

DR. R. B. GOUR: No, Sir, we did not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never objected.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Why should he take everything as if it is my reply to him? He need not be so egocentric. Anyhow, the objection was taken that while here my colleague, the Home Minister, said that this matter was too delicate, etc., yet I spoke there on it. As a matter of fact, if the hon. Member has seen what I have said there, they were certain general remarks which did not contain any fresh information. If there is any fresh information, undoubtedly we shall place it before this House and it may be that in the course of a day or two I might even make a statement and if it contains nothing else, I might place the letters that have been exchanged by me with those who are fasting and their colleagues, so that it will at least give some information. I have nothing new. Newspapers are apt to dramatise these matters and to give somewhat exaggerated versions of what might be happening. As a matter of fact, nothing very definite or particular has happened except that unfortunately to my thinking Master Tara Singh there and Swamy Rameshwaranand here are fasting and fasting more or less against each other. I confess, Sir, that Government has not found a way yet of preventing people from fasting, except by methods which I deplore.

#### MOTION REGARDING INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Gov-

ernment of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

A discussion on the international situation usually means making a list of the trouble spots of the world which are affecting or disturbing world peace. Secondly, it means our own trouble spots, India's, as affecting India especially. Now, undoubtedly the major trouble spot or area of the world today which has a very intimate relation to the possibility of war or the continuance of peace is Central Europe or the question of Germany or, in a more limited sense, the question of West Berlin and East Germany. All this indicates how sixteen years after the last big war ended the consequences of that war are pursuing us still. After a while, these consequences took a different form. The allies of the war changed sides or parted company and new groupings took place and now we find that the allies of that time are the bitter opponents today in the cold war. Now one could go into these numerous declarations, protocols and other ways in which nations deal with each other, which various countries, more especially the great powers concerned, have agreed to in the course of the last fifteen years or so, more than fifteen years—in fact, the story begins in 1942 and subsequently. One can examine them in a legal sense and come to some legal decisions, although everyone knows that these matters are not usually decided on purely legal grounds when there are big political and other consequences involved. Nevertheless one can go into them and one can go into the question of the allegations which each party makes of the other party having broken some covenant or some protocol, and one accusing the other of having done so unilaterally or otherwise. But the major fact is this that as a result of these various engagements and protocols two States were created—whether temporarily or permanently is another matter—West Germany and East Germany, and in the heart of East Germany there was the great city of Berlin,

which itself was divided up into two parts, West Berlin and East Berlin, West Berlin being not a part of West Germany but very much attached to it in various ways. There was this West Berlin therefore in the heart of East Germany but in effect attached psychologically and in various ways—even economic—to the Federal Government of West Germany. Now, it was not a very good way of carrying on things even temporarily; it has created difficulties. Now West Berlin has become a very prosperous city following the economic and social policies of West Germany. East Berlin is of course a part of East Germany and follows different social and economic policies. Now this kind of close association of a great city nearly one half of it with one side and the other half with the other side that itself is likely to give rise to conflict when that great city is itself surrounded by another area, and with all kinds of protocols governing in the matter of how to reach it, the whole situation is full of difficulty and conflict. Now it is not for me—I do not certainly claim to advise and say what should be done in this very complicated situation. But one thing I do venture to say and that is that a situation like this, or any situation, which might lead even to war, cannot be dealt with—well—by threats of each other, or military movements and preparations for war, but primarily by the leaders meeting and trying to find some way out. I do not myself see in all the tangle of declarations and rather threatening attitudes any particular problem which is incapable of solution at the present moment—not the final solution—I am not thinking in terms of a final solution but rather of a temporary solution leading, step by step, possibly to other solutions. There is the problem of German unification. Normally one would think that the unification of Germany is desirable. The people of Germany—if not all, most of them—no doubt would like that unity. But the fact that led to the creation of two German States, that fact still remains, and unless something happens to remove that necessity, it is unlikely

that unification will take place. No party, so far as I know, is opposed to German unity, completely. But each party wants German unity on its own terms, which are totally unacceptable to the other party. The result is that, in effect, you do not get German unity. And in fact German unity can only come through a peaceful process, when the two parts get together, or the big countries behind them get together and create conditions, an atmosphere where this thing can work. The way to prevent German unity is to carry on the cold war in its intensest form, because that very thing frightens each party not to agree to unity, which might be against their own interests, so that the present policies are being pursued, and this policy of intense cold war not only comes in the way of solution of any of the problems, but it particularly comes in the way of German unification which possibly, I imagine, most Germans desire—one can understand that. So how are we to meet this situation? It is clear that at the present moment there are two countries, and two Governments, the Federal Republic of West Germany and the Democratic Republic of East Germany. There they are; they are a fact of geography. One may not like this or may not like that, but there they are, and to ignore the existence of one of them or either of them is just to shut your eyes to facts, and therefore one must proceed on this basis that there are these two Germanys at the present moment functioning as separate countries—and one may say—not only as two separate countries but each Germany allied to a separate group of nations, to separate blocs, one to the N.A.T.O. group, the other to the Warsaw Pact group. Therefore, in order to solve this problem the two groups have to come to an agreement more or less; or approach an agreement. Many years ago, there was talk of a possible coming together, and suggestions were made which, I thought, were of considerable importance and may form the basis for these two Germanys becoming an area of—what is called—disengagement, an area where there

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

are no nuclear weapons, an area where, if they are not completely disarmed, they are at least largely disarmed and so on, which, in effect, means that they both come out of the military blocs on either side. Now of course there were difficulties in the way of that, they are still and they are even greater today. But we must be clear in our minds that all these problems can be solved by peaceful methods or else there is war; there is no third way. The third way may be just prolonging the present agony, carrying it on on the verge of neither peace nor war. That of course is not a very satisfactory way, because you always live on the brink, and a false step or something may make you topple over. Now if one wants to avoid war, then the only other way is to pursue peaceful methods, and by peaceful methods I do not mean that either party gives up its position, but that they must deal with it in the normal manner, whether it is through diplomatic channels or through a discussion of these matters. The immediately present crisis has arisen because of the Soviet Union saying that they would have a separate treaty with East Germany, in regard to Berlin, etc. Now normally one would think that some kind of treaty is desirable after sixteen years, sixteen years after the war ended, but I recognise that a treaty which does not bring into its fold the other countries—well—does not really end that odd situation. Now one major fact that is said repeatedly on the part of West Germany, West Berlin, or of the Western countries is that West Berlin must continue to exist in full freedom and to maintain its own structure—social, economic and other—and its full contacts with West Germany. I believe that the Soviet Government has declared repeatedly that the present contacts of West Berlin with West Germany will be maintained, will continue completely, and there will be no obstruction or limitation on them. Now, that should remove at least one major barrier to talks on this subject, and

whatever guarantees for this purpose may be considered necessary might be offered through talks or diplomatically.

Sir, I would personally think that, if the unification of Germany is desired, the only way to bring it about peacefully, though perhaps gradually, is to increase the various contacts between East and West Germany, trade contacts and the rest. In fact, there are a good number. People do not realise how many contacts there have been between East and West Germany throughout these years. So, an atmosphere would be created which would make further steps to bring them together easier. As it is, the very reverse is being done. An atmosphere of mutual fear is created with the result that no party is going to agree to a single step which it thinks might come in its way in case there is conflict, which it thinks might affect its prestige.

Now, it is a fact that while on the one side the tremendous power of the Soviet Union rather frightens some Western countries, on the other side there is no doubt at all that all the East European countries are frightened of German militarism rising up again. They have had two painful experiences of wars, all these Eastern countries, Western also, but more especially Eastern, and they do not want to take the risk of this happening. And this is, I think, the governing factor in the situation. If that fear was removed, the situation would be quite different. And step by step, as Germany gets more and more armed, this fear increases. If by any chance West Germany gets nuclear weapons—I believe they even now have some kind of nuclear weapons, nuclear heads, I think—then the result would immediately be that the East German Army also might be provided with these nuclear heads, and so you come nearer and nearer an eruption.

