to how the British and the French behaved, and here, in this House, the Prime Minister told us the other day about the certificate being given in September by our representative in the United Nations to the British Government on the basis of a statement made by Mr. Macmillan on the question of the U.N. resolution and the whole thing has been blown sky-high later on by the revelations made by Dr. O'Brien. He has made it very clear that it is the French and the British who obstructed his functioning, who opposed the implementation of the U.N. resolution and did all kinds of things in order to prevent positive steps being taken for the implementation of the U.N. resolution and made it hot for him to continue. We know the same Powers. Not only that, he mentioned that the representative at

Elisebatheville was doing all kinds of things contrary to the resolution of the U.N. Have we not said this thing here? And I would not ask Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal to resign from the Foreign Service and I would ask him to tell us the truth. But certainly I had expected the Government of India and the Prime Minister to take the House and the country into full confidence and tell us exactly what happened behind the resignation of Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal. It seems to us, after the revelation made by Dr. O'Brien . . .

#### (Interruption)

It is an Irish name . . . that there is something yet to be said. Let it be said. Therefore, I demand that the Government of India circulate a White Paper containing all the documents and correspondence regarding the circumstances in which it became necessary for Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal to tender his resignation to the U.N. authorities. I think we are entitled to another White Paper on this subject.

Then, Sir, let me now come to another delicate subject, the Prime Minister's visit to the United States of America. Now, Sir, a lot of officially inspired assessment has been going on about his visit to the United States of America. It was a good visit. Visits are always good but in discussing the international situation we must make an assessment of that visit too. Now, what happened? Reading it from the newspapers, I find that it had been used for certain purposes, in the United States to boost the morale. As far as the issues were concerned, they were discussed between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States of America. There were agreements on common understanding. Take the nuclear tests. He drew blank. Berlin question they talked and came to no conclusion. On Goa, well, we will see what we have achieved but it seems we did not do much, because after that Portuguese are behaving in this manner and everybody knows who is backing the Portuguese in the N.A.T.O. Powers. Then, Sir, let us come to the

South Viet Nam. Now, the State Department is threatening to send more troops and arms. Arms are being sent to the South Viet Nam in violation of the Geneva Agreement and to wreck it further. Let us come to the question of arms supply to Pakistan. I would like to know from the Prime Minister if that subject was broached. I should like to know from the Prime Minister of India what were the reactions of the United States of America in this matter. We got a report in the "Times of India" of yesterday. It says:

"Pakistan hasn't had a bad bargain. The total military aid it has received is about \$2,000 million. It includes 26 jet bombers, two squadrons of F-104s, hundreds of wide-winder missiles, radar support for the planes and two new items probably unknown to India—anti-tank missiles and C-130 turbo-jet cargo planes."

This is all that we get from the newspapers about President Kennedy's reaction to this kind of goodwill. Again, the "New York Herald Tribune" dated the 12th November, 1961, gave out the following:

"In asking Mr. Nehru to swing his moral force on the side of the West, the Kennedy Administration was in effect asking him to do his bit to hold the opponent rather than tie the hands of his friends and inadvertently help expose them further clobbering. Whether Mr. Nehru got the message remains to be seen."

Again, they wrote a very interesting thing in their paper, "Washington Daily News", in its editorial:

"It is understood that the President spoke quite frankly to Mr. Nehru and his daughter Indira about Mr. Menon's activities and that both the Prime Minister and his daughter were greatly surprised to discover how intense was the feeling against the Defence Minister."

Again, another paper suggested that after this visit there should be replacement of the head of the Indian delegation to the U.N.O. In other words, it suggested that Mr. Krishna Menon should be removed and somebody else should be put there. Immediately after he left, Mr. Kennedy, the President of the U.S.A., made a speech at Seattle, Washington, in which he ridiculed neutrality and made disparaging remarks about the neutral countries. This was noted by the "Egyptian Mail" but not by many of our Indian papers. The "Egyptian Mail", a paper of a neutral country, expressed surprise that after Mr. Nehru's visit, such should have been the reaction in influential American circles. Therefore, we would like to have an assessment of that visit from the Prime Minister and what it produced. As far as the American press is concerned—I have been studying the "New York Times", the "New York Herald" and various other papers in order to understand how it went—it seems to me that they yielded to nothing to none of the Prime Minister's good suggestions—he must have made some suggestions—at the same time they utilised it for their internal reasons and as far as Mr. Nixon was concerned, he was writing articles in the papers ridiculing and castigating the policy of neutrality and Mr. Nixon is a part of that bipartisan policy in the U.S.A. and was contesting the Presidentship and is an important personality.

Now, let me come to Cuba. All that I can say is this. I would draw the attention of the House to the meeting of the Council of the Organisation of the American States which was held on 4th December where it was decided to have a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American States with a view to dealing with some threats. Now they are preparing quite clearly for an invasion under the aegis of the OAS against the Cuban Republic. It is quite clear that having failed to succeed in suppressing Cuban independence by methods including direct intervention, now this

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] method is being utilised. I think the Government should take note of it and their policy should be properly clarified in this respect. The Rio Treaty which has set up the so-called OAS Council, which in Cuba is called the Ministry for Colonial Affairs of the U.S.A., relates to intervention from some other continent. Now, the U.S. is trying to get Columbia and others to club together and build up or line up and prepare for an invasion in the name of the OAS, in the name of dealing with the Communist threat—the same Hitlerite slogan. This creates a very dangerous situation today. As far as Cuban independence is concerned, we have friendly relations with Cuba and everybody knows how the Prime Minister expressed the goodwill of our country to Fidel Castro when he met him in the U.S.A. but what is needed today is something more than that. I think the Government of India should come out against any such moves and manoeuvres on the part of the Fascists and the U.S.A. to build up this kind of plan for the invasion of Cuba. They know that if they cannot succeed in the invasion of Cuba, then at least they can have a military bloc in order to create a situation there. Thirty centres have been set up by the U.S. authorities around Cuba. They are in very many places. They are in Nicaragua, Puerto Rico, Santo Domingo, the U.S. Occupation Zone of Panama Canal and other places. Bases have already been built up with a view to training personnel and armed forces so that the invasion could be launched in the name of the OAS. It is a very serious situation. Cuban independence has to be given our full support and I think this should not escape our attention in this House.

As far as South Viet Nam is concerned, all I can say is this. Today's paper contained the news that the U.S.A. are sending more arms and so on, the same talk, the Communist threat, etc. This is nothing new. Mussolini started it, Hitler followed it and they are also doing it. Wherever they

have to do it, whether in Pakistan or India or anywhere in the world they say 'Communist threat', send arms or weapons, start invasion and aggression in violation of international law, create tension and transform cold war into a shooting war—that is the line of the U.S. which is sought to be implemented in South Viet Nam in violation of the Geneva Agreement. The South Viet Nam people are fighting for their democracy and for the last 14 to 16 years they are fighting. If you take the casualty figures into account, one million out of 13 millions of population is the casualty. So, do not call it as something being engineered from outside. It is the people who are fed up with this terroristic regime and now want to assert themselves in a democratic struggle and the Geneva Agreement never empowered anybody to suppress such things. They are entitled to carry on their struggle. The U.S. is doing it. All that I can say is, the International Commission should take proper steps to see that the Geneva Agreement is adhered to. I think in another House the Prime Minister said that some representative of South Viet Nam on the International Commission was killed by North Viet Nam. This is a charge which the North Viet Nam people, I find, have denied and they say that he has been killed because of internal factional quarrel. Therefore, everything is being laid at the door of North Viet Nam authorities. This aspect should be borne in mind. All I can say here is that the Government should be very vigilant and take note of these.

As far as Algeria is concerned, I cannot understand why the Prime Minister thinks that our recognition of Algerian independence or the Provisional Government of Algeria would harm the Algerian cause of independence. I think there is honest difference between us and him over this matter because I have no doubt in my mind that the Prime Minister is fully sympathetic to the cause of Algerian independence. I submit that he is not rightly advised in this matter. I say,



on the contrary, that recognition of the Algerian Provisional Government would strengthen on the one hand the forces of independence struggling in Algeria and on the other those who stand for positive negotiations within France itself. As far as our experience goes, it took us 7 years to get the treaty drafted after the Mendes-France-Nehru agreement was signed in 1954—I mean the treaty over Pondicherry and Chandernagore and so on. This is the position with regard to us. So let us not think that our non-recognition will be of any assistance either to the case that we promote or to the Algerian people. I can tell you in this connection that there are forces in the French Government today who are absolutely in favour of partitioning the northern coastal areas of Algeria from the rest of Algeria and imposing their decision. The French Prime Minister belongs to that school of thought. Our recognition of the Algerian Government, I say, would strengthen the other elements in the French ruling class who stand for a peaceful settlement, maintaining the integrity and unity of Algeria. Therefore, it should be borne in mind. I think the Prime Minister said something which aroused hope and the Algerians seemed to feel a little disappointed today because after all they have great regard for the Prime Minister and they would like him to take concrete steps in this matter.

Now as far as the Immigration Bill in London is concerned, I support the Government when the Government and the Prime Minister oppose it but we were given a body blow in the ECM. The Prime Minister's expression I am using, a very appropriate expression according to you, Sir. Now another body blow is coming in the form of this Bill, the Immigration Bill. This is being opposed by all sections in England and even papers like the "Manchester Guardian" is asking for the withdrawal of this measure. The "Times" is very apologetic about it and recently the "Manchester Guardian" took a survey and it was found out how the colour prejudice is grow-

ing despite our Commonwealth relations in England today. They took a survey of 400 male students in England and they found out that the experience of 38 per cent. of students in Oxford and Cambridge is that they had faced colour prejudice. Sixty-one per cent. of the students in London have been subjected to colour bar treatment. Fifty-eight per cent. of our students in Manchester and Leeds have faced colour bar treatment there. This Bill therefore should be understood in the context of the growing colour prejudice in England and certain reactionary forces, faced with the situation in England, special economic situation and recession looming ahead, think that thereby they can stave off the calamity. Now, they are coming down upon these students and Indian students will be affected, as others no doubt will be. Therefore, I think we should take a very firm stand and from this House the opinion of the country should go to England. And if they pass this measure, we should take other measures here. Should they persist in it even now, I think we should try to prevent such an Act from being passed.

One last thing I would like to refer and that is about Col. Bhattacharyya. that according to my reading of the that accordnig to my reading of the situation, I doubt if the trial itself was valid according to International law. Time is short, as I said, otherwise I could have given certain quotations from international law to point out that the trial itself is open to question from the point of view of international law, as we understand it, and as Pakistan ought to understand it. As far as the sentence is concerned, it is a savage sentence, because the espionage charge could not stand. That charge had to be withdrawn. And now for what is called trespass or going without passport or similar charge, the person has been sentenced to eight years of rigorous imprisonment. That seems savage even by the standard of the military court of Pakistan. These are the two points. First

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

of all, the trial itself would seem invalid under international law. The charge of espionage is not sustained. Even if that charge had been there, such trial would seem highly untenable under international law. Secondly, the sentence seems savage. Therefore, the Government of India should pursue the matter and an appeal should be made by Col. Bhat-tacharyya to the President of Pakistan. One thing I would say in this connection. I hope the Pakistan Government and especially the President of Pakistan would bear in mind the paramount interest and importance of having good relations between the two countries, for the people of the two countries. I know he has got great prejudice against this country. All the same, we share this sub-continent and we have been neighbours. We are in so many other ways also connected with each other. Therefore, every possible step should be taken to improve this relation and I should like from the floor of this House to express this appeal to him. He would shoot me if I go there. Even so I would like to make an appeal to the President of Pakistan that having regard to the nature of this case, and what is more, having regard to the importance and the significance of good relations between the two countries, it is essential for him that he should release Col. Bhat'acharyya immediately. Human considerations demand it. Good international relations between the two countries demand it. Justice demands it and we are entitled to ask the Pakistan authorities that whatever other difference there may be, Col. Bhat-tacharyya should be restored to liberty and sent to his home-country, India. That is what I would say.

I think I have finished. I would have said many other things, but I will end now. If I have made certain criticisms of the Government of India in this connection, I have done so in a friendly way and as is well known, I generally support the foreign

policy of the Prime Minister. But, Sir, I think, we should be failing in our duty if there was not somebody in this House—friends—to point out some of the gaps, some of the mistakes or weaknesses of that policy.

Finally, Sir, I would appeal again now that we are coming to the end of this session, I would appeal to you, Sir, and through you, to the Government, that the hour for decision has come and as far as Goa is concerned, the only decision that remains to be taken is the decision to take the army and strike down the Portuguese there and free Goa, Daman and Diu and take them back to the bosom of the motherland.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Mr. Deputy Chairman, may I to begin with, congratulate the Prime Minister on the very clear statement regarding Goa and other matters that he has made? We have noticed a certain amount of criticism in the Press regarding three letters which are supposed not to have been published in the White Paper and I think our journalists will be pleased to find the explanation satisfactory with regard to the publishing of those letters which now the Prime Minister has placed on the Table of the House.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN) in the Chair]

Sir, it is not my business to talk about China at the present moment. There are other matters, particularly the one matter which my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, referred to, regarding the Prime Minister's visit to the United States of America. I think that that visit has been eminently successful and that visit has succeeded not only in placing India on the map of the world, but also in enhancing the reputation of India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the world map without India?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Quite right; and if India is ignored, the world map is insignificant. And that

is exactly what the Prime Minister has done so that India may not be ignored and that India may get the importance due to this country. And I have not the slightest doubt that when the President of America said about our Prime Minister that he was Lincoln and Jefferson combined, my hon. friend to my right representing the Communist Party, should have got up and bowed to the American nation for having clearly stated the importance that that country through its President attaches to our Prime Minister and to our country. Sir, it is wrong on the part of my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, to take up cudgels time and again, against the United States of America even when the United States through its President, does something which is absolutely right and correct.

Now, with regard to the situation in Goa, the statement that was referred to by the Prime Minister ought to be welcomed by my hon. friend. He should not look behind that statement and try to denigrate it or lower the prestige or the effect of that statement by irrelevant references to other things. I think, when we are being supported by a great country like the United States of America on any particular issue, it is our duty to say something complimentary rather than something that denigrates that country. I have not the slightest doubt that there are many problems that we have to face at the present moment apart from Goa and apart from China. I am quite certain in my mind that this House having dealt with the question of China the other day, the Prime Minister having dealt with it, it is not necessary now to go into that particular matter. There are other matters of very great interest to us.

One of these important points is the joining of Great Britain in the European Common market, as it is called. The effect of that is going to be disastrous, for the time being, as far as our trade is concerned. Our trade depends largely upon the develop-

ment of our exports and if our exports are going to be affected adversely in any manner, obviously that is going to be a serious situation for us. That is the situation created by the entry of Great Britain into the European Common market. I do hope that the prognostications regarding this matter, namely, that 25 per cent. of our foreign trade is going to be adversely affected by Great Britain's joining the Common Market, are not going to be fulfilled. I do hope that that is an exaggerated statement, although it has been made on the authority of experts who deal with this particular matter.