I say, Sir, it is not for me or for any of us to offer an advice in such matters, nor is it a very, I think, right position for us or for any country merely blindly, because of our likes and dislikes, to take up sides in this matter. That has not been our attitude. But in spite of the present method of increasing armed forces in Berlin, armies marching, giving the sound of armed feel all over, almost hearing the trumpets of war, an attempt should be made by responsible people from each side to meet and discuss these matters because there seems to me adequate ground for discussion. It is not that their position is so antagonistic that there can be no common ground though it may be antagonistic in the final sense but not in the present. And ultimately, I believe, the only real solution of these problems is disarmament. At least that will take one a good long way. That is all that I venture to say about this major problem of the present day because all other problems sink into almost insignificance when we face the problem of war and peace in the world, and it is that war and peace that is hanging in the balance today in Central Europe and they will affect the whole world immediately. All our problems, whether they are our internal developmental problems or our troubles with foreign countries, will immediately be affected by this and they become secondary and of little significance before that major event which may upset the whole world.

I might say here about Germany that as a result of the War certain new frontiers were accepted. Anyhow they came into being. They are referred as the Oder and Neisse frontier which affect Poland and other countries. Now, there is not the slightest chance in the world of these frontiers being changed except by victory in a major war. That is obvious. You cannot rule out all that has happened as a consequence of the last war. Therefore, one has to accept those frontiers and accept them clearly. All these Eastern countries are affected by them.

The State of Poland is affected if the frontiers are changed and any kind of talk of changing those frontiers, or even hinting at the possibility of a change, makes the situation much worse. That is the major part of the issue I wished to refer.

For the rest I merely wish to say something about the situation in Africa. In Africa the main trouble spots are the Congo, Algeria, Tunisia, Bizerta, etc. And there is also Angola. These are the major spots. There are others too. Of course there is South-West Africa and there is the Union of South Africa's continuing policy of apartheid and they are trying to affect other parts of Africa with it. For instance, in Angola it is said that the South African government is lending its help to some extent to the Portuguese authorities. Also there is a sense of fellow-feeling, I believe, to some extent between the South African Government and the Central African Federation or rather the white governing elements there. So you see in Africa this tremendous upsurge being met by the old vested interests in the shape of some governments and chiefly white settlers trying to stop the march of the Africans forward, and as we have seen, in the Congo a very difficult situation is being created. The most painful thing, of course, today in a sense, perhaps in the whole world, is what is happening in Angola and the way the Portuguese Government is dealing with the situation there with primitive savagery and barbarity. Many accounts do not come but some accounts do come, accounts chiefly of missionaries. Reading them it is a little difficult to remain calm and peaceful because it is a record of absolute primitive barbarity. It is shocking in the extreme that such things can occur. All one can hope is that the people of Angola will be able to meet this, as I believe they are meeting it and meeting it with a measure of success.

The terrible part of it is that the Portuguese authorities, apart from committing large scale genocide, are

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] particularly interested in liquidating, killing if you like, every educated African they can find in Angola. In a population of many millions there are not many but tens of thousands of educated people—I am not talking of very high class education but moderately educated—so that the Angolans may not have any leadership left. That is the idea.

It is a ghastly thing and it does little credit to other nations, especially the big nations, that such a thing should occur and they cannot check it or stop it. There is the United Nations, there are the other great countries and there is Portugal still sitting in the Councils of the NATO group of nations. Only one member of the NATO—I think it is Norway—has had the courage to say publicly that they will have nothing to do with Portugal in the shape of any help and that it should not be in the NATO. Of course we cannot expect that other countries will send armies to Angola to fight the Portuguese but the least that any country can do is to express its strong disapproval of what is happening there and to desist from even indirectly helping the Portuguese Government in this nefarious business. I am afraid some countries have not done so and I regret to say that the United Kingdom is one of those countries which indirectly have associated themselves with the Portuguese, and, if not directly approved of what is happening, apparently have made it clear that they can survive without much damage to their own esteem. I think it is very unfortunate that any civilised country in the wide world should take up an attitude or take up a very legalistic attitude in regard to what is happening in Angola.

In regard to Algeria, we have repeatedly hoped for or looked for some settlement between the Algerian Nationalist Movement and the French Government. They seemed to have come near it and yet again drifted away. There can be no doubt, nobody can doubt, not even the authorities in

France, that Algeria is bound to be free and the continuation of this struggle merely means needless suffering all round. In Tunisia what happened in Bizerta also indicates how even a vanishing imperialism strikes back and strikes back very roughly and very cruelly. Altogether the atmosphere of the world is so full of violence that it is becoming increasingly difficult to consider problems in a peaceful, quiet and logical way. So much in regard to foreign problems.

As the House knows, in about a week's time, I am going to attend a Conference at Belgrade, a Conference of countries that are described as non-aligned. I hope that this Conference will be able to throw its weight, such as it has, on the side of peace in Europe because one of the main questions to be considered is the question of war and peace at present as well as the other questions like anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-racism and the like. Also I hope that it will do some good. It is not merely a question of denouncing things. It is very easy to denounce things and condemn them. It is much more difficult to take some steps which help to improve a situation and I hope that some such step may be taken by them and that we shall not merely talk in terms of denunciation of what we dislike. Even here in our country and in the Parliament we have every right to express our opinions forcefully but we have always to think as to what steps or what word will help peace and what will merely aggravate a difficult situation.

In India we have our three problems now which are our companions all the time. They are the two border problems, if you like the Pakistan border and the Tibet-China border with India and there is Goa. Of course they are entirely different problems, specially the Goa problem. I believe that conditions are ripening even in regard to Goa for an advance being made. It is difficult for me to say

anything definite because I am not sure myself as to what might be done in the whole context of things, what is happening to the Portuguese colonies abroad and to Portugal itself because in regard to Portugal one must remember that it is not a question of their introducing some special type of Government in their colonies—of course they have introduced it—but in Portugal itself, the method of Government is tyrannical and there is no freedom or civil liberty for even the Portuguese, what is happening there today will produce new situations in Goa requiring a new approach and we are watching them carefully.

In regard to Pakistan, we have had recently quite a good deal of speeches and declarations from responsible people in Pakistan in regard to India, in regard to Kashmir and these speeches and declarations have rather pained me—no doubt it must have pained others too—more especially in the context in which they came. I do not wish to enter into any argument here or at any other time. So far as the question of Kashmir is concerned, our position has been perfectly clear and it remains clear and if anyone in Pakistan thinks that complaining to other countries or trying to rouse other countries or attempting to bully our people will force us into some kind of decision, if they think so, then they have totally misunderstood what India stands for and how India reacts to these tactics. Our position in Kashmir is completely clear. Apart from all the 10 or 12 years of history, the basic facts remain, that Kashmir was invaded by raiders coming through Pakistan and that the Pakistani Army followed them, that Kashmir joined legally the Indian Union. These are basic facts. When the U.N. Commission came here, they had accepted these facts. There is no doubt about it. Having accepted them, they made certain proposals. Even in those proposals, which we accepted, the first step was that Pakistan should withdraw from the Kashmir territory. They have never done so in the least.

So I cannot understand how anyone in Pakistan, least of all responsible leaders, can go on harping back on this issue. We have shown the greatest tolerance, the greatest patience, because according to us, the whole of Kashmir must be freed of any illegal control as part of it is under Pakistani control. That is our right. But we have also said that we are not going to take any military measures to push out the Pakistan Army or the controlling apparatus from that area. It is our right and we are prepared to consider that when the time comes, in a peaceful way. That is going pretty far, as the House will appreciate, when we say that we are not going to take any military steps in that area which is occupied by Pakistan. That, as I said, is a policy which exhibits a great deal of patience and tolerance on our side. As for talk of plebiscite, etc. we have had repeated general elections there. We have a kind of responsible government going on there. We have development plans functioning and changing the face of Kashmir. And on the other side which they have occupied, there is backwardness everywhere. Not only in that part, but in the whole of Pakistan, there is no question of any elections or anything of that type. For them to recommend a process in Kashmir which they have themselves discarded completely does seem to me rather odd. Anyhow, that is the position and we are not going to be pushed out or harried by this kind of tactics that some people are employing in Pakistan.

So far as the Indo-China—not Indochina, that is confusing, because there are countries in Indo-China—I mean so far as the Sino-Indian border is concerned, or the Tibet-Indian border, there is not very much to report. Ever since the official examination of facts was conducted by our officials and the Chinese Government officials and those big volumes came out, it appears to us, and I should imagine, to any impartial reader, that the Chinese case had little substance,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

while our case was established beyond any possibility of doubt. We felt that this having been done, it was a step forward certainly and it should affect Chinese thinking in this matter, because we are not thinking, as far as possible, to try to settle this question by a war, and a very difficult war, in the high Himalayas. Apart from our aversion to war and apart from the world situation which would be affected by any such thing, we wanted to settle this, even if it took time, by peaceful methods without, of course, giving up our own rights, our own position. The official documents that came out very largely supported what we had said and established our case, and I thought that the Chinese Government would be affected by this and might change their attitude. It is difficult for me to say whether they are affected or not. Externally they are not. But I cannot conceive of their having read this and not having felt that their position is a weak one.

When recently our Secretary-General in the External Affairs Ministry went to represent us in Mongolia at the fortieth anniversary of their freedom, a freedom, I might remind the House, which they obtained from China forty years ago, I asked our Secretary-General—it was a normal thing to do—to pass through Peking when coming back to India. He could have come back through Moscow, but he went through Moscow, which is a longer way and this is a shorter way through Peking. And it was right not only that he should pay courtesy visits to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, not merely courtesy visits, but frankly discuss the situation. It is not a question of negotiation or anything but discussion, because we do not want merely the thing to be jammed. That is not to our advantage. It may be to the advantage of the Chinese Government that we do not discuss and they do not discuss, because they are sitting on our terri-

tory, but it is not to our advantage. So we decided that when he was there, he should discuss this matter and point out more especially what the official report had brought out. This was done. They had long discussions. Nobody expects these discussions to result in any firm conclusions. It was, if I may say so, an attempt to find out by us—and may be by them—what was at the back of their own mind, as happens in diplomatic talks, not so much merely the thing that we put in a document, but what is behind it. That we wanted to find out, what the effect of these official reports was. But as I said, it is difficult for me to judge because in these matters, the phrases used are seldom very clear and no commitments are made. But I think these talks had some advantage in the sense that our position which has been clearly stated, of course, in our documents, was nevertheless again fully and clearly stated by our Secretary-General to them, lest they should be under any misapprehension on the subject. There the matter is and I am not quite clear at the present moment and I cannot say definitely what the next step in this matter may be. But as I said, as regards these talks etc. I do not want the door to be closed for them, because it is not to our advantage. In what way this matter may be considered in the future, at the diplomatic level, whatever it is—that of course, to some extent, goes on—is to be decided. But I should like this House to remember that in dealing with this very serious and very important matter, namely, our border with China, we are not dealing merely with a present difficulty. We are dealing with the future. It may affect generations to come. Therefore, we have to move with wisdom and with strength, and not merely in a huff, to take a step which might rebound upon us. Nor indeed, whatever happens, should we weaken in our resolve to face all the consequences of this. It is not necessary for me to say, as the House knows it, that everyone, nearly all groups and individuals in India, have strong feelings about this matter.

Some others have not those strong feelings, and I want to say quite frankly to some hon. Members opposite that this is a subject which does not admit of equivocation, in other matters whatever that might be. I find that even in this party or group which has had its doubts about the situation, they speak sometimes with two voices. I am not blaming all of them but the fact is that there has been in the past, and sometimes it does take place even now, a kind of propaganda or justification of China on our border, a kind of propaganda pointing out that this is just a game of some people in India in order to win the elections or in order to affect the elections. Well, Sir, this started about two or three years ago, and how did we look long ahead, two or three years ahead, about the elections coming and create all this? Here is the simple precise statement in the officials' report which states the position as to what has happened, and for people to go about criticising the Indian case—I do not mind criticism on a logical basis but bringing in this game of elections or something else and justifying what China has done—is an attitude, whatever it may be meant to achieve which is certainly an anti-national attitude and there should be no equivocation about this matter. There must be the clearest statement as to where we stand about it because unfortunately these things do not affect the people of India much but they produce some wrong impressions on the other side and that comes in the way of any proper approach to this problem.

For the present, Sir, I should like to confine myself to these remarks. There are many other subjects, of course, and I think it is better for hon. Members to have more time. Then, in regard to any other subject, I shall gladly say something in my reply.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I beg to 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 BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the signing of the peace treaty with the two German States and the declaration of West Berlin as a demilitarised free city are essential for easing tension in Europe and for promoting the cause of world peace'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken by India to move the UNO to take effective measures against Portugal for its flagrant defiance and violation in regard to Angola of the UN Charter and Human Rights declaration as well as the resolution of the 15th Session of the UN General Assembly'."

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

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

(i) that Government should fully support Tunisia over the question of Bizerta and take necessary steps through the UNO and otherwise for ensuring Tunisian sovereignty and compelling France to respect it; and

(ii) that the Provisional Algerian Government headed by



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Mr. Ferhat Abbas be immediately given full recognition'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should take serious note of the decision of the UK Government to join European Economic Community the political objective of which is to consolidate the NATO and the economic, consequences of which for India are extremely harmful'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that in view of the continued military aid by the USA to Pakistan, threatening the security of India, Government should register formal protest against the USA and declare the USA's behaviour in this respect an unfriendly act'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets—

(a) that Government attaches importance to the US assurance that the US arms given to Pakistan will not be used against India, while in fact, (i) Pakistan goes on asserting that it is free to use these arms as it likes and (ii) the USA refuses to include in the US—Pakistan agreement any stipulation whatsoever that these arms shall not be used against India; and

(b) that while the USA is pouring in arms to Pakistan and equipping the Pakistan Air Force with Supersonic military planes and air-to-air missiles Government speaks of cooperation and friendliness on the part

of the US Government towards India'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government should have rushed to sell sugar to the USA when the latter stopped imports of Cuban Sugar in order to create economic difficulties for the present revolutionary Cuban Government and bring pressure upon the brave Cuban people'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should move the UNO for the expulsion of South Africa from the world organisation'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the part played by India in the Cairo preparatory talks in June, in connection with the 'neutral summit' was not one of consistent anti-colonialism, and in some respects caused disappointment to Afro-Asian countries participating in those talks'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government do not take due note of the fact that as a result of vacillations and inconsistencies exhibited in the application of India's foreign policy in the recent period, the prestige of India has somewhat suffered in the world arena, specially in the Afro-Asian countries'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that

Government have not taken any initiative or even shown any enthusiasm for Secretary-General of the UNO as well as of its executive structure to ensure that countries like India get their rightful place in the world organisation and that the executive structure as a whole is brought in line with the world developments since 1945 and with the reality that many newly liberated Afro-Asian nations have now become members of the UNO'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government did not react properly and with self-respect to the manner in which Shri Rajeshwar Dayal was made to leave the UN mission in the Congo'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the *de-jure* transfer of Pondicherry has not yet been brought about nor has it been fully integrated with India'."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that adequate steps are not being taken by Indian missions abroad to inform and enlighten public opinion on the US aid to Pakistan not only from the point of view of the security of this sub-continent including Afghanistan but also from the larger point of view of the world peace'."

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same this House regrets that our relations with the neighbouring countries are steadily deteriorating and that our foreign policy is mis-understood by even friendly countries generally'."

*The questions were proposed.*

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Sir, in his very analytical and very exhaustive survey of the world situation, the Prime Minister has spoken about the trouble spots in the world and my speech, as indeed the speeches of many Members in this House, would necessarily touch upon the subjects that he has dealt with, and if I may sound a little repetitive, I hope it will be taken as being necessary under the circumstances. Of the trouble spots he had spoken of, first comes Berlin which is a very important trouble spot in the world today. On Berlin he has spoken with great statesmanship and in a constructive approach. I do hope the statesmen of the world will read his speech with an attitude to sit together and find a way out of all the disputes that are involved in the Berlin question, or to use a current international expression, make them negotiable. I will have a few words to say on this subject a little later, but I will speak now about two or three matters that pertain to us directly, in which India is directly involved. The first, of course, is Pakistan's belligerence, the very provocative utterances from that country, over which we are all pained, and the American arms aid to her. Second, China's continued belligerent attitude and the propaganda she is trying to step up against us among the friendly neighbouring countries. Third, the Neutral Summit Conference to be held in Belgrade to which our Prime Minister is going within a week. Fourth, I would like to touch on the situation in Laos because we are directly involved in that situation in Laos as India happens to be the Chairman of the International Truce Supervisory Commission.

I will take up the question of Pakistan's belligerent attitude and the

[Shri M. H. Samuel.]