There is not only this question of the Common Market, but there is also the question of non-alignment referred to by my hon. friend, Shri Gupta. Remember, Sir, that we were alone, we were the solitary nation at the time when the Prime Minister decided that we should adopt the policy of non-alignment. There is a valid difference between non-alignment and neutrality. Let us not confuse the two. Non-alignment is something different, very much different from what is generally known as neutrality. I remember, Sir, at the last Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in London which I had the honour to attend on behalf of this House, one Australian delegate got up and he pooh-pooed the idea of what he called the "luxury" of neutrality. I pointed out to him that there was this valid difference between neutrality and non-alignment, although he might not have heard of it. I do hope that my hon. friend when he talks about it, will also keep this distinction in mind, namely, the difference between non-alignment and neutrality. But, Sir, we were all alone originally and the other day at Belgrade, how many of us were there, nearly 25, and I am quite certain in my mind that the time will come when we shall be the majority of the nations at the United Nations. Now, this is not the luxury of neutrality or of non-alignment. It is an absolute necessity for us because in this world

[Diwan Chaman Lall]

situation today, if India throws in her weight as India is doing today on behalf of peace, there is no greater assurance of peace than that particular factor. Sir, it must not be forgotten that there have been two World Wars and India has been involved in these two World Wars and we lost millions of our men. It should also not be forgotten that as a direct result of the War in 1943 we lost in the Bengal famine three million human beings who died of starvation and it is these factors apart from the fact that we are a nation which adheres to peaceful ways which have compelled us to adopt a policy of non-alignment, non-alignment in order that we may bring the two blocs together, to abolish the two blocs that are facing each other today over many a front throughout the world. Now, this policy is a policy which was decided by us and which, I think, is eminently desirable as far as our nation is concerned and as far as problems of world peace are concerned.

There are, Sir, other issues which I hope the Prime Minister will deal with when he replies. One is the problem of Germany. Now, Sir, in Germany, there are three issues at stake. The first issue at stake is the question of the border of Germany, the Oder-Neisse Border of Germany. The second issue is the arming of the German army.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Former Nazis.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** My hon. friend is perfectly right, arming of the former Nazis, or may I put it like this? The creation of a German army of twelve divisions in Europe, and the third, Sir, is not only the creation of the German army but the arming of that German army with the latest weapons. You would recall, Sir, that in Teheran, in November, 1943, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin met. At that stage, they agreed on the Oder-Neisse Line. If you would recall, Sir, the Oder-Neisse runs right

up to the border of new Poland and incorporates certain territories which were Polish territories at the time. Now, having agreed to it in November 1943, at Yalta, in February 1944, differences arose between them and Churchill did not want the Western Neisse Border. He thus wanted to leave a part of Silesia to Germany. Now, Poland objected to this and Poland said that 20 per cent. of her territory had been taken over by them and given over to the U.S.S.R. in return for which she was given only 18 per cent. If now part of Silesia was taken and handed over they said it would mean further enfeebling of their country.

**AN. HON. MEMBER:** Which country?

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** East German Government.

Not only the East German Government objected to it but the Polish Government too objected to it, and having objected to it, they proceeded, I think in the same year, 5th February, 1945, further and the Lublin Government took over all the territories up to the Western Neisse which was territory according to Churchill to be reserved for the purpose of a peace settlement. Now, in Potsdam, in July 1945, the three parties concerned were rather vague about the Oder-Neisse Line. They said, "We reaffirm the opinion that the western frontier of Poland should await the Peace settlement". Hence, Sir, the great necessity to have a peace settlement in Western Europe. You will see, therefore, that a great necessity arises for a formal definition and a formal acceptance of the *de facto* position, namely, the existence of the Oder-Neisse Line. Now, half of East Prussia, the whole of Silesia, West Prussia, Pomerania, parts of Brandenburg were occupied by Poland and five millions moved out of these areas into East Germany and West Germany in 1945; two million more moved out in 1946 and 400,000 moved out in 1947. A formidable figure,

nearly 7 million people moving out and living in West and East Germany for the past ten years, and these people formed what is known in Germany as the *Landmanschaften* or the Provincial Association in Germany which has been clamouring for the return of these very lands evacuated by them. Now, this poses the first question, namely, the fixation of the Oder-Neisse Line finally by means of a peace treaty which, if it is not done, will leave the situation in Western Europe completely in a fluid state.

The second question is about nuclear arms. Now, you would realise, Sir, that Russia has been attacked by Germany twice and nearly destroyed. Last time, twenty million Russians are supposed to have been killed and those of us who have been to the Soviet Union have seen with our own eyes the terrible devastation that has taken place in Russia. Now, what is the position in regard to nuclear arms? West Germany today is possessed of a very large army, the largest army in the whole of Europe today, an army consisting of twelve divisions fully armed. The West German army is being trained in the use of nuclear weapons since West Germany joined NATO in 1954. In November, 1956, the West German army was issued with tabulated instructions regarding the use of nuclear weapons. In 1957 it was armed with protective equipment regarding nuclear weapons. Since then, it has been fully trained in rocket missiles as well as the use of potential nuclear contents of these missiles.

The third issue that arises is the question of the arming of the German army with nuclear weapons. Today, they are in possession of a series of missiles of the most deadly kind. Now, let me name some of them: Nike, Corporal, Honest John, Hawk Sidewinder to which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred. The West German army knows and knows how and when to use nuclear warheads, and as you know, Sir, guided missiles, Mace guided missiles

and star fighter (F 104) to which my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, referred in reference to the acquisition by the Pakistan Army of F.104, are being manufactured today in West Germany by the West German Government under a licence. I am referring to this particular matter because it has become very urgent now that the peace treaty with West Germany should be signed, and if the peace treaty is not signed, the danger of another war still remains. I notice that the United States is doing its level best to come to some sort of negotiated peace with the Soviet Union in spite of the difficulties being created by General de Gaulle but I do hope, Sir, and it is the hope of this House, that these negotiations will succeed, that the time will come when the Western Powers through their representatives who are meeting today in Paris will come to some conclusion regarding the setting up of a conciliation machinery or a negotiating machinery between themselves on the one side and the Soviet Union on the other, as a guarantee for world peace.

Now, Sir, I am done. But I would make one last appeal to the Prime Minister, and I hope this would be conveyed to him, namely, that whatever happens in the world, he must continue his role of conciliator and mediator which he has adopted ever since India gained its independence. That role is a significant role in the situation with which we are faced today in the world, and I do wish and hope that this House will support him in that particular role in order that the world may not be frightened into a holocaust of the type that we had seen in the past and worse and that the world may seek the ways of peace.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I listened to the speech of the Prime Minister very carefully, but I must confess, after hearing him, that I felt it was very disappointing to the House. I expected, Sir, that at least today, at this hour of the day, when there is a crisis and emergency brew-

[Shri Gurupada Swamy.]

ing near about Goa, the Prime Minister, as a statesman, as a man of action, would take the House into confidence and tell us what type of concrete action he is contemplating to take, and when he is likely to take that action. Sir, we have been listening to the speeches of the Prime Minister for some time past—and his various declarations and protests—in regard to the question of Goa, but to me it seems that he is not moving forward apart from making verbal and theoretical declarations on a question which cannot be solved by such means. Sir, according to me, conditions are such that only military action, and no other, can solve this problem of Goa. I am making this remark after carefully considering the various courses followed by the Government of India in the past and the failure of such courses in liberating Goa from colonial rule. Sir, according to me Goa should have been liberated along with the independence of India fourteen years ago. That was not done. Again there were many occasions when the Government of India failed the nation to liberate Goa. There was *satyagraha*. It was decidedly supported by the Prime Minister and the Government. And there were various economic sanctions introduced. And all these measures and pressures followed by the Government of India up to now have ended in failure, and nothing but failure. Therefore it is wrong and tactless to think that the problem of Goa will be solved by mere peaceful means. We never deprecate the utility of peaceful methods, but whenever we apply a method or a mode of action, as statesmen, as wise people, we should think whether these methods or modes of action are adequate for the purpose in hand. It has amply been proved already, in the case of Portugal, that these methods will not be able to get us Goa; on the contrary, it would prolong the agony and the pain, and in future there may be a situation in the world which may complicate the problem of Goa. Therefore, I beg of the Prime Minister to consider whether the time is not

propitious and ripe now to take military action in Goa. The Prime Minister often talked of emergency, that a great contingency had arisen, and he has also said that he was prepared for any eventuality, even for military action, but unfortunately he still seems not to have made up his mind, and I think there has been a difference of opinion in his own Cabinet, among his own colleagues. I do not know whether the problem of Goa was discussed in all its aspects in the Cabinet meetings. I do not know, Sir . . .

**SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA** (Madhya Pradesh): He wants all that information.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** But the way the Ministers are moving about and making speeches on Goa amply shows to us that the Cabinet do not have one mind; they do not have one approach to this problem; they differ; it is very disappointing and unfortunate. I feel that a firmer action, a stronger action is necessary now. And what do we see in Goa? Let us see whether there is justification for prompt action. The Portuguese have amassed a large number of troops in Goa; they have been firing at our vessels and also making incursions into our neighbouring areas and shooting our people while they have let loose a reign of terror inside Goa itself. When conditions are such, as wise men, should we not realise that these conditions are conditions of emergency, which call for strong action on the part of the Government of India? Sir, some of the statements of the Prime Minister and the Government spokesmen have really created an atmosphere of excitement in India. People have been expecting very concrete steps, timely steps and immediate steps to liberate this part of territory from colonial rule. If the rulers of India do not take military action now, I think the people of India will never pardon them this time. The Prime Minister talked of the United Nations and the NATO Powers. May I tell him that even the best friends of the

Prime Minister will not help him in this case? He himself admitted that even the friends of Portugal advised Portugal to give that part to India and at the same time counselled the Prime

Minister to wait for some 2 P.M. more time on the ground that any day Goa would become part of India. Till today after fourteen years of waiting we are still listening to the same kind of speeches on behalf of the Government. It is most saddening; it is most unfortunate. Sir, for the solution of Goa, the Munich approach, the Munich outlook, cannot help us. Therefore, I demand a firmer, a more concrete and timely step to liberate Goa and I feel strongly that the steps that we have already taken—the peaceful steps—have not yielded any result in this direction.

My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, dilated on various things all over the world but unfortunately he significantly left out touching on the problem of Chinese occupation of India and he was very vehement as to why the Prime Minister was not acting on Goa. I do agree with his approach; at the same time I ask him and his party why the same approach should not be employed in the case of China. Sir, the problem of China has to be understood in a very clear manner in its historical and ideological perspective. The Prime Minister seems to have taken for granted that China and India for the last thousands of years have been very peaceful and both the great countries of this continent have lived in the most friendly way and by saying so he has assumed that this friendship will live for ever. May I tell him that even in the past both China and India have not met in history? Maybe these two countries have been peaceful for various reasons. China was peaceful for thousands of years; yes, but the fact remains that these two countries have never met in history. Even if we have met in history, the conditions in the past in China were different from the conditions that obtain in China today. The China that we are facing today is the China of 1950 onwards,

not the China of the 19th century. There is a great difference in the approach of the Prime Minister and the approach we are having to this great problem of China. It is very unfortunate that in the past such an assumption has led the Prime Minister to commit himself to so many wrong and doubtful steps. Sir, in 1954 he concluded a treaty on Tibet with China. That treaty also included a pledge that India and China would accept the principle of coexistence and non-aggression. We signed this treaty without knowing the ideological, the historical, background of the Communist Party of China. Neither the Government of India perhaps nor the people of India were aware of the longstanding designs of the Chinese. If the Prime Minister and his Government had taken care to know the ideological motivation of China, he would have understood that what he was doing in 1954 in signing the treaty was obviously a wrong thing to do.

As far back as 1950—perhaps even before—it was well known that the ideological motivation of China was aggressive expansionism and the leaders of China even at that time—even afterwards and even today—were talking in terms of the tripod as their party strategy. According to the tripod that they have been talking about, three things are necessary for bringing about a political revolution in any part of Asia or in any part of the world. One is the proletarian party, the second is the revolutionary army and the third is the united front. These are the three legs of the tripod. This model was enunciated and the whole thing was meant to be exported to other countries of South East Asia and to other parts of the world. Sir, this was the background; this was the ideological motivation of Chinese Communism in 1950 and they have talked of it all these years from 1950 to 1960 but between 1952 and 1956 there was a lull in their talk and they were a little bit peaceful in their approach. It was at that time the Government of India agreed to sign this treaty. Why was there this peaceful approach on the part of

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.] China at that time? It was entirely tactical. At that time China was isolated. There was the Korean war; there was trouble in South Viet Nam; there was the threat of massive American retaliation; and there were wars in Burma, Indonesia and Malaya backed by the Peking Government and in all these places there were reverses. And China stood defiant and virtually alone at that time and when we signed this treaty in 1954 we came to its succour, Sir, really this *panch-sheel* opened the gates to China to make its entry into Asia in a very honourable way. We never met China before 1950. So the whole approach to the problem of China was wrong from the very beginning and it is more tragic, more unfortunate, that the people of India were not made aware of this great challenge from the north, its implications, its ideological and political implications and their tactical motivations.

I do not know whether the top bureaucrats who are managing the Chinese affairs in the External Affairs Department know sufficiently well all these implications. Our top bureaucrats are trained in a colonial atmosphere. They carry the memories of the old colonial rule and they are not in a position to appreciate and understand the basic issues and the ideological implications of this policy on the part of China. I want to say something more about the top bureaucracy when I deal with the question of South East Asia.

Now, what is the position today about China? China is moving forward. They are changing their maps and even the Soviet world map contains indications to show that our territory has been assigned to China. Our leaders' protestations had not had any impact on Soviet authorities but all the same we are very friendly with the Soviet Union. They have not changed their map. Just yesterday I came across a map which is very important. I do not know whether the Prime Minister has seen that map. I

came across it, a map produced or published by the American Geographical Society of New York in its October, 1961 issue, on page 540. I give the reference to the Prime Minister so that he may refer to it. It is a road map of China and it shows a road linking Lhasa and Bhutan *via* Yatung.

THE MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR): Which issue?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: It is the "Geographical Magazine" published by the American Geographical Society of New York in its October, 1961 issue.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Published from where?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: From New York. It is October 1961 issue. According to that map some of our territory has been taken over and road is built. It is extraordinary. It is the latest development. And we are told again and again that all possible steps have been taken and are being taken to face this extraordinary challenge. After all, words cannot be believed at their face value. Words have to be judged in relation to the action taken. If effective defensive measures have been taken, how is it that the Chinese had the temerity to put up three more posts in our own territory at Ladakh? I do not know what our Defence Minister was doing. Now, we have been concentrating our troops around Goa. I know there is massive concentration. Conditions may be different in Ladakh, but still there could have been a concentration of our troops around Ladakh area. For some time past we have been building roads and creating conditions for our troops to be there. When that is so, how is it that we have utterly failed to protect the interests of our territory? I say that this Government has proved itself completely incapable of protecting the interests, integrity and security of India.