American arms aid first. Field Marshal Ayub Khan's utterances, as he tramped the length and breadth of the country with a hate India campaign has pained us all. He has continued in the same strain. His speeches in U.S.A. pained us because he was doing so in a country friendly to us and secondly, I personally felt that at that time India gave no effective answer to his outbursts. On this point, I would like to pay a compliment to our Charge d' affaires in Washington who took a bold initiative in projecting our point of view on Kashmir. I do so with pleasure. American arms aid to Pakistan, particularly the supply of supersonic jet fighters which are capable of flying at 1,500 miles an hour, and I hear also drop bombs, at a time when Pakistan is openly talking about her aggressive intentions against this country is unfortunate, unfortunate about a country towards which we have envinced the friendliest of feelings. This event, the supply of Supersonic jet fighters to Pakistan, at once establishes Pakistan's military superiority in South East Asia, and has made the countries in this region nervous and anxious in view of Pakistan's usual truculent and belligerent attitude.

What is important for us is to 1 P.M. notice that the United States policy towards Pakistan has consciously or unconsciously suffered a change as a result of or after Field-Marshal Ayub Khan's visit to the United States. America does not seem to insist any more, as she used to a couple of years ago, that the military aid that she gives to Pakistan under the 1954 Mutual Security Pact is to be used only against Communist aggression. Today she seems to wink at the idea—indeed has winked at Pakistan using this military aid against Afghanistan—of Pakistan or any other country receiving military aid from the United States using it against aggression from any quarter. Now, it is very difficult to say, after fighting breaks out in any area, who started the fighting. From newspaper accounts it is difficult, for example, to say who is

starting the skirmishes around the Durand Line, Pakistan or Afghanistan. If this change in American attitude is correct, I think we ought to get a clarification from the United States Government. But whatever the position, as far as Pakistan is concerned, we should agree with the Prime Minister when he said that in view of Pakistan's truculence and aggressive attitude, even if we solve one issue with her she will always trot out another in order to vent her spleen against this country. It seems to me, Sir, that we have to be prepared or reconcile ourselves to live almost perpetually with a hostile neighbour. We also, it seems to me, have to prepare ourselves to live almost perpetually with another hostile neighbour—I hope I am wrong—and that is China. China's belligerent attitude, even though she has not made any further military advance into our territory, has not diminished in any degree. Chinese troops are still in occupation of about 12,000 sq. miles of our territory. They have not been ejected; nor do I feel have we succeeded—although the Prime Minister has just said that anybody could realise that there is no substance in China's case and that we have a very strong case in regard to the border question but in spite of that I do not think we have succeeded—in making China understand our case. On the other hand according to reports from the neighbouring countries China is stepping up a tremendous propaganda campaign against us among the neighbouring countries who are friendly towards us.

Now, that brings me to a point to which, in my opinion, we have to pay a little more attention—to countering this kind of propaganda by China among the neighbouring countries which are friendly towards us. We should, I think, lose no time in setting about this task of presenting our case on the border question effectively to the countries friendly towards us and seek their support. If we do not do

so, the attempt of China to isolate us from our neighbours may be effective, may not be effective, but before that happens, I think, we should set about this task.

Now I come to the next question I tabulated, the Neutralist Summit Conference to be held in Belgrade to which our Prime Minister is going. Now from accounts that appear in the papers—of course the Prime Minister has just now clarified that it will discuss the question of war or peace in Central Europe and we hope also other matters of world tension—I have not been quite clear as to what this conference of neutralist or non-aligned countries is meant to achieve. If it is meant to emphasize the solidarity and the unity of outlook of these neutralist and non-aligned countries on the various world issues, I am not very sure if it can do so, or if it is possible, in view of what took place at the preparatory conference in Cairo. With these neutralist countries in such disarray, it may be that it may not be quite possible to emphasize that point of view which we expect. In these days, many countries are proclaiming themselves as neutralist or non-aligned, but not in the sense we understand the word. To them neutralism seems to convey anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, aggressive nationalism or even a belligerent third force. To them our policy does not seem to fit in with the extremism of some of those countries. They take our policy, according to reports—I do not share that view of course and it is certainly not true—to be some sort of a conservative attitude, a kind of moderation or some restraint or a sort of a dignified attitude. It is true that a constructive approach such as ours to international issues may not certainly smack of extremism but it certainly is not conservatism or moderation. Whatever our attitude at Belgrade may be, I hope that these countries gathered at Belgrade will not misunderstand our constructive non-aligned policy as

moderation or conservatism in any degree.

Now, I am afraid I have not got the time to talk about the situation in Laos or the 14-nation Geneva Conference. I will only just mention Laos in passing because I want to say a few words about the Berlin issue. The International Truce Supervisory Commission in Laos, of which India is the Chairman, has said some time ago—I do not know whether the matter has been rectified later on—that it is finding difficult to function without proper equipment. I hope this matter has been rectified since. If not, I suppose we have to take up the matter with the Chairman of the Geneva Conference.

In respect of the Berlin question, the Prime Minister has very rightly, with his unerring judgment said that Berlin stands today as perhaps the most potent cause for a world war. I do not want to go into the events related to this crisis in Berlin but I would like to mention one point which, right from the start has seemed to me to be leading straight towards aggression. That is the rearmament of West Germany aided and abetted by the NATO powers. The most dominant fact in Europe today is the resurgence of German militarism. For that nobody but the NATO powers are responsible. Added to this is the decision of the NATO powers to place nuclear warheads—as the Prime Minister has said they already possess nuclear warheads—at the disposal of West Germany. This immediately put West Germany among the foremost military powers on the continent of Europe. These facts must necessarily alarm the neighbours of West Germany. They must alarm East Germany, the Soviet Russia. And the position of Berlin, 110 miles right inside the heart of East Germany, with allied military forces in occupation of the city, must also cause a certain amount of alarm. The military situation in respect of the Berlin crisis is now a matter of speculation around the world by military experts. It is an interesting

[Shri M. H. Samuel.]

speculative exercise. According to these military experts—and most of them whom I have read are the Western military experts—both the Soviet Union and the United States are about equal in their nuclear delivery capabilities, as they call it. But they say that the Soviet Union is a little stronger in the area in respect of land forces. The Soviet Union can move into the area, at any given time, any amount of land forces, whereas the United States will take considerable time to do so. This, according to military experts, is the greatest weakness of the United States, at least as far as the short-range context of the Berlin crisis is concerned. Now, in respect of the air and naval forces, that is a matter of anxious speculation in view of the recent naval and air displays of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it seems to me that if force is invoked to settle the Berlin question in the next 4½ months, both sides must anticipate that nuclear weapons will be employed. According to the experts, there is no doubt that in the year 1961, whatever other military measures may be taken by either side, Berlin is indefensible without the atom bomb. This fact alone invests the Berlin crisis with a tremendous world importance. Such being the analysis of the military consequences of the Berlin crisis, it is important that statesmen of goodwill throughout the world must heed the words of our Prime Minister and try to avert a catastrophe, not indulge in military preparedness, in contests of will power or what Mr. Dulles used to indulge in, diplomatic brinkmanship, but sit down together and discuss the matters, so that each may understand and accommodate the other. In this crisis, I believe, there can be no solution unless each party gives in to some extent, though not all, unless each party tries to accommodate the other to the best of its capacity and power, subject of course to its own security. Reunification, recognition of East Germany, making Berlin a

Free City with international guarantees, revocation of the NATO powers' decision to supply nuclear warheads to West Germany, are all negotiable matters. I am very happy that this subject of Berlin is uppermost in the mind of the Prime Minister and I hope that when he goes to Belgrade and Moscow, he will have the opportunity to discuss this matter with the statesmen of the world. And, in his visit to Belgrade and Moscow, let us all wish him the best of luck.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think it was right on the part of the Prime Minister to start this debate with a reference to the question of Germany and West Berlin, because this is the most important burning question in the present-day international situation and naturally we would expect our country to so function in the context of the situation that we help the processes of the solution of the problem. Now, it is aptly said that two German States have come into existence, i.e., the German Democratic Republic and the German Federal Republic, as it is called. It follows, therefore, that the Government of India should recognise also the German Democratic Republic, because this reality is going to exist unless by agreement these two States, by steps, bring about the final unification of Germany. I say this because otherwise it would seem indiscriminatory against the German Democratic Republic and would mean encouragement to the German Federal Republic in all its activities of militarism and aggression. It would be, of course, utterly inconsistent with the policy of neutrality and non-alignment in the matter. I am sure the Government is giving thought to the problem. Now, Sir, as I have said, two German States have come into existence. It is essential that we correctly assess the situation. Obviously, if we do not take sides, it does not mean that we should not be after the truth or we should shy away from the realities

and the exact nature of the problem and the situation. In 1945, after the end of the War, the Potsdam Agreement was signed by the four anti-Hitler coalition powers, as you know, and I may recall here the statement which was issued on the 5th June, 1945 in which it was clearly stated—

“The four allied Governments will take such steps, including the complete disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany as they deem requisite for the future peace and security.”