**SHRI SATYACHARAN** (Uttar Pradesh): Question.

**SHRI A. D. MANI**: Five Volumes of Government White Paper are there.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY**: It is not a question. It is a fact. It has been admitted by the Prime Minister himself. The Government of India has proved itself incapable of protecting our integrity, our sovereignty and our honour. That is a fact. That has to be admitted. My language may be a little different, but the fact remains. I call upon the Prime Minister, I request him to give up this policy of infirmity, a policy of hesitation, a policy of weakness in regard to meeting this great challenge from the North.

As there is no time, I would touch on one important thing about South-East Asia. I feel that both China and India are meeting in South-East Asia. That is the softest belly of Asian continent, where China is casting its tempting eyes. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was very vociferous in saying that we are supporting a very reactionary regime in South Viet Nam. Do you know the situation in South Viet Nam at the present moment? At the present moment South Viet Nam is completely under the pressure of Communist guerillas and it is not necessary for the guerillas to move from North Viet Nam. They need not pass through Cambodia. They may directly pass through Laos, that part of the territory which they have occupied already. There is a great pressure and there is a great infiltration going on and the work of the Control Commission has been considerably upset as a result of this guerilla action on the part of North Viet Nam. So we must have a bold approach. Till today we do not know, I do not know myself the policy of the Government of India in regard to South Viet Nam. Apart from co-operating with the Control Commission in their task I do not know what approach, what policy we are having in regard to a solution of this problem. This area is important

to us. It is very strange that most of the countries in Asia have not supported India's case against China up till now. And the Prime Minister says that we are friendly to all our neighbours. Where is this neighbourliness? Where is this friendship? I do not see it. No country in Asia up till now has supported us in our case against China. Secondly, their friendship has become rather weak. They are going away from us and China has been able to conclude treaties with Burma, Indonesia and Nepal. They are trying to isolate us in Asia and trying to penetrate in this area. Today what is needed is a more purposive, determined effort on the part of the External Affairs Ministry to consolidate our position in South-East Asia. There is still goodwill. There is still a feeling of friendship for us in that area. But unfortunately the top bureaucrats in the department are not aware of the problems, the local issues and the local susceptibilities of the people and they are not moving in the right direction. Even today there is so much of ignorance on the part of Indians. There is very little study carried on, very few scholars are there. For instance, Mr. Mazumdar has written a book on the "History of Cultural Colonialisation of South-East Asia." It is such titles which make these people enemies of India or hostile to India. Such books should not be encouraged. So, I say, a further study of more assistance, economic, technical and political assistance, for these powers is called for at this time. Therefore, I urge upon the Government to take some concrete steps so that in future we may not face similar crisis which we are facing in the North, which has been deliberately created by our Chinese neighbour.

Thank you.

**SHRI N. M. ANWAR** (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a strange irony, of the international situation that our country which, under the dynamic leadership of Prime Minister Nehru, carries the banner of peace to all the trouble spots of the world wherever

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

the dark clouds of war hover, today finds itself, paradoxically enough, threatened by these very clouds of war on our own borders, at our very doorstep! This poses the most serious challenge to the ideals and intentions of our basic approach to resolve all international disputes by peaceful and friendly negotiations. I should say that this grim situation calls for an extraordinary courage of conviction, an exemplary proof of faith and an enduring patience to pursue the path of peace in terms of *Panchsheel*. We are now fast getting into a period of test and trial and believe me, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have already got, both inside the country and abroad, some sinister circles which are entertaining certain surreptitious and Mephistophelean glee at this hour of our trial. Only the other day we saw how the die-hards of the British Tory Press have taken advantage of the situation and have been trying to show a sneaky sympathy for the Portuguese in Goa. Presumably as very shrewd statesmen they do realise that in this they exhibit an undercurrent of panic and anxiety for the future of their own colonial possessions similarly placed as Goa; for Goa is to India what Gibraltar is to Spain, Malta is to Italy and Hong Kong is to China, and in the inexorable logic of events they know that sooner than later when Goa is returned to India—and I dare say that Goa is bound to return to us—Gibraltar will return to Spain, Malta to Italy and Hong Kong to China. The war lords of the British Press have now tried to forestall the inevitable contingency, and in that they have only betrayed the hangover of their dead past, the dying embers of their imperial ego and an echo of their own guilty conscience. Believe me, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a ridiculous proof of their perversity that these gentlemen of the British Press should see in our Prime Minister Nehru a Hitler such as the "Daily Telegraph" had reported the other day. It is something rather far too farcical that they should have seen in him a Hitler when all the world has

been hailing him as the most outstanding pilgrim of peace, as the only catalytic agent for world peace today. In both the camps we have got now superlative encomiums showered on him for the role he has played for promoting world peace. Only recently we have heard how Comrade Khrushchev had acknowledged his services for promoting peace, and above all President Kennedy in his own inimitable way of expression showered superlative encomiums upon his role, for his soaring idealism, and ranked him with Abraham Lincoln in the roll call of honour in world history.

We feel, therefore, Sir, supremely self-confident in the ideals that we are now pursuing in terms of *Panchsheel* for promoting and preserving international peace. But, ironically, we are now faced with a situation where we are called upon to display our inexhaustible patience. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am not so much distressed at what the war lords of the British Press have expressed recently as at what our own political adversaries have come to say from also every platform. It is very unfortunate that a leader of the eminence of Rajaji should have thought it fit to consider that our action in Goa is a political stunt of the ruling party. To him it is quite possible that everything Congress has become allergic, but may I ask: For whom is that a political stunt? My own fear is, reading through the currents and under-currents and cross-currents of our power politics in this country that it is our political adversaries that are now exploiting the situation as the country is now preparing itself on the eve of the general elections. We see today that there is a curious coincidence of conspiracies between our enemies abroad and our adversaries at home. They are all trying to exploit this situation for political ascendancy at the polls. But Mr. Vice-Chairman this country of 438 millions stands as one man with implicit faith in the leadership of our Prime Minister, and

we trust his Government to deliver the goods and to vindicate the honour of this country. But what is sickening is the lack of a sense of proportion which our political adversaries are now displaying at this most crucial moment of our time. It is rather something very cruel indeed that we must be criticised for taking precautionary measures in Goa. We have been bearing this insult to the honour of our nation right from the advent of our freedom, and today if we find in Goa certain atrocities being perpetrated in the name of colonialism, well, it is but right and meet that the Government of India should have to take adequate and effective precautionary measures to forestall any mischief that may spread from that colony. What do our political adversaries think? Sometimes I feel whether we can afford this luxury of the costly paraphernalia of a parliamentary machinery of democracy (indulging in controversies—*(Interruption)*)—involving questions of the security and the solidarity of this country. I believe and I dare say even if I should be in a minority of one in our country of 438 millions that a matter that involves the honour, the solidarity and the security of India should not be debated in this manner and should not be converted into an election issue. As a member of the party in power I have got that sense of supreme self-confidence to feel that we are going to return to power again and with laurels, and even the members and the leading lights of the Opposition parties themselves have realised and conceded that after all they are only going to be back in Opposition. Nevertheless I say this that if it is necessary in the interests of the preservation of the security of India, in order that we shall not allow any information to be of advantage to the enemy, we can very well plead for the postponement of the general elections.

AN HON. MEMBER: I see.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Yes, I know that But if the powers that be feel  
668 RS—6.

that that is not necessary and desirable, I would plead with the Government that particularly in matters that concern the security of our country when we have got now a tense situation developing, an international emergency on our borders, we cannot have the luxury of this limelight of publicity of these controversies which most of our political adversaries are trying to take advantage of. On the contrary Parliament should be seized of these questions in a secret session, and I believe that that will be the proper *modus operandi* for us to discuss fairly and squarely and to try not to allow the world at large and particularly the enemies round the corner to get to know the secrets of our diplomacy.

I am very much amused when I feel that our good friends, the Communists, the 'Red' Indians, have been so silent over the problem of China. Shri Bhupesh Gupta who waxed so eloquent over the policies of the Government of India from Angola to Algeria, from Algeria to Morocco, in fact about everything in every country, why was he so significantly silent on the problem of our borders with China? He said not a word. On the contrary, I know that he suffers from a guilty conscience, as every communist from Albania to China does. They are today suffering from the worst disease that can afflict human psychology, that of split-personality. Believe me, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the disease of schizophrenia has overtaken the Communist Party in our country and it has divided them into Stalinists and anti-Stalinists. Well, they have absolutely not a word to say as to what we should do with regard to China.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

But believe me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, these Communists are hustling our country into a precipitous action against Goa asking us to issue an ultimatum to Lisbon and they want to see that we get ourselves into complications in international situations.

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

But I know—and every Member here and outside will echo this view—that this country, in Prime Minister Nehru, has got one who knows the interests of the country best, and particularly from his recent visits overseas and from the discussions he has had at the highest level with Comrade Khrushchev, with President Kennedy and President Nasser, he knows best what the problems concerning our country are, particularly in matters of security and solidarity. And, therefore, this nation, as one man, will stand behind him to the last hour, to the last minute, in trying to preserve the integrity and honour of India. We know that most of these members belonging to political parties in Opposition to the ruling party are looking forward only to political ascendancy at the polls by raising this issue of our borders. But they are not going to be returned. I am sure the country knows and knows pretty too well how these political adversaries are now prompted by considerations of political aggrandisement. And they are going to get their verdict and the Congress Party under the dynamic leadership of Prime Minister Nehru, if anything, is going to be returned with greater laurels and in greater numbers. Therefore, that will be the time when the nation will give the verdict on all the controversies which they have raised. As between the Communists who happen to be the leftist subversionists in our country and the rightist reactionaries under the leadership of Rajaji . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Is he your enemy?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I am reminded of the immortal words which Shakespeare has uttered 'Et tu, Brute'. And that is the role that the great leader is now playing at the fag end of his life. He is coming from a State which I have the honour to belong to and we have to defeat him and give him a death-blow there. He is carrying on a campaign all

over the country in this weather. But he is going to meet his Waterloo in his own State.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there are many important questions affecting war and peace in the world which require consideration at a time like this but I should like, first of all, to discuss one of the questions that affect us directly. I should like firstly to discuss the question of Goa but before I deal with it, I must refer to the Prime Minister's recent visit to the United States of America. I think it will be correct to say that the Prime Minister has, for the first time, made an impact on American public opinion. He was, of course, cordially received even during his two previous visits but I doubt whether he made then the impression recently made by him last month on American opinion. I hope that the impression created by him will last. The relations between India and America are, I believe, better now than they were some time ago, and if the good impression created by him lasts as I hope it will, we may expect these relations to improve as time goes on. I would only ask him, however, in order to make sure to see that no unnecessary misunderstandings occur between us and the United States and he should see to it that views are not expressed in the United Nations which are contrary to the views expressed by the Prime Minister. It is clear from the accounts published of the Prime Minister's visit to the United States that the pronouncements made in the United Nations had created misapprehensions about the Indian policy and the attitude of India towards certain questions. I am glad that the Prime Minister was able to remove those misapprehensions but as Minister of External Affairs, he should see to it that such misunderstandings are not allowed to be created again.

I now come to Goa. I cannot add anything to what the Prime Minister has said on the subject. A few days

ago, the Prime Minister described the despatch of troops to Indian territory round about Goa as action taken in order to prepare ourselves for action when necessary. I take it that that is still his opinion. As I listened to him today, it seemed to me that he is in no hurry to use Indian troops unless an emergency is created which requires India not merely to vindicate her self-respect but also to maintain her territorial integrity and security. We have to follow a consistent policy towards all nations, and though the attitude of Goa has, as the Prime Minister rightly said, been utterly provocative, I hope that we shall remember that the greatest threat to our security that we have to meet is on our north-eastern frontier. Let nothing that we may do now interfere with our efforts to strengthen that frontier and to make sure that we are able to meet the challenge when it comes.

Sir, the Prime Minister said some time back that he had received offers of mediation between India and Portugal from certain countries. I do not know whether the Prime Minister will care to enlighten us on this subject. But I should like to know how these offers have been received by him—were they rejected outright or were the would-be mediators simply told that their efforts would be useful only if they could persuade Portugal to vacate Goa or was it also suggested to them that Portugal should be persuaded to grant freedom to the people of Goa to decide their own future? I think, Sir, we have, in this matter, to respect the wishes of the people of Goa just as we did in the case of the two enclaves to which the Portuguese could not send their troops, and I have no doubt that the people of Goa, like the people of the old French colonies, would like to join hands with us in order to strengthen their own position and to make the Indian unity even greater than what it is.

Now, Sir, I should like to say a word about the U.K. Immigration Bill.

Sir, I do not, at any rate, know what the terms of the Immigration Bill are in spite of the discussion that has taken place in the House of Commons of the United Kingdom. We know that the Bill was not sent to the governments of the countries whose emigrants were likely to be affected, and when the Opposition, that is, the Labourites and the Liberals, demanded that the main provisions of the Bill should be made public. Mr. Macmillan did not agree to it. I should, therefore, like the Prime Minister to tell us what exactly its main provisions are. We know in a general way that immigration is to be restricted in accordance with the opportunities available for employment. But it seems that this condition will apply only to the immigrants from certain countries. Now, is that true or will the Bill be of universal application or in practice it will be employed to restrict immigration from those countries that are not regarded as white? We have no interest, Sir, in encouraging our people to do things which would be detrimental to the economic interests of England, but if the Commonwealth is to have any meaning—and we shall have to wait till the United Kingdom joins the E.C.M. to know the meaning of it—it must allow the citizens of all countries the same opportunity of entering the United Kingdom and seeking better prospects for themselves.

Then, Sir, I should like to say a word about colonialism in general. We have discussed the Goa question several times, but we have to remember that the attitude of Portugal has been strengthened not a little by the encouragement received by it in the past from some great Powers. One of them was the United States of America. American opinion has happily changed, but there is no doubt that the pronouncements of the previous Secretary of State have done us a great deal of harm and done not a little to make Portugal even more intransigent than it was.

[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]

The second country to which I should like to refer in this connection is the United Kingdom whose Foreign Minister went to Portugal the other day to strengthen the ties between the U.K. and Portugal. Now, England has a right to provide for its security in ways that it considers best, but it was deplorable that the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom should have gone at that particular time to Portugal. It seemed then as if he had gone there in order to make it clear to Portugal that Great Britain would be on its side in all cases.

Then, Sir, take the question of the Portuguese possessions in Africa. The colonial Powers, though none of them has gone so far in the suppression of human liberty and constitutional freedom as Portugal has gone, are not, it seems to me, inclined to put pressure on Portugal to change its policy. However, the Algerian question, I hope will soon be settled. The President of France made an important speech the other day at Strasbourg which showed that he had, after all, recognised the reality of the situation and was prepared to do what lay in his power to save the Algerian nationalists and to enable them to decide their own future.

Then, there are, Sir, British colonies in Africa which are part of the Central African Federation, but the Africans of Southern Rhodesia have been left at the mercy of the Southern Rhodesian whites, and the fate of the Africans in Northern Rhodesia is still hanging in the balance. Though no nation differed, so far as I remember, from the resolution passed by the United Nations calling for a speedy and for an immediate end of colonialism, no nation has yet acted on that resolution, and it is our duty, rather it should be our privilege, to use our influence, for whatever it may be worth, to see that that resolution is carried out. If that resolution could be carried out, the position of the Africans of Southern Rhodesia would not be what it is

now, and there is every fear that if a solution is accepted by the British Government in regard to Northern Rhodesia, which will not ensure an African majority in the Northern Rhodesian Parliament, the fate of Northern Rhodesia would be similar to that of Southern Rhodesia.

Sir, now I should like to say a word about Pakistan. It appears that the Pakistan newspapers are wholly on the side of Portugal and China. Little do they realise that in acting in this manner, they are acting contrary to their best interests; yet prejudices and prepossessions have so warped their judgment that they are unable to see that in attacking India they are really weakening their own position. They can strengthen themselves not by befriending Portugal but by trying to be friends with India. India has recognised this principle, I am glad to say, and has consistently acted on it. It is not its fault but its misfortune that Pakistan is still hostile to it; but it is rather surprising that President Ayub Khan, who at the commencement of his career expressed his anxiety for the development of friendly relations with India, should allow things to be published in the Pakistani papers—I say this because there is no freedom of the Press in Pakistan—which, instead of improving the relations between India and Pakistan, cannot but make them much worse. It seems to me that what the Pakistani newspapers are publishing meets with the approval of the Pakistan Government, otherwise their articles would not have seen the light of day.

A word now about the Congo. A few weeks ago, the U.N. suffered what may be called, a humiliating defeat. We were surprised that it should be so and we were surprised and pained that the U.N. should have had to put a stop to the action that it had taken against the Katangan authorities but it was clear at the time that some of the Powers, at least some countries, were supplying arms to Katanga. It is to be noted that

while the Central Government is not allowed to import arms by the U.N., the Katanga Government gets the arms that it needs from practically all countries. The result of the renewed action taken by the U.N. against Katanga seems to be more satisfactory. If what today's paper says is true, the U.N. troops have the upper hand and I hope that they will be able to act in such a way as to put an end to Katangese secession for ever.

**SHRI M. H. SAMUEL** (Andhra Pradesh): Is it the U.N. objective to stop the secession?

**PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU:** Yes, it is and I hope it will succeed in doing so. We were surprised, I was certainly surprised, when I read in the papers that the British Government disapproved of the action taken by the U.N. and that it wanted these questions to be settled peacefully. Now, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, in the course of his remarks to the press correspondents at London Airport, said that Britain had made its position clear that it was entirely on the side of the U.N. but that he wanted that the question of future relations between Katanga and the Central Government of the Congo should be settled peacefully. This is trying to put it both ways. England wants not to condemn Katanga and at the same time fights shy of going openly against the United Nations. It is conduct like this that has complicated the situation in the Congo.

I would like to say a word about Laos and South-East Asia generally. So long as Laos observed a policy of neutrality, its position was secure but unfortunately, when it tried to side completely with one Power, difficulties came into existence and even its future life was endangered. It was the un-wisdom of the American Government and the Government of Laos which worsened the position. Happily now an agreement has been arrived at in the Geneva Conference which gives

hope that a neutral government would soon be formed in Laos. The International Control Commission was not allowed to function freely there, I should say, to function freely or normally there. I do not know what its position now is and I would therefore like the Prime Minister to tell us exactly how this Commission is functioning in Laos. Has it now the freedom of action that it requires in order to do its work successfully or is it still working under some kind of restrictions imposed on it because of the disagreement between the two Co-Chairmen? Recently an agreement has been arrived at on six points in the Geneva Conference and it seems that among these questions are the voting procedure, the manner of carrying out investigations, etc. The Prime Minister seemed to think that this agreement having been arrived at in the Conference and between the two Co-Chairmen, the delay in the establishment of a neutral government was due to differences among the Laotian Princes themselves. He may be right—he has much more knowledge of this question than I can claim to have—but I am inclined to think that none of the parties concerned there, with the possible exception of Prince Souvanna Phouma can act contrary to the firm advice received by it from the Power supporting it. If the agreement that has been reached on paper in Geneva is worked out in Laos, I have no doubt that a government will soon be formed there but if things are left to the Princes themselves and they are made to feel that they are still free to act in accordance with their wishes, I am afraid it will be long before we shall see an end to the hostilities that have not yet ended there and have a stable government which ought to be formed there as early as possible.

Lastly, I would like to refer to South Viet Nam. We all know that for some time, South Viet Nam has been subjected to attacks by troops which are supposed to be of South Viet Nameese origin, that is, troops composed of people belonging to

[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]  
 South Viet Nam. It may be.  
 3 P.M. I mean the organisation that is behind these attacks is known as the Vietkong and it is claimed by North Viet Nam that this is an independent organisation. But it is hard for me to believe that Vietkong can get a large body of troops trained, find the money, weapons and equipment required to maintain them in fighting trim, without the help of some other country. I do not know whether it is North Viet Nam or China or Russia. But I think we can feel reasonably sure that Vietkong is inspired in its attacks by some outside Powers and so far the Central Control Commission has not considered it its duty to enquire into this matter. It seems that now there has been a change of opinion in the Commission and it seems that this matter will be considered and that there is a possibility of the Commission investigating this matter.

There is just one more difficulty with regard to this question which I want to mention before I sit down. While the Viet Nameese are, no doubt, anxious to maintain their territorial integrity, the failure of the South Viet Nameese Government to give freedom to its people or to allow the Parliament there to function normally has created tension in the country which prevents the Government from securing the full support of the intelligentsia and I fear that so long as this state of things continues, the position of South Viet Nam will continue to be morally weak. It seems that the United States Government is using its influence with the South Viet Nameese Government to persuade it to grant a measure of constitutional freedom to its people; but I do not think, in spite of the power that it wields, that it will be easy for them to persuade the President of the South Viet Nam to agree to this proposal. Such proposals have been made to him by the representatives of many countries in the past and the danger of alienating the sympathy of the intelligentsia has been impressed on him strongly.

Nevertheless, he is inclined to feel that the people who are asking for freedom are really in favour of the Communists and that if full freedom of expression is given to the people, it will be used to the detriment of South Viet Nam and to the advantage of North Viet Nam. If India can do anything in the matter, it would be a good thing for that country and for South East Asia in which we are deeply interested. In a way, our future is bound up with it and we should see if something cannot be done by the South Viet Nameese Government to earn the goodwill and co-operation of the intelligentsia.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I deem it a great privilege to extend my hearty support to the hon. Prime Minister's motion with regard to the international situation in relation to India. I must confess that we have become wiser after listening to his brilliant exposition regarding some of the intricate international problems.

Sir, this morning, when I was entering the House, an esteemed lady colleague of ours said that the young men and women of the West felt extremely frustrated and depressed today when they thought about their future prospects, because they thought that war clouds were looming large on the horizon of human fate and they did not know what exactly would be tomorrow, whether they would be alive or be extinct. This really is a problem which confronts the entire world today and there is no doubt that it has to be given priority over all other problems. We have not to make an assessment as to whether we have been able to do or achieve something tangible in this situation. I feel that, except indulging in ideological perorations, nothing tangible has happened and nothing in the shape of settled solution has come before us. We are still groping in darkness. Now, the



situation is such that we may be confronted any day with an explosive situation. Sir, whether it is a complete ban on nuclear tests or complete disarmament which we have been advocating, since we do not believe at this stage in piecemeal disarmament, the fact is that the whole question is now before us at the very stage at which it was at the beginning. Without playing to the gallery of the gentle ladies I have, today, to make a very bold suggestion on the floor of this Parliament and it is that man has conducted himself rather with stupidity and the stupidity of man's conduct is proved. We are unable to solve the issue. Let it be left to the ladies, especially to the ladies in the belligerent countries, those countries that have nuclear weapons. Sir, in this context, I am reminded of the three dramas of the famous Greek dramatist Aristophanes who wrote some famous comedies. Three of them are specially famous, namely, "Acharnians", "The Peace" and "Lysistrata". The last one is a very important one and the problems that were raised in Athens about the conflict between existence and co-existence are refreshingly topical today. In the drama it is portrayed that the heroine Lysistrata came forward and organised the most effective feminist movement. She persuaded the women of Athens to get themselves shut up in the Acropolis, far away from their husbands and said unless the men came to peace terms, they were not to come out. The result was that since the men could not live without their wives, they agreed to have peace and Lysistrata had the occasion to dictate her own terms. Sir, I have not spoken in a light vein. I am quite serious about this matter. This human problem has been discussed for long and the result has registered the incapacity of men, just as it happened in that drama, in the twenty-first year of the Peloponnesian War. Here we have been dealing with this question of armament and disarmament since the year 1914 when the first conference for the purpose was held under the leadership of Angelica Ballianoff at Brussels.

Sir, the question of Goa has been discussed at length and now, that intolerable position which has been there for the last fourteen years has reached the saturation point. We have been charged with inaction. Our silence or the absence of active action has been misconstrued as our weakness, though it was not so.

Diplomacy is not a simple art. We have diplomats who talk in equivocal languages and as the definition says, they have an elastic conscience and a rubber neck and it is a great deal difficult to face a team of such diplomats. Therefore, Sir, the assertions that we have on the floor of so many Parliaments and so many Councils are not always true. The friends of Goa gave us a different impression but we had been vigilant and extremely cautious. To that end we have to pay a tribute to the policy of the Government of India. Sir, it is enough to say that Goa had a large number of supporters only yesterday but our patience, the way our Prime Minister and the External Affairs Ministry and our representatives have dealt with problems on the floor of the United Nations has today earned for us a team of admirers, a team of supporters who now think that our cause is just. Sir, I must pay a tribute to the hon. Prime Minister who made the other day a very important statement in the Lok Sabha. It was to the effect that India had added to her armed forces round about Goa and was prepared for any contingency that might arise. The Defence Minister also made a statement in which he said that the Government of India had not abjured the use of force in the vindication of the nation's right. These statements of the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister should go a long way in allaying the fears of our compatriots who had been thinking that probably the Government of India had been sacrificing the interest of the Goans for the vindication of the policy of peace and non-violence. Sir, the conduct of the Portuguese Government in regard to Goa is so

[Shri Satyacharan.]

very well known that I do not like to indulge in historical reconnaissance of the 15th Century. The Spanish historians themselves have condemned the role that was played by Portugal in Brazil or in the entire Latin American continent. That is a long history but currently too from the way Portugal behaved in Angola, Mozambique or in Goa is enough to say that they have a different pattern of culture. Our Prime Minister was confronted with a question by our Communist comrade as to what type of pattern of civilisation and culture the Portuguese had and he rightly said that he knew only about the absence of culture rather than the presence of any culture. I would respectfully add, Sir, to his statement that they have historically proved to be belonging to the culture of the pirates.

Sir, it was in May last that we received a very sensational report from Angola about 35,000 defenceless Africans having been butchered. Another paper said that tens of thousands of people were mowed down simply because they wanted peace and they wanted their homeland for themselves and demonstrated their defiance against the colonial policy. Unfortunately, the Goans had no compunction. They had absolutely no scruples and the result was that they paved the way for something else. I shall say very boldly—and I wish to open the eyes of the Western nations—that the Western nations have paved the way for the expansion of international communism from Algeria to Cape Town and from Morocco to Zanzibar.

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU** (West Bengal): The hon. Member said that the Goans had no scruples.

**SHRI SATYACHARAN:** I am sorry. I should correct myself. The Portuguese have no scruples. The only course now left for Portugal is to quit India or be kicked out because if they persist in their demand, that

is not going to be tolerated. It was Foster Dulles, the late unlamented Secretary of State of the U.S. who permitted the claim of Portuguese over Goa as a province of the metropolitan country. Now, that regime is gone and I must say that the concept of colonialism which impelled Foster Dulles to say so and Dr. Salazar to receive inspiration from it is now dead.

(Time bell rings.)

I should crave your indulgence for two minutes more. It is a very important question about Nepal that I want to deal with and I have not been able to speak about it. I would leave the Congo and the rest.

I have to make rather a very important statement about our border kingdom, Nepal. Conditions in the neighbouring border kingdom are, of course, disquieting. Parliamentary democracy has been flouted, rather thrown to the winds. Parliament is not in session and the situation is that politically people feel oppressed. It is rather delicate to give unreserved expression about this kingdom which is very friendly to us but I am constrained to remark about the Nepal-Tibet road. This road, to which the Government of Nepal has given consent, has given a great foothold to the Communist organisations in Nepal and it has also given China a foothold in Nepal. Another thing is that a pact of non-aggression has been signed between China and Nepal. I do not know and I would request the hon. Prime Minister to throw light on it as to whether at the time of effecting this agreement, the Government of India was at all consulted or whether any intimation or information was given to it.

Then, Sir, a great volume of anti-Indian propaganda has manifested itself in a most virulent form in the Nepal Press and I would respectfully urge that this thing should be taken proper cognizance of, because Nepal happens to be a buffer State between

China and India. Lately, five papers have been suppressed and banned, the last of which was the "Swatantra Samachar". I do not know the reasons for suppressing this paper but it is said that it was banned immediately after the paper editorially condemned the Chinese attitude on the border troubles with India. This is a serious matter and that is why, Sir, I craved your indulgence to speak about it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman in today's review of the world situation, the Prime Minister mainly dealt with matters which were of direct concern to us. Sir, there are three trouble-spots on our borders, Pakistan, China and the Portuguese possession in Goa. As far as Pakistan is concerned, nothing important is happening at present. I do hope that it is not a question of lull before the storm but the other two fronts are active. Sir, in regard to China, I have to get, if possible, one or two clarifications from the Prime Minister. On the debate on China, five or six days ago, the Prime Minister laid down the broad policy of the Government for dealing with this situation. The Prime Minister stated:

"What is, again, our policy? Obviously, aggression having taken place, to vacate the aggression by whatever means are feasible to us. To begin with—and not only to begin with but even afterwards—to try every method, negotiation, etc., because, if your intention is war, even then you have to do this and at the same time to strengthen your position to meet any contingency . . ."