This was the solemn pledge given at Potsdam by the four powers which included the United States of America, the Soviet Union, France and Great Britain. Now, this is the only valid international postwar agreement on Germany today. There is no other agreement whatsoever, apart from the Potsdam Agreement, which can be called an international agreement and which is valid. NATO has no *locus standi* in this matter. In fact, NATO is directed against the very principles and declarations of the Potsdam Agreement, which binded into an obligation the four powers that were signatories to it. The question now arises to who has carried out the Potsdam Agreement and who has not. Today we find that the West German Federal Republic's militarism, Fascism and revenge-seeking groups have all been defeated. Nuclear weapons are being stockpiled there. And it was stated in a memorandum, which was submitted to the Summit Conference in Paris, which did not come off, that by 1963 West Germany would have about 900 nuclear weapons. That was stated. And as you know, even at that time, there were about 100 such arms supplied by the United States of America. Now, almost all the Hitlerite Generals and military officers are today in the West German Armed Forces. Last year in May a decision was taken by West Germany that there would be no more trial for war crimes and no more trial of war criminals.

After all, the war criminals have become officers, generals and so on, in the Federal Army. How could there be a trial? Then the army has to be tried. Then, Sir, there are about one thousand judges who sentenced under Hitler many patriots and democrats to imprisonment and life terms and death, thousands and thousands of people. One thousand of them today are in the Federal Judiciary either as judges or as public Prosecutors. Such is the position.

Then, Sir, militarism of course is revived. Where is militarism revived? It is only in West Germany today, and the United States is equipping West Germany with weapons and other things. It appears that West Germany is no longer interested in re-unification. What they want is integration of Germany in the European Community. The idea here is very clear. West Germany has secured a kind of economic superiority in capitalist Europe today. Today they want to utilise this position with a view to integrating West Germany into the so-called European Community for establishing political supremacy, that is to say, the German dream of establishing hegemony over that part of Europe which is still under capitalism, where imperialists can still operate with impunity. Such is the position, and there is no doubt about it. As far as self-determination is concerned, that is again a humbug, because, as everybody knows, West Germany supported Portugal against India on the question of Goa, and in Angola of course Portugal is being supported by West Germany. Even with regard to Kashmir, West Germany is supporting the position taken up by Pakistan. Therefore, let us not go into that question of their professions.

Then, Sir, let me come to the other aspect of the matter. As far as disarmament is concerned, disarmament which the pledge of the Potsdam Agreement, atomic weapons are now being piled up, and they say that

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

by 1962 atomic war preparations will have been completed there in that particular state of West Germany. Territorial claims in the right royal style of Hitler have been revived against Poland and against Czechoslovakia, territorial claims of the aggressive German imperialism led by the revenge seekers there.

In such a situation naturally the solution lies in the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two German States. Sixteen years have passed since the war. Must a state of war continue? Must a peace treaty not be signed? Now the Soviet Union has made the proposal that she and other socialist countries in the neighbourhood are all interested in signing this peace treaty with both the German States—I say both the German States. They say, should West Germany not sign it, they would not sign it with the German Democratic Republic. The signing of the treaty would help the solution of the problem. The United States of America imposed on Japan the San Francisco treaty unilaterally. At that time there was no question of agreement, they did not even try to consult other. It was foisted upon Japan with a view to dragging Japan into the war preparations of the U.S.A. and fastening upon her its regime, so that they would be suppliant to the United States imperialists. That was done, but when it has come to the question, after sixteen years of signing a peace treaty with the two German States, then of course there is uproar in the Western World. This cannot at all be justified. If the treaty is signed, occupation ends, and if the treaty is signed with West Germany and East Germany, both States, new forces are released in West Germany which begin to operate. The danger will be lessened. That is why it is in the interests of all peace-loving world that this peace treaty should be signed with both Germanies, and there is no reason why the other countries of the anti-

Fascist coalition should not do this. That is the position. That would also solve the Berlin question.

The Berlin question is called the Berlin crisis by the U.S.A. After all it is now called a crisis, and it is a crisis of the West German Government. West Berlin which is about 110 miles deep within the German Democratic Republic is today being used for all kinds of activities directed against the German Democratic Republic in general and East Berlin in particular. It is a centre of sabotage, centre of intrigue, centre of all kinds of provocations against the Democratic Republic, and not only against the German Democratic Republic but against the Soviet Union and against all other socialist countries. This is the position. It is called western civilisation. Yes, western civilisation has come here with a gang of assassins, saboteurs, provocateurs, and so on, and there are nearly eighty-three agencies operating in West Berlin which are working day in and day out to bring about subversion of the German Democratic Republic, to give provocations and to create difficulties, both political and economic, in the way of fashioning their life by the people of the German Democratic Republic as they like. We hear much about the so-called refugee exodus. Perhaps a small percentage leaves the German Democratic Republic on account of their political belief; that is to say, they like revival of German imperialism or German militarism. But a majority of them are being tempted to go there. They are always worked upon by the agents who operate from West Berlin to take them away. Who are they? They are foremen, they are technicians, they are medical men, they are scientists, and so on. That is how they are worked upon all the time with a view to creating certain difficulties in East Berlin and also in the German Democratic Republic. Therefore, let us not attach much importance to this kind of stories, to the stories that are spread here that the people are going

away. Even according to the information supplied by the Information Department of the West German Federal Republic in December 1960 two million people have left West Germany, for Canada and Australia. This is the position. However, all that is a part of the subversive chain of activities. Imagine what would have happened if, for example, a hostile country had a part of Calcutta in its hand and operated from there against the rest of Calcutta and the Government of India. How would you have liked it? This is the question today and we can well understand. I had been to Berlin myself, and I have seen what kind of tension and propaganda they are mounting there, and I have been told by many people including Indians how the West Berlin saboteurs operate from their base. It is proposed that West Berlin must be a demilitarised free city. Not only the Soviet Premier but Mr. Ulbricht, Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic has given the assurance that there will be absolute freedom of communication, that there will be no interference in the internal economic or political life, that people would be free to develop their culture, trade and economic life as they like. They have even said that the U.N. can be associated with the guarantees for the fulfilment of these pledges. What else they could say? Even so the Americans would not be satisfied because they want to keep it as a base. Therefore, here we should bear in mind a few aspects of the matter, that in order to have this settlement first of all the existing borders of Germany cannot be changed. There must be reduction of armaments and exclusion of atomic weapons, and of course elimination of war-mongering Fascists and militarists from West Berlin, and this is also very important. That is why they say that the problem could be solved that way. Now, therefore, we should support it. I do not see any reason why we should fight shy of coming out in the open and support that position. It is not supporting this or that alignment. It

is supporting something which is just and reasonable, and it offers a constructive solution of the problem that has arisen there. Now, I do not wish to say much about this problem. I think that this problem has got to be solved peacefully. And as far as the Soviet Union and other sides are concerned, they have expressed their desire to talk and they have made a concrete proposal—the only proposal that has come for the solution of the problem—and that is the draft peace treaty. Nothing constructive has come from the United States of America or from the Adenauer Government.