This is the broad policy which the Prime Minister stated in this House in regard to China. Sir, here one point is not clear to me as far as the policy is concerned. There cannot be any two opinions; we are all agreed that in the circumstances it can be the only policy. But after Mr. Chou En-lai had been here, after that the

officials of the two countries sat together for months, and they discussed the whole situation from every point of view. Our officers submitted our report and the Chinese officers submitted their report. But after that it was practically agreed between the two Governments that the *status quo* that existed at that time would be maintained, that nothing new would be allowed to happen. At the same time the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister assured the country that the Chinese would not henceforward be allowed to take an inch more of our territory beyond what they had already taken. Now, Sir, what we have done is this, that in our Note of 31st October, 1961, we have told the Chinese that they have made 11 separate serious fresh incursions, and have established three new check-posts and have built roads to connect them with their rear bases, etc. Therefore, Sir, how does it reconcile with the statement of the Government that not one more inch will be allowed to be taken by them further? Now, Sir, in connection with this policy we would like to know, if they make fresh incursions and establish new check-posts, what our policy would be. Would our policy be to wait and allow them to establish more check-posts and to make more incursions till we get ready, get prepared, in accordance with the policy laid down by the Prime Minister, and when the time comes, we will repulse them? Is this the policy or the policy also means that we would not allow any more check-posts to be established? This point is not clear in the policy statement that the Prime Minister made, and I would be very happy if the Prime Minister would kindly make it clear, namely that they will not be allowed to establish any more check-posts. Or is it that we are not prepared to do so and therefore they will continue to establish more check-posts, but that when we are ready and fully prepared we will repulse them? This point, if it is cleared, will clear my doubt on this particular point.

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

Now, Sir, my second doubt in regard to this policy statement of the Prime Minister is this, namely, what our defence forces are supposed to do, or what our check-posts are supposed to do? Are they only to record from a safe distance evidence of fresh Chinese incursions to enable the External Affairs Ministry to send more protest notes? Or are our defence forces forbidden to put up resistance or even fire a shot or resort to shooting if even forcibly they establish check-posts? So far it had not been made clear to us because it appears to us, when so many incursions have taken place, new check-posts have been established, that there has been no encounter, there has been no resistance. So, is this also a part of the policy, or whether our armed forces have orders or they do not have orders . . .

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:** Does my hon. friend expect that the details of our defence policy should be discussed on the floor of this House?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** Yes, certainly.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh):** No, not at all.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I am entitled to it, but luckily you are not the Prime Minister of India. Therefore please . . .

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:** As one of your colleagues I am here to correct you.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** Therefore, I would like to know whether our forces have orders to resist, or they have no orders to resist and we will repulse the Chinese when we are ready. If these points are made clear, then my doubts will be cleared. Now what is the position? The position is this that we have told them that they have done this, that they have done that, but it may be noted that not in one instance have the

Chinese admitted their guilt. In each instance the Chinese have given their own version of the facts, have refused to listen to any argument and repeated the claim that right and justice were invariably on their side. Further, in their Note of the 12th August, 1961, the Chinese charge that Indian troops and personnel and aircraft have repeatedly encroached on Chinese territory and Chinese air space. And we have gone a step further. Of course, we have told them that they have been violating our space so many times—repeatedly—and they tell us openly that, if that is so, we can take any action whatsoever, and actually their words are these:

“Should India discover any unidentified aircraft in its border air space, the Indian Government is fully entitled to take any counter measures and need not make any enquiry of China.”

They have made their position clear. Then what is the point in protesting as far as our air space violation is concerned? Well, they have told us that if that is so, ‘you’ can shoot ‘us’ down. Pakistan has shot our plane down. Perhaps, we are not prepared even to do this, and in the face of this assertion of China asking us to take action against aircraft violating our air space, we only go on sending protests to them, which serve no purpose, since they have themselves openly told us to shoot such aircraft down without making reference to them.

Now, in regard to China I want to refer to two points. One point was raised by the hon. Dr. Kunzru on the China Debate, to which the Prime Minister did not give any reply; he had to deal with so many points and probably that escaped his notice. The point that Dr. Kunzru made was this. We and Burma are very great friends, and the two Prime Ministers personally are great friends. Now, they accepted Dipu Pass as the border between China and Burma. Of course,

their first concern is the interests of their own country—I agree. But then it is a nation whose friendship we too claim to possess. We too claim—and it is a fact also—that we have got a vast number of friends—practically the largest number of friends all over the world. If that is so, then did a friend like Burma, in a vital question in which our interests are identical—and here our stake is bigger than that of Burma—consult us or did not consult us and ignored us? And did we make any reference to them and, if so, what was their response?

Similar is the point raised by my friend, the previous speaker, in regard to Nepal. Now, here again is a very big question for our safety and the matter is the road being built between Lhasa and Kathmandu. During the Question Hour recently I asked of the Prime Minister whether he was convinced that this would not affect our safety, and he said "No", that he was not convinced. We are more connected with Nepal than China. We help them at every stage; they look to us for funds for their projects, for everything, and here is a vital question, which they know very well, we are interested in. When they are so friendly with us, whatever the Government in Nepal may be, whether it be absolute monarchy or a monarchy with a responsible Government functioning, we have been equally friendly to them in spite of the feeling of the people of India for those in Nepal asking for responsible Government. Even then we have been supporting King Mahendra and his present Government, as best as we were supporting the former responsible Government. Now they go and enter into a treaty with a declared enemy of ours, and it is something serious. Here also, why is it so, that even the closest friend of ours had not even consulted us in regard to matters in which we are vitally concerned? And whether they consult us or not consult us in such matters we treat them the same old friends. We now know

who are our friends and who are not our friends.

Then, with regard to the question of China, it is my considered opinion that our border trouble with China will always be there as long as China continues to occupy Tibet. For some reason or other we have agreed that Tibet belongs to China. It is no use raking up past history; it is a *fait accompli* now and it has to be faced and in my humble opinion it can be taken for granted as far as our northern borders are concerned that they will always remain active and we will have to bear the responsibility of what we did at one time without looking at the question from every point of view. We knew very well that a strong China has always been expansionist and with this present regime in China naturally they will be expanding. And they will be expanding at our cost and therefore we have to be very very vigilant as long as Tibet will be occupied by China.

In regard to Goa I want to say a few words. The question is very serious. But whatever action the Government is taking, we have our policy. We have made it sufficiently clear that we believe in negotiations and we do not believe in aggression. Anyway, the Prime Minister has come round to this view that this is a negative policy and that it is not always fruitful. He has veered round to the view that even military action is possible. That is a good thing. But what is the military strength of the Portuguese in Goa—army, naval and air combined? If they are getting together a few thousand men, a few ships and a few aeroplanes, for this purpose—it is a very good thing that we take precautions; all wise people have to take precautions; even a weak enemy has to be taken as an enemy and therefore precautions are necessary—the movement of troops to the Goa border has been done in such a way that an atmosphere of national emergency has been sought to be created. If in regard to a small place

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

like Goa we consider that a national emergency has taken place that hundreds of trains have to be cancelled, if our Southern Command cannot cope with the situation, then I feel a little unhappy.

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE** (Bihar): From which source have you come to know that hundreds of trains have been cancelled?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** It appears my friend does not read papers. It was in the papers a week ago that something like a hundred trains to Bombay—Delhi-Bombay, Madras-Bombay and other trains—were cancelled. It makes a psychological effect on . . .

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** Factually it is incorrect. Surely, there cannot . . .

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I am not giving way. Psychologically it creates a very bad effect. I am all for taking precautions. As a matter of fact, I am one with those who believe that the enemy should not be under-rated; immediate action should be taken. But to create an atmosphere as if a national emergency has arisen where so many troops have to be sent in regard to a small place like Goa, psychologically it will have a bad effect because what will happen if we have to encounter Pakistan or China? If Goa has to be tackled by the cancellation of hundreds of trains, the question of Pakistan and China being more serious, I do not know what will happen or what will not happen. I feel a little unhappy that this psychology that has been created for dealing with this small question is bad and it will have an adverse effect. On the other hand, the Portuguese will be boosted up that just by collecting a few planes, a few ships and a garrison of a few thousand people, India has had to take all this action.

Sir, the Prime Minister referred to the seminar in regard to Portuguese colonies which took place in Delhi and Bombay recently. I thought from the papers that I read that they met here to get some lead from us but I feel that they had to go disappointed. Because of the stand that you have taken on this question, neither you can take any action nor advise them to do so. You advise them to negotiate peacefully; that means the Portuguese possessions in Africa are doomed for a long time. They have not got any lead from us. If we had taken any action immediately in regard to Goa, their movement would have gathered momentum and they would have been helped but they met here and in Bombay and I feel that they have gone back disappointed. That is my feeling.

One word in regard to Congo. We are supporters of the United Nations and therefore it is right that we are taking such a leading part in regard to the unity of Congo but my feeling is this that unity and political solution cannot be imposed. If we impose it on them, then it will be trouble for ever. Whatever action has been taken as far as United Nations are concerned they are justified but if they feel that they can impose unity, well, I feel that they are very much mistaken because then the country will only go to rack and ruin.

Lastly, I have to submit that our policy in regard to colonialism and in regard to certain other matters in the United Nations to which Dr. Kunzru in his characteristic way referred a little while ago is being misunderstood and it goes to the credit of the Prime Minister that in his statements in America he dispelled all this feeling from the minds of our friends. About the recent explosion of 50 megaton nuclear bomb by Russia our position had become very difficult but I feel very happy that the Prime Minister put the blame squarely on the Russians and expressed his views clearly. It is a very good thing. The second point is in regard

to colonialism. In regard to colonialism the Prime Minister has been speaking in general terms so far which appeared to give the appearance that more or less we were blaming the Western countries more than the others but during his recent visit to U.S.A. in a television interview with Mr. Stevenson at New York the Prime Minister agreed that the people in Soviet dominated Eastern Europe should be given an opportunity for self-determination. He added that Soviet domination was not colonialism of the old type but it was different and was sometimes even worse, from the human point of view, than the other. These are very happy statements on the part of the Prime Minister and we do hope, as appealed to by Dr. Kunzru, that he will see that members of our delegations do not speak contrary to the views expressed by the Prime Minister. Thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I should like to say at the outset that I approve of the statement of policy made by the Prime Minister this morning on Goa and China. As far as Goa is concerned, I hope that by Republic Day next year, Goa would be part of Indian territory.

I should like briefly to deal with the amendment which I have tabled and which has been put down on paper in order to elicit a statement of policy from the Prime Minister if he has the time. I should like to take up item (iii). The Prime Minister this morning referred to the recent exchanges between the Government of India and the Chinese Government but a point was raised in the China debate which I should like to raise here. The Chinese Government has asked for a renewal of the 1954 Sino-Indian Treaty on Tibet. I believe the Prime Minister said in the other House that the matter will be considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. I do not deny the treaty-making powers of the Government, but I should like to mention that, in view of what the Chinese Govern-

ment has been doing, it is clear that the Chinese Government is doing things as it does not because it is not aware of its own history and of its own tradition of politeness. Whatever is done is being done deliberately to insult the people of India and to create bonds of friction and irritation on our side. There is no doubt whatever that China wants to make trouble. If that is the case, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether it would be proper or wise to renew the treaty on the same old terms. My suggestion would be that while negotiations may be carried on with the Chinese Government for the renewal of the treaty, because it would be improper on our part if we do not want to negotiate, the vacation of aggression must be one of the conditions which China must fulfil before the treaty is signed. I should also like to suggest that this is the one occasion we are getting of putting all the things that we have got to say on the Chinese Government to them and ask for a satisfactory statement of their position. If the Chinese Government does not vacate the aggression, I would suggest that the Government should not renew the treaty. It may be that there would be a gap in the diplomatic relationship between India and China, but that gap has existed between us and the Portuguese Government. Nothing serious has happened. Any ratification of the treaty at this stage without vacation of aggression would mean that we are tacitly accepting the Chinese position in regard to aggression. I would like to say further that on an important matter like this we should like both Houses of Parliament to be consulted if the treaty is going to be signed, because we should like to make suggestions on our side. If China does not vacate the aggression, I feel we would rather not renew the treaty, but there is no question of renouncing it.

I have also put down on the amendment that we should seek to present our views on the Chinese dispute at the United Nations forum. If one

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

goes to the library and calls for foreign comments on the China-India border dispute, one will find that a large number of countries are not well posted with our side of the case and I have not seen so far any booklet issued by the External Affairs Ministry on the subject which explains the position to the foreign reader. It may be that such a book has been issued. The general practice in the United Nations is for a country to state its differences on territorial matters with another country at the U.N. forum itself. I am not suggesting that we should oppose China's admission to the United Nations. But whenever the question comes our delegate should go and state that he supports its admission because China is essential for any disarmament conference and without China the United Nations would not be a complete organisation. But he should also give a very brief and very polite survey of our dispute with China, so that we get our facts across to other nations, because the time may come when the China-India dispute may when the China-India dispute may not come tomorrow. It may come in the next generation. Let all our facts be on record. These are my comments on item (iii) of my amendment.

I would like to refer to item (iv) of my amendment relating to the Immigration Bill. My hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, asked for details about the provisions of this Bill. One of the provisions of the Bill is that the immigration authorities, if they are satisfied that a person has got mental disorder, can send him out. It is not a doctor who is going to do it. It is the immigration authority which is going to decide whether a person is or is not insane. And it is a matter for credit that Mr. Gaitskell and the Labour Party have put up a courageous fight against this Bill. I have no doubt that Britain has got the right to control its own population, the control of the racial content of its population. It is the right of any

country. They have their problems. We sympathise with their problems. But undoubtedly the Immigration Bill, in view of the fact that it permits Irish immigration, even though Irish immigrants may be impoverished men without a job, puts a bar in the case of Indians and others, is racial in character. We would not like to embarrass the British Government, because as I said the population problem on account of uncontrolled immigration has led to serious difficulties for the British Government. I think last week there was an article in the "Daily Telegraph" where the writer very cleverly suggests now that the Bill is on the anvil we hope we will have satisfactory accommodation arrangements for the coloured people. This means they are thinking in terms of segregation. What are those accommodation arrangements? My suggestion is that if this matter is going to be discussed at any future stage at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, we might convey our sense of dismay and resentment at the passing of the Bill and hope that the British Government will administer it in a very humane manner and will not resort to segregation and other ancillary things which follow from the policy of immigration. In Ceylon the other day I read that people have been forced to carry identity cards. We do not want that position to obtain in Great Britain. I felt that this matter should be raised in this debate because while the British Labour Party and Mr. Gaitskell have been carrying on a very brave fight on this Bill there have not been sufficient protests from the affected parties, including Trinidad. In Trinidad opposition to the Bill has been going down. They have resigned themselves to this Bill. These are my comments on item No. (iv).

I would like to take item No. (ii), i.e., statements made by Indian representatives at the United Nations. My hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, has already referred to it in his speech. I



should like to assure the House and the Prime Minister that this amendment has nothing to do with North Bombay. We have no sides in Bombay, at least I have no sides. I am frankly an admirer of the leader of the Indian delegation, but I should like to point out that while the Prime Minister spoke the very same things in New York very few misunderstood him. Within 48 hours of his arrival the misunderstanding that had existed about India's attitude at the U.N. had evaporated and the Prime Minister was questioned on the T. V. by interviewers and asked questions about the Indian resolution. The Prime Minister will agree that the manner of putting a thing is as important as the matter. If the Prime Minister would refer to the United Nations verbatim record of the 17th October, documentation PV 1168, he will find that the speech which was made was a very long speech. Unfortunately we have fallen into the habit of making very long speeches on these matters, two hours, three hours and so on. You will all agree that when a person makes a long speech, he opens a very wide front of attack because any person can pick out one sentence from here and another sentence from another place and try to make out a case against him. My submission is that in all these matters, while there is really no difference of opinion between the Indian delegation and ourselves, the manner of presentation is as important as our matter.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Short speeches.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** Precise speeches, not in the long-winded fashion with which my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, is familiar. When the Prime Minister makes a speech, the Prime Minister says the same thing, but no hurt is inferred.

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:** Mr. Bhupesh Gupta always delivers short speeches when he speaks, I hope.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I follow in the footsteps of the Prime Minister in this matter.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** May I invite the attention of the House to the fact that there is really no difference between the Indian delegation and the Government's policy, except in the manner of putting things across? And we are in the 15th year of Independence. We ought to develop a certain restrained way of speaking, because the friends that we are making today are going to be the friends for our next generation. I think that with restraint on verbiage on the part of the Indian delegation we can bring it in consonance with the Government policy.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Short speech.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** Only one sentence and I shall conclude my speech with a reference to the extraordinary statement made by my hon. friend, Mr. Anwar, my good friend, Mr. Anwar, who in his eloquent speech hinted at suspension of parliamentary Government and the postponement of the general elections. This is the first time that a statement of this kind has been made either in this House or in that House. I hope, Sir, that in the interests of democracy the Prime Minister would say that these are not the views of his party but those of Mr. Anwar who made it.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** It goes without saying.

**SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, as many hon. Members have said, we are immediately faced with two dangers: one the incursions in the north, and the other the depredations of the Portuguese on Goa and other western territories. If anybody in the world had a hope that Portugal would give up her ways and enter the civilised community of the world, that hope is belied. The recent events both in Goa as well as in Africa, particularly in Angola, have proved that Portugal

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]  
is beyond remedy, that Portugal is beyond correction. Within the domains of Portugal we know that there is no democracy. There are no civil rights. People who are against the Government are persecuted. People cannot freely vote and people even cannot freely contest, and by what happened in Angola we know that Portugal has no respect for the United Nations' Charter. She does not recognise rights such as human rights which the entire civilised world recognises. She has followed a policy of extermination of the Africans which has shocked the whole civilised world.

Sir, the Foreign Minister of Portugal has declared the other day that if things become worse in Goa, his Government will not hesitate to pursue a "scorched earth" policy. This shows that the Portuguese Government have no regard for human considerations. Will a Portugal of this attitude, of this standard, of these barbarous standards, ever realise that she should vacate an occupied territory in India or should show civilised methods with regard to settling this question? Sir, the only hope we had was that the big countries in the world, the big Powers, would exercise a salutary influence on Portugal and bring her round, bring her to her senses that she should be one in the civilised community. But that hope is also fading, because we know one of the Powers, to which hon. Dr. Kunzru has also referred, Great Britain, values more a treaty with Portugal which is three centuries old than rights of self-determination which the whole civilised world has acknowledged. As we know, Sir, she is hobnobbing with Portugal. He referred to the Foreign Minister's visit to Portugal a year or so before the head of the State visited Portugal, and there was the other event where a part of the British Navy was to go to Portugal for exercises. This shows that far from discountenancing Portugal, they are indirectly encouraging Portugal in its attitude, or at least

they do not show their displeasure at the methods and the intransigence of Portugal.

Dr. Kunzru has also referred to the previous American Government's attitude, the Secretary of State's statement that Goa was a province of Portugal. Of course, we see indications that the present Government of the United States does not associate itself with the previous policy, but there is no positive change in that, positive change to discountenance Portugal for the atrocities that she has committed in Angola and elsewhere and for holding on to the colony of Goa. So, when these big Powers themselves are not taking a positive step to exercise a salutary influence on Goa there are only two methods: either Portugal should be brought to her senses by these Powers, or Portugal herself should recognise that she was going down, which is not possible. The only other method left to us is to see that the Portuguese Government vacates its possessions.

Now, Sir, the Portuguese Government has taken advantage of the policy that we have been following. As a nation which has attained political maturity, as a nation which has long been devoted to peaceful methods, as a nation which is conditioned by its entire history to think of the welfare of the rest of the world as well as its own, we have followed a policy of settling disputes by peaceful negotiations. For fifteen years, considering the events that have taken place in Goa and the suffering and hardship to which the people in Goa have been put, we have been tolerating hoping against hope that some day wisdom would dawn on Portugal or that the world public opinion would assert itself on Portugal and she would see that her policy was wrong. But because of our peaceful attitude and because we were unwilling to take the law into our own hands—and we would have been properly justified if we had taken—the Portuguese Government has taken advantage of it

and is strengthening its military build-up in Goa and is making inroads into our territory, looting villages and shooting peaceful fishermen and sailing ships. This is a thing which challenges our national self-respect. Apart from questions of peace and war, it is a question of national self-respect. If we do not take action in this matter and if we allow these things to go on simply because we will not resort to force, well, Sir, our prestige suffers and our national self-respect suffers. So, it is now up to us to see that Portugal, a condemned nation, a condemned Government in the whole world now, does not any more carry on its depredations on our territory or freely deal with our shipping craft or our personnel. Sir, if we do not enter the territory of Goa, at least we must see that they are taught a good lesson if they make inroads into our territory or if they deal lightly with the lives and properties of our people. Sir, look at the arrangements they are making. If they do not stop at this, if they continue carrying on their depredations, I believe the only course that will be left to our Government will be to use force, and it will not be wrong because the whole world knows that we have waited with patience and waited consistent with the principles we have followed all along.

Since there is no time as the Prime Minister is to give his reply at 4, I will make one submission to the Prime Minister. These days there has been in the papers some leakage about the request of the United Nations authorities in the Congo to the Government of India to send planes. That request was also made to Great Britain. But Great Britain seems to have been offended at something that happened—whether that letter was not revealed to them or something of the sort—and it is in the papers that the B.B.C. has commented unfavourably against India. I do not know the full facts and I would request the Prime Minister to give the correct position.

4 P.M.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in the course of the last few hours, a large number of points have been touched upon. I shall endeavour to refer to them and give such information as is in my possession with regard to these various points. First of all, we will take up Goa, which has attracted the attention of most of the speakers today, as is natural. Not that Goa, as I have previously repeated, is a bigger problem than others that we face; for instance, our border problem in the north-east is a far bigger and a more important problem. Goa is, relatively speaking, a much smaller problem, and I doubt if anyone anywhere including Portugal ever thought that Goa could continue indefinitely under the Portuguese sovereignty. It was a question of time as every one realised. Probably, some Members may be right in saying that we gave too much time and were too patient but in matters involving military steps, so far as I am concerned and my Government is concerned, we are reluctant. All our conditioning, all our policy, has made us to be reluctant to take such steps. Not that there is any such question of high principles but it would not have fitted in with what we have often said about these questions, of settling problems by military means. Therefore, we were reluctant. But ultimately the situation became such that I have hinted at some of the factors which went into our thinking. Finally it was what happened in Goa itself but also other factors came in which compelled us, first of all, to take up the broad position in this matter that we could not rule out military measures in order to deal with this problem. Subsequently other things happened and recently quite a number of provocative steps have been taken by the Portuguese which have made it clear that some more effective ways have to be found by us in dealing with the situation. It was when this became clear to us that we gave directions to prepare for any possi-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]  
bility, to meet any possible emergencies that might arise, and forces were sent, some forces, and other steps were taken.

One hon. Member on the opposite side complained of the upset in railway trains, etc., because these forces were sent there. At the same time he wanted us to take action militarily. Now, these two things do not quite fit in. One cannot move special railway trains with forces, with weapons, quietly in the dead of night or without interfering with normal traffic for a few days. We did not want to advertise this fact. It became quite inevitable to cause some inconvenience for a few days, which is over now, some days ago. So, we took steps to that end, to be prepared for any action, and in preparing for it, one has to take into consideration all kinds of possibilities.

It is true that Goa is a small place, and compared to the strength of India, it does not count for much. But even a small problem has its many aspects, which make it bigger than it looks. Therefore, preparations have to be made to meet such a contingency arising. Even in Goa itself, the Portuguese have largely added to their armed forces, have brought some ships along too; got, I believe, some aircraft—where they got them from, I do not quite know—mined; and what is really extraordinary is their—deliberately or for some other reason—functioning in a most provocative way as if they just wanted us to take steps against them.

Just one instance I will point out to you, a fairly recent one, which appeared partly in the press. There is a place called Terekhol on the Goan side of the border, a mile and a half away. On the 7th December, that is four days ago, some Portuguese soldiers came there and turned the people out of their houses, presumably because they wanted to occupy them, themselves being near the border. Whatever it was, these poor

people, about 150 in number, were just turned out. They did not know where to go. They expressed a wish to come to India, that is, they felt like coming to India, and they sent word to the villagers on the other side of the border—it is only half a mile this side—asking them if they could come over. The villagers said, 'Yes, certainly you come. We welcome you'. Now, learning of this move, some Portuguese soldiers who had established themselves there, actually crossed our border, just a little bit, started firing right and left and exploded bombs just to frighten people. They made a lot of loud noise. Thereafter, some of our police forces there, guards, fired back and wounded one of the Portuguese soldiers who then retired in a hurry. Then on the 9th night, that is, 9-10th night, the Portuguese soldiery came back and arrested all the villagers—one hundred and fifty—of Terekhol on their side, and what is more, they again crossed our border slightly and started firing machine-guns—again, I take it, to make such a noise and generally to frighten the people that they were punishing the Terekhol villagers whom they arrested for having thought of coming over to India—and they were trying to frighten our people on this border for having agreed to do that. I presume so. Again, I gather that last night or early this morning, there was some firing also by the Portuguese at a check-post of ours somewhere nearby. It is quite extraordinary. All this has not resulted in any heavy casualties anyway but it has created some kind of an excitement on the border as it must. So, the position is one which is becoming more and more aggravated and when we are asked to protect these people, it is not right or proper for us to deny them our protection.

Another thing I might mention to the House that yesterday—so our information goes—the Overseas Minister in the Portuguese Government came to Goa and under pressure of events apparently he is going about

making fairly large promises of some kind of autonomy that Portugal is prepared to give to Goa which they have thought of at no time previously. I do not know what this autonomy means. I believe the phrase used is 'frozen autonomy'. Whatever that might mean, I do not understand it. But whatever it may mean, it seems to be very frozen indeed. It is obvious that the time has gone by for this kind of talk and nobody can possibly put their trust in them. But it is meant possibly to influence people in Goa or the Goans even outside Goa, in Bombay possibly, chiefly people in Goa, because people in Goa have been getting more and more distressed and unhappy about the conditions there and have been hoping that the Portuguese would depart. So, possibly, it is meant for that but, as I said, the time has long gone by for this kind of vague talk. The only thing that really will go towards a solution of this problem is for the Portuguese administration itself to depart. I entirely agree with what Dr. Kunzru has said. It is not a question of our imposing ourselves on the people of Goa; it is the wishes of the people of Goa that should be uppermost. Quite apart from that, one thing we have always said and we attach importance to is that there should be no foreign out-posts on any corner of India, on the territory of India because that brings all kinds of complications and dangers to us. That we cannot tolerate. And, therefore, Portuguese domination cannot, in our opinion, continue there anyhow. For the rest, it is for the people of Goa and our Government and others to consider what steps should be taken for the future.

Now, I think it was Mr. Gurupada Swamy, who in a very eloquent speech demanded that I should tell him exactly what we were going to do, when we were going to do and in what manner we were going to do. If that is his idea of carrying on the Government and military operations, I regret to say that it is not mine. It

is a most extraordinary proposition, approach to make to a complicated problem like this.

Here is an extraordinary fact to which, I suppose, the hon. Members' attention may be drawn at the present moment. If one reads the newspapers in Pakistan, they are supporting both Portugal and China as against India. It is an extraordinary thing that a country like Pakistan, tied up with all kinds of military alliances—presumably against China these alliances are—should support China when the question of India comes up. On the other hand, Pakistan together with other countries have openly declared and very stoutly declared that they are against colonialism and imperialism, yet they support Portugal and call India an imperialist Power trying to impose its will on Portugal maybe on China too presumably. It shows how there is only one base for Pakistan's policy. That base is just dislike, or call it hatred of India. Everything else is secondary, minor, and everything that they think will help them in their propaganda or action against India is accepted by them regardless of their other policies whatever they might be. It really is quite extraordinary, this kind of, what shall I say, attitude, which has no basis in policy or principle. So, all these things have to be kept in mind. I need not spell out all these matters, but we have taken steps, we are taking steps to be ready for these emergencies, and unless the situation improves out of recognition, I fear that we shall have to give effect to the step that we have had in mind.

One thing I should like to say. It really has deeply pained me and surprised me, this kind of charge which some eminent leaders have made that we have sort of cooked up the Goa issue because elections are coming. Apart from complete lack of intelligence that that shows in a Government if you do that, I hope, however foolish occasionally we might have been, we do not wholly lack intelli-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

gence. I suggest it would be a monstrous perversity for anybody who says so and it shows how this kind of election and electioneering and political thinking can pervert and upset the people's minds and make them incapable of straight thinking. How can you conceive of it? Is it a pleasure to me or my colleagues, with all the tremendous normal burdens we carry, with the elections coming, to add to burdens, difficulties and problems manifestly, we would have done away with? Let it come at some other time when we have a little leisure to deal with it but there is no choice in spite of us and against all our thinking on the subject.

Now, meanwhile, as I said, there has been a good deal of mining round about Goa which is a very dangerous thing for our normal shipping even, and land-mines, of course, also.

Then I forgot, one hon. Member, I think probably Dr. Kunzru, asked me about some reference of mine to mediation about Goa. Perhaps, I went a little further than I ought to have done when I talked about this matter in the sense that there was no formal offer of mediation from anybody. Some news items have appeared in the newspapers, that is, good offices being offered, not to us directly but in the air.