Let us come to the question of President Ayub Khan's visit to the United States in last July. We have expressed our anger and resentment about what has happened during his visit to the United States. But I think that now, after this expression of anger, and understandable anger, we should coolly assess the situation in order that we can decide upon the right course of action. Sir, let me start with the assessment of the situation, as we understand it. President Ayub Khan's visit took place in the wake of the CENTO meeting in Ankara this year. And what happened in Ankara as revealed by the Tass recently is that there at Ankara meeting, new plans were laid for aggressive moves in that particular region. It was decided to set up a joint command in that area with the United States participating, although the United States of America does not happen to be a member of the CENTO. It was also decided as to how they would meet the situation of a nuclear war. Certain other areas had been earmarked as areas of destruction and devastation, clearly indicating that in those regions the nuclear war would be unleashed if they had their way. After that, I again come to the other aspect of the background of the meeting—not background—actually, the meeting started in the United States. President Ayub Khan calls on President Kennedy; the two great ones meet. What happened



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

there? There the tirade against India started as if it had been planned before. I do not know whether certain emissaries from Pakistan were sent for consultation with the State Department before to settle the manner in which the campaign against India would be started. However, it went on according to plan. The tirade went on against India, against the Prime Minister, against everybody in this country who stood for peace or for a reasonable position. Then, Sir, when it started, the Prime Minister expressed surprise that a head of a State should be engaged in such a kind of attack against a country like ours or against him. I should have expected that the Prime Minister would also have expressed surprise at this. How was it all possible right in Washington, before the United States Congress, before an audience of Congressmen and Senators. He could have expressed his surprise also at the fact that the host, namely the United States President, did not have any objection to this kind of behaviour on the part of President Ayub Khan, when Mr. Chester Bowles and Prof. Galbraith trotted round India to pretend friendship and sell American friendship also like the American dollars, wheat and so on. I am surprised that the Prime Minister was not surprised. Therefore, the Prime Minister, to say the least, is partial.

Then you saw how in the United States' press, a terrific campaign was mounted. Here again—I do not want to point out very much—I would only show something of the kind of campaign the Washington Post and the various other papers started; they started writing vehemently against India. The Baltimore Sun wrote under the caption 'Whose Kashmir'—

"Kashmir aside, the Pakistani leader has scored a great personal success in his visit to this country."

The 'Washington Daily News' wrote—

"Ayub wins aid request."

Let me come to the official version of what the Vice-President of the United States said. He said—I have taken this from the newspaper—

"U.S. Vice-President Johnson referred to Ayub as 'a strong voice in the chorus of human freedom.' He is the sort of ally we greatly need and profoundly value in these years of strain and upheaval."

This is what they have said.

Now, are these not according to the plan the United States' press boosting President Ayub Khan, the Congress giving him an ovation, the Vice-President saying such eulogistic things about him and everybody dancing around him wherever he went? Therefore, it is not so simple as that.

Another aspect of the matter was that Kashmir was high-lighted. I have been following the United States' press for the last few months. Till he went there, there was little talk about Kashmir but immediately he went there, Kashmir was talked about. It featured in the press of the United States and well, in their talks also, it featured. I do not know what business Mr. Kennedy has to talk about Kashmir with President Ayub Khan.

Then again, there is the question of the extension of the arms aid. It is stated in the agreement itself. But the quantity of arms that are supplied is not of course stated. That remains a secret. But then we are told that supersonic planes equipped with air-to-air missiles—a number of them—have been supplied to Pakistan. And we know that the U-2 plane took off from the Pakistani territory initially. It is clear that the Americans are interested in ensuring the air superiority of Pakistan *vis-a-vis* India. Are we to remain silent? Are we just to lament about this fact and say a few things at a meeting or should we do something more? It is quite clear that the military build-up that is going on in Pakistan—for which, according to my information, about Rs. 250 crores

worth of military equipment has been sent much earlier by the United States of America to Pakistan,—is clearly directed against our country as against the other countries in this part of the world. Now this is the position. Cold facts have to be faced.

Sir, we are told that these arms are not to be used against India. The United States Government says that the arms that have been given to Pakistan would not be used against Afghanistan. Yet they were used against Afghanistan. In the agreement the United States Government says that the arms that they are giving to Pakistan would be used against somebody else, though they did not mention it and they bring in some kind of a phraseology, sometimes they talk of the Communists, sometimes of others. This time even Communists have been omitted from it. But it is clear that the arms are meant for us, against India and against others. And then, Sir, remember this that the whole thing is being done in the context of playing up the Kashmir issue, and President Ayub Khan is the holder of the arms which are imported. But the person who holds the arms, what does he say? President Ayub Khan laughs at the suggestion that the arms cannot be used against India and he has made it absolutely clear that there is nothing in the agreement or in the understanding between him and the President of the United States to say that the arms cannot be used against India. Indeed, because of these arms in their hands they are in a position to talk so tough every time they come to the subject of Kashmir or some other matter relating to Indo-Pakistan relations. Therefore, Sir, this comedy of seeking clarifications must end. What are we to be clarified about. Military build-up is going on; arms are coming in and Pakistan points its guns at us on the eastern border and on the western border; fires at Afghanistan and sometimes also against us on the eastern border and we are to seek clarification? Well, Sir, I think

these are not toys given to the children, that they should play with them at the kindergarten of President Ayub Khan or his grandchildren. These are given for maintaining the tension between our country and Pakistan. These are given for threatening our country all the time; these are given for pressurising our country and keeping us in a state of constant tension. What should we do in the situation? Apart from making speeches in the Ramlila grounds or in Parliament or may be in Srinagar, something else should be done. We are not asking the Prime Minister to go on a fast in protest against the American arms deliveries to Pakistan. I am not asking him to do that; let there be no mistake about it. But there is something that he could do and is not being done. Now, Sir, I think the Government of India should develop diplomatic and political initiative in this matter, and it is important in this connection that we concentrate our fire against the United States of America, the villain of the piece. But for American arms aid to Pakistan many of the problems between India and Pakistan would have been long settled. But for American arms to Pakistan President Ayub Khan would have talked in a courteous language and would not have been threatening us all the time. Therefore let us not forget the real villain of the piece in this whole matter. Now to shake the U.S. Government it is essential that we rouse public opinion in the Western countries including the United States of America. It is important more so because the imperialists are today on the run; they are morally on the run and it is possible to hasten this process by rousing public opinion. Therefore the U.S. game has to be exposed. But what does our Prime Minister do? Strangely he does exactly the opposite things in some times. He criticises that; I entirely agree; he should do that. But in the other House what did he do? He went to the length of saying:

“The United States Government policy has been particularly friendly

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

to us in the last few months—even before that, but in the last few months specially.”

Exactly when President Ayub Khan was getting arms deliveries—extended deliveries, air to air missiles, supersonic planes, etc., our Prime Minister gets up in the Lok Sabha and tells us—well, U.S.A. specially friendly now, always has been friendly. Then you find again—following this string of thought and reasoning—that Mr. Chagla, our former Ambassador to the United States of America, spoke at a public meeting in Bombay on the 6th of August, the meeting being presided over by Mr. S. K. Patil, who is in the Ministry of Food but dabbles in all kinds of things. Here is what Mr. Chagla said:

“A very great and striking change in the U.S. policy was noticed when she voted against Portugal in the United Nations on the Angola issue.”

Also he said:

“These two great democracies hand in hand can make a great contribution not only towards the establishment of peace but also towards the abolition of poverty from this country.”

This is what Mr. Chagla said.

Then again I have got Mr. D. N. Chatterjee, our acting Ambassador in the United States of America, and he said in Kansas city on the 18th of July—when Pakistan was getting all this thing; President Ayub Khan was perhaps still there or perhaps he had just left at that time:

“India-U.S. relations have been improving in the last few years and were excellent at this time.”

This is what he said. Now, Sir, are we going to bring moral pressure on the United States of America by praising the United States of America in this manner, I ask. Is it diplomacy? If it is diplomacy, it is bad diplomacy. If it is politics, it is ununderstandable

politics from the party which stands against United States' arms delivery to Pakistan. Now this is a plain thing. Therefore I say that the Government has not enough courage. They would not even say that the U.S. action in giving arms to Pakistan is unfriendly to India. How can they because they are talking about the friendship? Some say we are two democracies. Are we and the United States of America the same? Are we competing with President Ayub Khan in flattering the United States of America, or not? This is what I would like to know from some hon. Members here and from the Government Benches. It looks as if some people are interested in flattery. It seems that the only explanation for all these absurd things is the dollars that we are receiving from the United States of America and that we still expect. I can tell the Government in all humility that if the United States does not give us dollars because we take a firm stand, a stand of national honour and dignity, against arms deliveries by the United States of America, then there are other countries in the world where we can get such help. Today a big part of the world including some non-Socialist countries is being built in defiance of this kind of technique and manoeuvre on the part of the United States of America, and without U.S. dollars. We can do so in our country too. Then why all this talk about the other things?