PROF. M. B. LAL: Sir. I beg to submit that there is difference between good offices and mediation.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Of course, there is, but one thing may grow into the other, may lead to the other. There was vague talk by one or two countries. It is too vague for me to define it, but it tends to say if they could help they would try to help and it was just given on that occasion when I mentioned this. But I want to make it perfectly clear that there has been no such offer and no progress has been made in that respect anywhere. And anyhow, I do not myself see how such an offer could be

helpful except in the sense that it can induce the Portuguese Government to vacate Goa. Then, of course, we welcome it gladly.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Sir, some correspondence has passed through the U.A.R. Can we expect some reply through that agency?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Correspondence between whom and to whom?

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Regarding Goa. It appeared in newspapers also.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not aware of that correspondence at all. I do not know.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Correspondence through the U.A.R.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am telling you I am not aware of any correspondence on that subject. I do not know what the newspapers have written about it. The U.A.R. are dealing with our interests in Portugal. So, sometimes all kinds of formal correspondence goes on, some kind of formal protests about some incidents, their reply to the protests and our reply. But I am not aware of any important thing relating to the present position.

Then, Sir, someone from this side—Mr. Anwar, I think—talked about the possibility of the general elections being postponed. Well, I can assure him and assure this House that no such idea has struck in our minds and we have every intention of going on with the general elections.

There are a number of other points. But before I deal with them, there is one other matter. I think somebody referred to what I said in New York at a T.V. interview, I think, about—as the hon. Member said—Soviet colonialism. Now, I should like to remove any misunderstanding on that

subject. I was asked a question as to why I did not condemn colonialism in the East European countries as I condemned imperialism and colonialism elsewhere. My reply was that to use the word "colonialism" in that respect was completely wrong, had no basis. Colonialism is a specific word which describes a specific type of government, of foreign domination plus economic exploitation. It grew up largely in the 19th century. Therefore, to apply that would be completely wrong. But I said there may be—I did not mention any country but I was dealing with a general proposition—some kind of domination or pressures which may be undesirable, if you like, but to call it colonialism was too wrong. That was my reply. Now, apparently—I do not know how it appeared, in what form it appeared—the hon. Member, who spoke about it, has been misled by that into thinking that I said something else.

Dr. Kunzru referred to the Congo situation and gave a brief account of what has happened there to which I have little to add and he criticised the policy of the U.K. and said that it was facing two ways. Perhaps, hon. Members may remember that when we discussed the situation in the Congo previously some months ago, I said that the difficulties that were there were difficulties not so much caused by the situation there but by the fact that some important Powers were not supporting the U.N. there. That was the main reason why the U.N. had got itself entangled there and it could not carry out its own resolutions. Partly it is was that reason which led to Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal's ultimate withdrawal from there, his resignation and withdrawal. Now that fact has come out even more blatantly by the recent statements made by the two eminent Irishmen who were serving there, in a civil and in a military capacity both, and that has pursued us throughout, this business of coming to a decision in the Security Council and then not acting up to that decision or trying to undermine that very decision for which one had vot-

ed. It is very unfortunate but there it is. That, to some extent, may be said to apply not only to the Congo situation but to the Goan situation also, only to this extent—I am not hinting at the fact that somebody is doing something—but this thinking in two directions at the same time, realising that what the Portuguese have done in Angola especially, to some extent in Goa, is all wrong or saying that Goa must, of course, ultimately come to India and Portuguese colonialism must end but nevertheless also expressing the hope that nothing should be done to disturb the things as they are and allowing them to develop and then gradually, like a ripe apple, it will fall into your lap. Here are straightforward issues, whether it is Goa or Angola. Angola has attracted more attention because there has been a regular massacre there, genocide or call it what you like. It is something horrible. Because of this, some countries, like the U.S.A., have either openly condemned this and voted against it in the U.N. but some other countries, even now, have abstained from doing so and sometimes even voted for Portugal.

Dr. Kunzru talked about Laos. What happened now in Laos was—whether it was Laos or Viet Nam or Cambodia—the basic decision arrived at by the Geneva Conference seven years ago was that their future lay only in their adopting an attitude of what is called neutrality, that is, not trying to tie up with any military bloc. That was obviously so because the moment any big military bloc came in, the other came in too and they fought and destroyed the country they were fighting for, fighting in rather. It is obvious. This succeeded largely, this policy, in Cambodia because the leaders of Cambodia were popular enough and strong enough to stick to this policy and not allow too much interference from outside. In Laos after many many difficulties, it seemed to be succeeding about two years ago when pressure was brought on the Control Commission, of which

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

India was Chairman, to disband or end itself and go away. The pressure actually was brought by the then Government of which the Prime Minister was Souvanna Phouma, the so-called neutral leader today. Whether they use 'neutral' or not, I do not know but anyhow he brought it and presumably he himself was under pressure from others to bring it. We felt that that was a dangerous move because these Commissions, I think, without doing anything spectacular, have been performing very important service and holding or preventing the position from deteriorating whether in Viet Nam or here. So we pointed this out, but obviously we could not continue if the Government of the country did not want us to continue. Ultimately it was agreed that the Commission should not be wound up but should adjourn indefinitely and be called back when need arose. Now it is odd—or rather it is not odd, it seemed to us natural—the moment the Commission came away, the situation in Laos started deteriorating. There was no connecting link left between the conflicting forces and this went on till it arrived at the stage of a crisis. There were *coup d'état*, there and another Government came in but by a *coup d'état* not by the regular course of events, and from the north the Pathet Lao forces marched down and all that happened. Ultimately the only way out was to get back the Commission and the Commission was sent for again and after some weeks or months of discussion, the Commission went back and naturally we went back—the Indian Chairman went back—with the Commission. At about the same time, the new Geneva Conference was held and they have been carrying on now for months and months. The people who went there in the hope of spending 2 or 3 weeks there have been there for 4 or 5 months. While I passed through Geneva, I met the leaders of the principal delegations, the American delegation, the British, the Soviet, the Indian and one or two others and they all complained and

said: 'We had come here for the Conference and we are here for a few months and it goes on and on'. Anyhow they were all of the opinion that so far as their work in the Conference was concerned, it was rapidly coming to a successful end and only minor points were left and now the next steps to be taken were in Laos itself. In fact that also had been agreed to at the previous meeting of the three Princes. They met at Zurich once and subsequently elsewhere. It had been settled first of all that Laos should definitely follow a neutral policy and not be tied up with any country, secondly, it should have a National Government, that is representing the various forces there; thirdly, that Souvanna Phouma should be the Prime Minister. One would have thought that this was a clear enough decision and the rest would be easy but for months what has happened is that attempts are being made to get the three Princes together to meet in that little country of Laos to decide on the composition of the government, the Prime Minister having been settled upon. Another step was taken I think—and I am not quite sure of the number I am mentioning but I think I am right—that is, a government of 16—4 of one party, 4 of another and 8 of the so-called neutral group. That too was settled. Now all that remained was to pick out people for the composition of this 16-member government. They have not succeeded for months. Apart from not succeeding, they have not been able to meet to consider this question. It is obvious from this that some people or one of the Princes is coming in the way of that meeting. He just does not want to meet so that this might be considered, with the grave possibility of the whole thing breaking down after all these months and months of labour, breaking down and then of course, after that, they revert to military way of settling it, that is, the armies marching against each other and then whatever may happen happens. That would be unfortunate, because the amount of labour that has been put in by the foreign countries



at the Geneva Conference on Laos has been tremendous. Dr. Kunzru asked: What is our Commission there doing? Well, our Commission for Laos has been trying its utmost to get these people together, trying to get the three Princes together and to meet and do the other things that arise in this connection, because at the present moment, by and large, things have been peaceful, I mean, there has been no fighting. Maybe there are petty incidents here and there, but there is no major fighting. The Commission's job is to get a government established. It is not their direct job, but being there, they want to try to help them. Therefore, they travel and go up and down, sometimes going to this Prince and sometimes to the other and trying to induce them to meet. I think there is now some little hope that they might agree; but I am not at all sure that they will do so. As for South Viet Nam . . .

**PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU:** Is the International Control Commission free to move about and work in the same way as it could, before the adjournment two years ago?

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** I could not give a very precise answer to that question. But the difficulty is not lack of freedom of movement, but the lack of transport. When they want to go about, they want transport and they have to go by air and that transport is not there. So the difficulty comes in. And therefore, they are not able to go. I have not heard of any impediments to their movement.

**PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU:** Is it not a fact that some months ago they were prevented from going to certain areas?

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** Yes, I think some months back that did happen. Also there was another difficulty. When the Princes met or when some consultations took place, one of them wanted them to be present and they were agreeable, but the other side said, "No" and said it will

not allow them to come and have consultations. So these difficulties have arisen.

**SHRI SATYACHARAN:** Why are the three Princes not meeting together? What are the precise forces acting against them?

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** The three Princes, although they are cousins and half-brothers, as sometimes happens in the case of cousins and half-brothers, are very much opposed to each other. Apart from that, they represent three completely separate forces. The nominal government that is continuing is that of Boun Oum, but the man behind him is Gen. Phoumi Nosavan. They represent, broadly, conservative forces there. On the other side there is Souvanna Phouma, who was Prime Minister two years ago and who is the proposed Prime Minister. He is the neutral Prince, supposed to be neutral. Then there is the third one—Souphanouvong—I hope I am right. And he represents the Pathet Lao. Now, the Pathet Lao are the continuing resistance force. They resisted the French and to some extent, the Japanese also. In the old days when they were resisting the Japanese, they were helped by their allies. Then they were expecting freedom after the war. In fact, the French had been sent out by the Japanese. But the French came back and I regret to say that they were helped in getting back, by the Indian army, I mean the British then used the Indian army to help the French to come back to South-East Asia. And then started the war, the internal struggle for independence and the Pathet Lao took the most prominent part. Now, the Pathet Lao were a mixed lot. They were nationals struggling. They were fighting. But there was a fair mixture among them of local Communists. How they became as such, I don't know. In the circumstances they got help from wherever they could and probably from China they got help. So the Pathet Lao is supposed to represent the pro-Communist element there.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

They are not all Communists. Of the other two, as I said, one is neutral and the other is conservative.

Now, with regard to South Viet Nam, there also the same story was repeated, of resistance forces which resisted the French remaining over. It is a body continuing the resistance, not in South Viet Nam,—it was captured by the French—but in North Viet Nam. Ultimately, it led to the victory of North Viet Nam or Viet Minh over the French. You may remember the famous surrender at Dien Bien Phu, some seven or eight years ago. It was as a result of that surrender that the Geneva Conference of 1954 was held and these agreements were made. There also essentially they were a nationalist force fighting for freedom, but with a considerable mixture of Communist element. Their leader was Ho Chi Minh, who is the President now. He is undoubtedly Communist. He came to India, as you remember. At the same time, he has been considered by South Viet Nam—by north and south—as a great nationalist leader also. He is very popular not only among the Communists, but among others also as a national leader. Therefore, all these complicating factors are there. When the Geneva Agreement was signed, it was with the French and South Viet Nam Government, which was the successor-government in the South, took up the position that they were not bound by the Geneva Agreement or by this Commission, and they did not co-operate with the Commission. They did not turn them out, but they treated them rather badly, or rather they allowed them to be treated badly. Once or twice crowds came and looted the property of the Commission and some Commissioners were given a beating and all that. That was several years ago. After that, they settled down, tolerating the Commission, not really co-operating, but they tolerated it. There is no doubt that the fact of the Commission being there has helped, to some extent, in keeping the peace and seeing

anyhow that the situation did not worsen.

Today, I suppose there are troubles occurring on both sides and the Commission has plenty of complaints and each side accuses the other. On the Viet Minh, that is to say, on the North Viet Nam side, the position they take up is this. They say, we are not creating trouble. It is the local people who are against their Government; and I think there is a good deal of truth in it. They are not a large armed force, they are a guerilla force with arms. Maybe as Dr. Kunzru said, they are helped to arm themselves, maybe from the north. We cannot definitely say. It may well be. In the South, that is to say, in South Viet Nam, the people have definitely and openly been armed by the American forces. There used to be a French force there. It was left there even according to the Geneva Agreement. But they ultimately went away. They refused to stay on and some American forces came in. And this is one of the complaints of the North, that they should not have been replaced by others. So it is a highly complicated situation with which we cannot easily deal. The Commission did not have much authority to deal with it or much co-operation. We suggested that the first step to be taken was for the Commission to function properly and that they should get authority and also co-operation from both these Governments. The other thing is—and it was hinted at by Dr. Kunzru—the proper structure for the Government in South Viet Nam. It is too narrow, too rigid. It is rather difficult for me to go into all the details, because we are the Chairman of this Commission and as such many things come to our knowledge which it is best that we keep to ourselves, and we have to.

Now, Dr. Kunzru referred to the Immigration Bill in the United Kingdom. So far as this Immigration Bill is concerned, the draft that did come to us later is so general and vague; there are no details in it. It really is

giving authority to whoever the officers might be to stop anybody from coming, offending against the rules. It is said that in practice it is likely to be applied to people of colour. The biggest country which sends the biggest number of immigrants to the United Kingdom has been the West Indies. India and Pakistan have sent some. In fact we have tried to limit them. We definitely do not want our people to go there, more specially many of these people who do not know any language except normally Punjabi, and that is not of much help in England, and who are not acquainted with any custom, anything there, but because of their demand for labour there, they get good wages and they are employed. Then, social problems are created. We did not like this. So, we have been discouraging them and, as the House probably knows, on this question of these people going—they were so anxious to do so—the lure was so great that they used to pay thousands of rupees to people for forged passports. It was Rs. 8,000]—in one case. So, so far as we are concerned, we limited this very greatly and, in fact, in the last year or two there have not been many. The figures are fairly big still but those figures include the students who, of course, are *bona fide* people and they anyhow go there, and some other *bona fide* persons. But the real immigrants who want to go there to get some business have gone down very much so far as India is concerned—I do not know about Pakistan. But the West Indies still sends a large number of people, and it is true that, if you go to London now, you see these West Africans or Indians in large numbers all over London, and you can hardly go anywhere without seeing a few round about. So, our position in regard to this Immigration Bill broadly has been that we do not want to encourage our people to go there, but any step taken based on colour, whether in theory or even in practice, we object to, and as you know, it is not we only, but some other countries in the Commonwealth have taken strong exception to this. And there was the

question of the Irish immigrants. Now, the Irish people cannot be kept out on the basis of colour. That is one reason, I think, why there is no definition of who is to be kept out except that he should have a certificate of employment, or some such thing. But there is a strong demand in England from certain more or less conservative groups that the Irish be also eliminated from coming. Others opposed this very much. So, the position now is not a clear one, because the opposition to this Immigration Bill, even from the official Government Party there, is considerable, apart from the Opposition parties.

Now just one word about Nepal. Well, when we heard about the Lhasa-Nepal road, well, we did not like it; it opened out possibilities which were not desirable, apart from everything else, from the point of view of smuggling goods from India *via* Nepal to Tibet, goods we had forbidden the export of but which could go to Nepal.

We pointed this out to the Nepal Government, and there the matter stands. We cannot order them about in this matter, but to say that they have not consulted us is partly true and partly not so; that is, from time to time, they talk generally about these matters, but about these specific matters there was no reference to us, and as the hon. Member who spoke about this matter said, there has been a good deal of anti-Indian propaganda in Nepal.

Now, I come lastly to the China border . . .

SHRI SATYACHARAN: Whart about the Nepal-China Agreement?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Pardon.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: The Nepal-China Non-Aggression Pact.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Well, I just referred to this. They have a Non-Aggression Pact. They have a right to enter into an agreement about their border, about various

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

things. We did not like some parts of that Agreement and we pointed this out to them. But you must remember that we cannot bring extreme pressure to bear on these neighbouring countries of ours on something. Take Burma with whom we are very friendly, and they do not want to do anything which might injure our interests, and they try. But they are also keen on getting what they want themselves, apart from our interests. Now we cannot go out of the way and tell them: "You must not do this; you must not gain something to your advantage because something else is to our disadvantage." It is a difficult position to take up. We do not want to take up that position. Our questions did not arise at all there except in regard to a corner of the frontier, where the three countries are supposed to meet. We pointed this out to Burma at an earlier stage, and they kept it in mind, and they did not agree with the Chinese proposition, but ultimately they agreed not to what the Chinese said, but in a sense to keep this matter open, and they told them that this would be settled when there is an agreement between India and China about that issue, on the lines of that. So, the Burmese Government went a good deal and tried their best to meet our position and our wishes in this matter. But there is one point I should like to put before you, that both the Nepalese and the Burmese border agreements are based on the border being the crest of the Himalayas. Now, that is one of the principal points that we raised in determining our border, that it should be the water-shed or the crest of the Himalayas. Even the MacMahon Line was based on that principle. Therefore, to that extent the Burmese and the Nepalese border agreements with China have laid down a principle, which we have upheld all this time and which, if applied to the China-India border, would solve most of the argument, not entirely, but most of it. So, in that sense those agreements are helpful to us.

Then Mr. Jaswant Singh, talking about the China border, repeated something about 'Not an inch should be given up.' I have no particular recollection of having used that expression 'not an inch', but I may have done so. I know many speeches I have delivered but I have no recollection of having said so, because it is a rhetorical phrase which has no particular meaning except that we want to resist, we will not allow them. And for me to guarantee this kind of thing would be absurd. I can only guarantee one thing, that we object to some thing happening and we shall resist it; more than that I cannot say in a border like this, a 2000 mile border, where somebody may take a step forward, where neither they can stop us, nor we can stop them, but broadly speaking, it is so that we do not wish to allow them to come at all, and we want to stop that. Now, what happens, what has actually happened, is that a few soldiers may creep in somewhere and put up some kind of camp there, not a camp strictly—they normally dig a kind of—well—an underground shelter and go there and a few more come. It seemed difficult to stop them. We cannot stop them; we cannot police all the broad plains of Ladakh. They can come in there. It is only when they build something, a structure there, that it becomes apparent that they have built up something. And in regard to the three posts that I had mentioned previously, one near the Karakoram and two down south in Ladakh near the international border, now, of the two proposed down south they have repudiated one; they said: "We had not been there." Our own information is that they did go there but they have withdrawn from there, from that particular post. But they say they have not been there. They also say they have withdrawn from one or two other posts near Nyagzu. We objected to those two posts not because they come in our territory—they may just come a few hundred yards; it is not quite clear—but because—even if they have done it on the border or within the border we

objected to it—they had put up a new post when they had said they would not; but the other post in the north—but not far from the Karakoram—was a very definite post within our territory and therefore it has certain importance although it was in a sense overshadowed; not overshadowed but nearby was one of our major posts nearer the Karakoram to prevent any turning movement from there.

Mr. Jawant Singh asked me, 'Have our forces orders to resist or not?' Certainly, they have orders to resist completely. Somebody had said—I think Acharya Kripalani in a public speech said or may be in Parliament—that definitely to his knowledge we had ordered them not to fire unless fired upon. Well, that is not correct. You must distinguish between a post that we have or a fighting group that we send and a reconnaissance party that we send. If we send a reconnaissance party, it is not to fight but to find out. They are small parties or small groups of five to six men; they find out and inform us of what the position is. We are constantly sending out such parties. If you read the Chinese letters, they are always complaining that we are doing it. The difficulty is that what we do we do not give much publicity to it. It is not proper; it helps the other side. What the other side does gets more publicity than what we do. If we send out reconnaissance parties, it has nothing to do with the Chinese border. It is the normal rule that the reconnaissance party finds out and does not get entangled; otherwise we would not know what is happening. If we want to fight, we send a fighting party. Of course, if they are interfered with, they have to fight but in self-defence. The reconnaissance parties normally do not fight; they gather information, come back quickly and then report. Then one takes steps, whatever steps may be necessary. But it is quite wrong to say that they have orders not to fire or not to resist.

Then there was a question about shooting down aircraft which come here. We have orders that aircraft should be shot down but it is not very easy to shoot them down. These aircraft that are talked about cross—they have often crossed—a tiny stretch of our eastern border with Burma. Between Burma and Tibet there is a little bit of Indian border. Now, the Chinese authorities have maintained that they are not their aircraft and have told us to shoot them down. It is very difficult for us to find out whose aircraft they are. They are very high, sometimes above the clouds. We only have a glimpse and off it goes across; it is a small area. But some months back one of these aircraft got into trouble and was brought down near our border but by the Burmese in their territory. It turned out to be a Formosan aircraft going towards Tibet. Whether the others are also from Formosa or not, I do not know but this particular one was from Formosa. There was no doubt about it because it fell down. There is absolutely no question of our being soft to any aircraft that flies on our territory; it is our business to shoot it down if we can catch it but it is not always easy to catch it. If it is caught it should be brought down.

Mr. Gurupada Swamy referred to a map appearing in the October 1961 issue of the National Geographical Magazine. I am informed that there is no such map in this issue at all. But in the September issue—a month before—of the magazine there was a map and it showed our boundary line correctly according to us.

Dr. Kunzru referred to various factors or some hon. Member referred any way to ....

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: May I just point out that in the issue of October 1961 on page 540 there is the map?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I shall look it up again. I just got a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]  
note to this effect. I have not myself seen it. About these maps appearing at various places, we draw attention to these matters but it is very difficult for us to control all kinds of publishing houses in the world. In India we can and do but outside it is very difficult. We can draw their attention to any mistakes made.

Some hon. Member mentioned about the U. K. Government generally showing favour to Portugal, the Foreign Minister of the U. K. visiting Lisbon, some naval ships visiting the Portuguese ports and so on. That is a fact; it created an unhappy impression not only here but in some quarters in England.

I should like largely to associate myself with what Dr. Kunzru said about Rhodesia. One of the African leaders who has impressed me most by his general peaceful attitude was Mr. Kaunda. He is a fine man. He went to England some months back. These people imagined that Africans were a sort of uncivilised people and barbarians and they were astonished to find a very highly civilized, decent, quiet individual inclined rather to Gandhism than to anything else. Here was this man who had kept the people of Northern Rhodesia quiet and disciplined and what they do is to prevent him from going there. And immediately there is trouble there. He asked to go back to deal with the trouble but he was not allowed to go. Obviously, Northern or Southern Rhodesia cannot continue as some kind of offshoots of the Union of South Africa.

So far as the policy is concerned, I believe to the best of my knowledge I have said something about the matters referred to. Maybe I have forgotten something but I hope that Members will forgive me if I have lost count of some matter.

Anyhow it is clear that we are facing rather critical situations but that

does not mean—and I do not agree with some hon. Member who said that—because they are difficult situations therefore we must keep our mouths closed and eyes shut. That is not how a democratic country functions. That is perfectly true but at the same time a difficult international situation has to be met with a measure of unanimity and joint functioning, and I would like all hon. Members here to feel that and not to exploit the position from the election or any other point of view. I am referring not to the Opposition only but to all parties in this House because it is undoubtedly a difficult situation. We need not get excited or worked up about it. In fact, when one has to face a difficult situation, it is all the more reason why we should be quite about it and work without an excess of passion even though we may feel strongly. The strength we may have should be converted into action and cool thinking rather than merely excited slogans and the like.

It is a difficult situation, 5 P.M. there is no doubt about it, difficult not because of one particular matter, but the total picture. It is not only a difficult situation because of this and that here, but because of the world situation. Every country in the world, including the biggest countries, has to face very difficult situations. There is no country more powerful, more wealthy than the United States of America, but it is facing very difficult situations, if I may say so with respect, some because it has undertaken those burdens itself and some because of the position they have come to occupy. They cannot escape them.

There is one small matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. It is a significant development which took place, the news of which came, I think, in this morning's papers, that is, the Soviet Union Government breaking off relations with Albania. Now, Albania is a very tiny country and the Soviet Union is a huge, very powerful country. It may normally mean nothing

much, except that this is the pressure of the Soviet Union. But in the peculiar context of things that we have had it does mean a great deal. I do not wish to spell all these out. Hon. Members must realise it does not mean a very big shift in world positions and internal relations between the great countries. So, all these changes are happening and those of us or those people who take up rigid attitudes and imagine that the world is a rigid world of blocs, this and that and who cannot get out of this rigidity forget that in spite of these so-called isms and all that, the situation is a flexible one and a changing one. It cannot be described as something we seek to describe as a solid bloc of imperialists and colonialists sitting on one side and a solid bloc of communists sitting on the other. It is not so. Although there is an element of truth in that, it is not so really and in such a position there is a great deal of room for understanding and maybe even affecting the course of events sometimes.

Dr. Kunzru and some others referred to my visit to the United States. Well, according to the Chinese press and Chinese leaders what we are doing here, many things, are due to the fact that we received orders from the United States Government to do them here. That is the way, it really surprises me, how this peculiar type of rigid mentality works. They cannot understand anything except in those grooves of thought that they are accustomed to. The language they use is such that, apart from the content of the language, having some pleasure in the use of language myself, it pains me to be thrown the same words again and again at me. The same phrases the same words, they have lost all meaning by staleness of use. So, they think as if the attitude we are taking up in regard to Goa is by orders from the State Department of America. Now, this is the attitude they take. The attitude we take about the border issue, is again 'supported by America.' Maybe supported by Ame-

rica—I do not know. In fact, it is rather odd that the United States Government has said very little about our China border issue. One or two persons have said it broadly, but on the whole they have not said much. In this connection, we are naturally interested, and I am not saying this as a debating point, in the attitude of the Communist Party of this country, which has been in some mental difficulty to adjust itself to these changing situations, and I have no doubt even in greater difficulty, now that this action has been taken by the Soviet Union against the Albanian Government. The fact is that the moment you tie yourself up with these cold war rigid attitudes, you slightly get out of touch with the living, throbbing changing world situation. We must have some basis, of course some principles on which we act. Each country has to think of its interests, its integrity, and so on. That is the first charge of any Government of a country. That is true. But together with that you have to see this world situation and not merely talk in terms of settling every problem quickly by some lathi way or the like, because lathi is out of fashion now. We live in an age of atom bombs. We do not possess it and we do not intend to have it. Nevertheless, the whole context of things has changed.

If I may go off to another aspect of this broad question, take the various economic ideologies which are so powerful today and which take the place of religious creeds and dogmas of the past. They excite the same passion. I have often wondered how far an economic ideology developed in the pre-industrial age would apply to the industrial age. I think it cannot, because the whole structure of economics changes. Now, to draw this analogy a little further—an economic ideology built up in the early industrial age, how far does it apply to the later one and how far do all these things apply in the atomic age and the jet age. After all ideologies

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

depend on all manner of factors. If these factors are changing, the application of those must also change. Yes, broad principles must remain. Broad principles should remain. Take even the fact, one of the most powerful factors in the development of human thought in Europe was the French Revolution. Now, when the French Revolution came with its thundering, tremendous noise and something, that on the one side frightened a number of people thoroughly. On the other hand, it was the light of dawn to millions and millions of people and even in our youth, speaking for myself, when as a boy I used to read about the French Revolution, I used to be very excited and very pleased—not with every act of the revolutionaries, but still generally speaking. Now, the French Revolution there was based entirely on the cry of 'Liberty, equality and fraternity'. Very good cries, but all those had no economic content. It was a political slogan and, of course, it was against landlords and the like. Although even at the time of the French Revolution the Industrial Revolution had begun, no one in the French Revolution thought of the Industrial Revolution. It was not apparent, although it was taking place in England. That is not surprising. But what is surprising is that fifty years later, or more than fifty years later even as long after 1848, which is often called in Europe the year of revolutions, because all over Europe revolutions took place, the Industrial Revolution had advanced adequately. But all those revolutions in Europe in 1848 were based on the French Revolution of fifty years previously. People had not caught up ideologically to the changes in the physical environment, which the Industrial Revolution was bringing about. It shows how there is a gap always between our thinking and all that when facts are changing. Now, we are living in an age of extreme rapidity in which changes take place. Technological changes, technical changes and scientific chan-

ges affect our lives, which affect our productive processes, which, again, affect the society in which we live and which must, therefore, affect our thinking in terms of social and economic problems. It seems to me obvious. Therefore, rigidity is one thing, to incline one way. I am inclined very powerfully, if I may say so, to the broad socialist appeal, to the fact that human beings should have equal chances, there should not be big differences and all that. That is one thing, a broad principle, which I think is inevitable and which is affecting the whole world. It is obvious today that capitalism, even though it still maintains the basic ideas of capitalism, is very very different from the 19th century capitalism. They all change. Social thinking is becoming a common factor all over the world whatever your party may be. So applying that to the political changes and others, we have to be wide awake. We have to be flexible. We have to stick to certain principles, certain ethical principles, and we have to stick to the interest, integrity and progress of our country and judge problems accordingly, and not like Sir Galahad or some people rush about lance in hand at anything we do not like. There are so many things in the world which I suppose many people do not like. No one likes everything, but one has to put up with many things till we can change them.

I am sorry, Sir, I have gone beyond the foreign affairs debate. May I say, Sir, that the amendment moved by Mr. Pathak is agreeable to me? I am prepared to accept it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

\*Amendment No. 2 was, by leave withdrawn.

\*For text of amendment, see col. 1779 supra.



MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the Government of India should take immediate armed action for the expulsion of the Portuguese from Goa, Daman and Diu so that these territories become part of the Republic of India before the next Republic Day'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

1. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy.'"

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will now put the amended motion to the vote. The question is:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twelve minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 12th December 1961.