I cannot understand the impression sought to be created in our country as if the United States' foreign policy has undergone a great change after Mr. Kennedy took over the administration. I entirely disagree with that point of view, because their latest budget—the biggest ever peace-time budget—sanctions 46.7 billion dollars, that is to say, forty-six thousand seven hundred million dollars and more for military purposes, and if you include other items it comes to 55 billion dollars. On the 25th of May President Kennedy asked for an allocation

of 1885 million dollars for overseas military aid, and in that connection he mentioned Asia, Latin America, Africa and West Asia as the 'great battle-ground for defence and expansion of freedom'.

I am quoting his words, Now Asia is the 'battle-ground for defence and expansion of freedom', for which he is drawing so much money from the American exchequer to be spent on such military aid as is given to Pakistan. Then, Sir, he has ordered the U.S. Armed Forces to get ready for a non-nuclear limited war. It is under his orders that the abortive invasion of Cuba took place. He took such an attitude on the German question and strengthened the N.A.T.O. alliance with Portugal continuing to remain there. And remember that in Angola the Portuguese are carrying on genocide, murdering men, women and children, with weapons not supplied by President Ayub Khan but supplied by the same Mr. John Kennedy. This is the position of the President of the United States of America. Therefore I ask: What is the use of trying to create that impression—just because you are getting some more dollars or expect some more—that U.S. foreign policy has undergone a radical change? It is bluffing the people, your own people. It may be a kind of art in flattery, but certainly it is not showing statesmanship on the part of wise people, because it helps America to tell the world that, after all, 'my' aid to Pakistan does not cost 'me' the friendship of India. On the contrary, the Prime Minister from house-tops and his satellites from elsewhere, here and abroad, declare: 'Well, friendship is growing'. Now I do not mean that Shrimati Lakshmi Menon is a satellite of him. She is a star, not a satellite. Now the point I am coming to is that a policy should be there. If we take a firm stand and declare that American action is unfriendly and lodge protests and rouse public opinion in the West, nobody would say that India is uncivil or unmannerly in this matter, because

379 R.S.—5.

we are doing the right thing, and the justice of it will be seen by many people.

Then, Sir, coming to the question of Angola, I need not say much. All I say is that in an interview in May last to the Daily Mirror correspondent, a Portuguese officer said that he had killed by that time 30,000 Africans there, and the latest information, according to the British press, is that 50,000 people have been killed, but African sources say that the number would be twice as many. Burning of houses . . .

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, what happened in Hungary some time ago is happening in Angola now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Burning of houses, killing of even children and so on are going on there. But what we can do? Certainly we can protest. But then something more should be thought of in this matter. I think the United Nations can be moved much more effectively.

As far as Bizerta is concerned, well, the Prime Minister has referred to it. I would only add here that steps should be taken to expel France and allow Tunisia to establish her sovereignty over Bizerta. The French have to be expelled from Bizerta. They have no right at all to be there.

And as far as the Congo is concerned, I hope a solution would be found.

Now, Sir, I would like to come to the United Nations Secretary-General. One of my amendments relates to that. That office has to be reorganised. Today the World Organisation has 99 members as against 48 or so when the Charter was framed and the structure was formulated. Today countries like India and newly liberated nations, let alone the Socialist

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]  
 nations—they can look after themselves—must have a rightful place in the United Nations Organisation. At the structural level, at the executive level, the positions have been made over to the representative of one group or power, namely the Western power. Therefore, Sir, this matter, I hope, would be discussed at the Neutral Summit which is going to take place and a solution would be found because all these non-aligned nations, all those nations which have been newly liberated—and mind you, since the last World War 1700 million people who were enslaved by foreign imperialists have been liberated—must have their place of honour and dignity in the higher council of the United Nations Organisation. I suggest that this should be taken into consideration.

Then, Sir, I would like to say a few words about the Neutral Summit. It is good that the Prime Minister is going. But I am very sorry that the performance of India at the Cairo preparatory talks was not good. I want to refer you to the report that appeared in the Hindu of June 17 this year where it was pointed out how India found herself isolated almost on every single issue because its stand was inconsistent with its policy of anti-colonialism and it did not take a firm stand on the question of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. I hope the Prime Minister will respond to the urges of the African people and neutral nations and other people so that a bold anti-imperialist, anti-colonial stand—language, I leave it to the Prime Minister—is taken up there at the Neutral Summit. At the same time the Summit is called upon to face the situation in Berlin and bring the collective opinion to bear on the question, so that in that context the United States and the Western powers are made to see reason that the solution of the problem lies in signing the peace treaty and in declaring West Berlin a free demilitarised city.

Sir, as far as Goa is concerned, well, it should be liberated. I am glad the

Government now has taken up in principle the position that we had taken. It took them time, to say that military action is not ruled out. I need not go into that. It is good they said it. I think we are entitled to take whatever action we like for the liberation of Goa.

As far as South Africa is concerned, well, Sir, expulsion of South Africa should be sought.

I do not wish to say much about Laos excepting that we hope a solution of it will be found. As far as Vietnam is concerned, I regret that the Government of India submitted to the pressure of the Western powers and appointed an Investigation Commission to investigate into the legitimate resistance struggle of the people of South Vietnam against their regime. The American military build-up, by the American Teams and so on is going on there in clear violation of the Geneva Agreement. It is bound to militate against the Geneva Agreement. Anyhow he has not covered such things. I do not see why India should have accepted the resolution sponsored by the West and allowed such a kind of investigation which means investigation directed against the democratic movement there.

I think the hon. Members would expect me to say a word about China. Sir, nothing further has happened since we spoke on foreign affairs with regard to China last time. However, let me say something on China. This is a question that everybody asks. I know that the subject would be touched upon by others. What else can I say except supporting the Prime Minister on having pursued the line he has taken, that is the line of negotiation and settlement? I do not know any party in India questioning that line but in this matter we are accused. How many times must they be told that this is not a fact. I would like to be informed by the Prime Minister with facts and figures. I do not think there is any such person who is carrying on such a cam-

paign against India on the China border issue. If the Prime Minister has any particular Party in mind, for him the more honourable and more wise course would be to call the leaders of the Party, place before them the papers and documents and say, 'Here is your Party doing this. Look into this matter and say what you have to say.' Instead of that, I am sorry the Prime Minister made certain wild allegations which were absolutely false. Such things did not exist. I would ask the Prime Minister not to go by this kind of common place political propaganda because he can stand on his own pedestal. I am afraid as the elections come near and near, we will hear more of such things. But then it is all in the bargain. But you need not introduce a subject in the foreign affairs debate because nothing has happened in order to warrant further discussion on this matter. Our policy is clearly stated in our resolution. I have read it out on the floor of the House. That is the position. Therefore, Sir, we have stated everything. Today the Prime Minister has brought in this thing. Perhaps he just wanted to say some thing though he might not have felt that it was necessary for elections. But that is how others will think. I am reminded of a French story in this connection.

*(Time bell rings.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Two Frenchmen went to a house. A dog was barking at them. One of them got very upset. The other fellow said, 'Do not get upset by the barking dog. A barking dog never bites. He will not bite.' The other Frenchman said, 'But does the dog know it?'. That is the position. They say that the Prime Minister knows it but do his people in the various States know it, because when we went to Calcutta in connection with the Parliamentary election where our colleague, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, contested, we found the Congress leaders and Congress volunteers speaking on nothing else but on China. They forgot the Second Five Year

Plan. They forgot their Nehru. They forgot everything. The only theme of propaganda was such propaganda against the Communist Party of India for catching votes. Now, Sir, if by shouting at us, by calling us names or bringing wild accusations against us, the Congress Party can get more votes, let them try. One can understand that position. But for the life of me I do not see how by needlessly accusing the Communist Party, by attacking it, by flinging wild allegations at it, you can solve the border problem. If that were the position, if that were the solution, I would offer myself to be accused the whole day. Let there be public accusation by the Prime Minister for the whole day and not at the fag end of his speech. Let him shout as much as he likes if that can solve the border problem with China. I am interested in the solution of the problem, in the restoration of friendship between these two countries, India and China.

Sir, I do not wish to say very much. I only wish to say towards the end that we generally support the Government's foreign policy. But for the Prime Minister's occasional flings of provocation, we support the principles of it. But at the same time we venture to say here that in the application of it, in the implementation of it and relating it to the concrete developing situation, there is a vacillation. There is an attempt to pull back and to escape certain responsibilities. This is not good.

Sir, I wish the Prime Minister good luck in his trip abroad to Belgrade and then to Moscow because his stature is there . . .

*(Time bell rings.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You wanted ten minutes. You have taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just half a second and I have done. Only one thing more I would say. I have always felt that when the Prime Minister goes abroad on such missions, he should be accompanied not merely by officials but also by some Members.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

We would not think of being taken there. I do not suggest that. But there are many hon. Members opposite in the Congress Party who firmly stand for the policy of peace and non-alignment. I think it would be a good thing for him to be accompanied by such people because this would help us to establish contacts with leaders of public opinion in the countries he visits. The officials accompanying him cannot bring about that thing. Apart from that, these Members will be in a better position to react in the light of public reactions and so on. That will also help in building up good public relations there and bring about wider contact for the Prime Minister to assess and understand the situation.

2 P.M.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is our privilege, pleasure and pride that India, that is our motherland, looms large in all the Chancelleries of the world such as never before in our history. We have attained this unique moral stature on the international plane within 14 years of our Independence, not because of our vast numbers, our 435 millions, not because of our big size, our 1½ million square miles, but because of our basic ideals of peace which constitute the bedrock of our unity through several thousands of years of our cultural civilisation so brilliantly reflected in the conduct of our foreign policy, thanks to the dynamic personality and soaring idealism of Prime Minister Nehru.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. A. SUBBA Rao) in the Chair.]

It is our good fortune that we are very soon having a Conference of as many as 30 countries at the Neutral Summit at Belgrade next month. It is gratifying that in this world which is now divided between two power blocs, there should be as many as 30 countries with a population equal to one-fourth of humanity, with an area equal to one-fifth of the world, which should feel unaligned or not attached

to this or that power bloc, a policy which India has been vindicating right from the advent of our freedom. It is also gratifying that our Prime Minister is going to Belgrade next week and he carries with him, behind him, the sanctions of the 435 millions of India and even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. In spite of all the criticisms that he had levelled against certain aspects of our foreign policy, nevertheless, he conceded that in the general conduct of our foreign policy, the House is one with the Prime Minister and that he has also given him the assurance of his cooperation and I am sure that our Prime Minister will emerge from that Conference at Belgrade with greater laurels for the cause of peace. Never in the history of humanity has the cause of peace come to be considered more urgent than now. The world in the bewildering welter of conflicts finds itself now almost on the brink of war. We are sitting now on a volcano. The Prime Minister had rightly said in his speech this morning that Berlin had turned out to be the most burning question of the day. Whatever might be said for or against the viewpoints now being taken up by the power blocs in the world, it remains that the world, divided as it is between these two power blocs, has got to look to only these unaligned countries for creating that climate of peace, for providing that bridgehead which alone can settle international disputes. I believe that our country very soon is going to have that rare opportunity of trying to use its good offices particularly because of the dynamic personality of our Prime Minister to see that we widen that area of peace and try to settle problems that are now trying to disturb the peace of the world. I am very hopeful that at that Conference of neutral countries, we will, as a country, lend our weight and a mighty weight at that, to all people in the different parts of the world who are struggling for liberation. India, which has been taking a very considerable part, almost a lion's share, in the deliberations of the U.N. for the cause of liberation in the world now gets an

opportunity at Belgrade to vindicate that cause and our hearts go out for those who have been suffering for the cause of freedom in Angola, in Tunisia, in the Congo and in Algeria.

The atrocities that have been perpetrated in Algeria by the French colonialists and now in Angola by the barbaric treatment meted out by the Portuguese authorities have shocked the conscience of humanity. It was really very relieving to hear that our Prime Minister denounced this barbaric action of the Portuguese authorities in Angola. In fact we have known in our own little tiny part of our country, in Goa, how the Portuguese have been perpetrating barbarity but what really concerns us most at the moment is the problems that are confronting the country on our borders. Our Prime Minister has clearly indicated how in spite of the provocations, in spite of the sabre-rattling which sometimes we hear from across the border, particularly from Pakistan, he still pursues that peaceful approach to all our problems. I think with that inexorable patience which alone can account for that peaceful approach, we are in a happy position because, as the Prime Minister himself has rightly said, Pakistan, our neighbour, is suffering from a fear complex. The tremendous progress and the lightning rapidity with which our national reconstruction is now taking place to the envy of the world, naturally, has aroused many misgivings in Pakistan and what was really surprising to me was to see in the news the other day that the President of Pakistan, Field-Marshal Ayub Khan, should have taken up this stand of saying that Members of Parliament have not properly exercised their wisdom. It does not lie in his mouth, I am sure, particularly from that country where they have not had their elections even, where they have not built up their representative institutions such as we have done in this country. But let us not be worried or upset. In fact that is where we will display our weakness and we will play into his hands. As our Prime Minister has said and said

rightly, let our pursuit be peaceful. After all, in the end, I am sure that Pakistan and India will be the greatest friends. It may be that at the moment there are certain issues which are clouding the vision and they are resorting to expressions which they will be the first to repent sooner than later but I would very much wish that with regard to our borders with China, whatever might be the expressions which our Communist friends have made, I feel that with regard to this front against China, it is necessary that as a party the Communists have got to indicate their policy because even now there are certain misgivings that they are—some of them, not all—speaking in two voices and I would very much love to have this assurance from the leading lights of that party that in regard to China, even as with regard to Pakistan, the entire country, to the last man, to the last woman and to the last child, stands behind our Prime Minister. And we vindicate our stand that while pursuing that policy, we shall try to see that no aggression, if that is committed against our territory, shall be tolerated.

Next, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have to say one thing. In the survey of the international situation to which we listened, we had an assurance that with regard to Goa, the Government would pursue its policy and might even try to change the tactics if the situation so warranted. I believe, that gives us a message of hope, because in Goa, for quite a long time, our patience has been tested and what with the atrocities that we hear, of the Portuguese authorities, both here and elsewhere, I believe, that a time will come, and come very soon, when the Government of India will have to think of how best to settle that question once and for all.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am glad that at this moment, as a country, our stock has gone very high. But there is one thing to which I would like to refer, although it is not a matter which



[N. M. Anwar.] comes entirely within the subject of our foreign policy. Nevertheless, it is quite pertinent that we should refer to it, I mean the issue of this European Economic Community that is being evolved on the Continent. Now that the United Kingdom has joined that Community in order to set in motion a common market, we in India feel that the Government of India will have to take up the matter with the individual members of the European Economic Community, particularly with the United Kingdom and West Germany, to see that we get adequate safeguards for our merchandise because we apprehend rather serious repercussions on the flow of our commerce with the removal of the tariff barriers in between the different countries that constitute this European Economic Community. I hope that our Prime Minister will take note of the situation and will see that the Government exerts its best to see that this European Economic Community will not have any adverse effect upon our trade, industry and commerce. I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, since we met last in this House to discuss the international situation, a number of very disquieting developments have taken place in the world. The most important development that has taken place and which is very disquieting is the situation that has developed with regard to Germany and Berlin. It is true that today this is the biggest problem that faces the world and unless and until some solution is found for this problem, we will slide into some kind of war, some kind of catastrophe for the world. What has happened in the world today? What has happened even on the question of Berlin? Armaments are piling up. Better and better armaments are being built and there is a lot of sabre rattling which is indeed very nerve-racking. If this kind of thing goes on for a very long time, then obviously, whatever we might say to the contrary, though we might say that there will be no war

because there is the deterrent of the nuclear weapons, how long, with passions mounting, with preparations being made from day to day for a fight, how long can we say that the world will remain safe and free from war? It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that steps are taken to see that the two power blocs come together, that Russia, that is to say, the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. and the other Western Governments come together and find out how the problem of Berlin and the problem of the two Germanys are to be solved. It is true that there is a great desire in West Germany and among the Western powers and among the people of East Germany also, that the two Germanys should be united, that there should be a unification of the two Germanys. But in the circumstances of today, it is perhaps not possible, except by resort to arms, to bring about this unification. Therefore, a solution—a short-term solution—may be thought of, a solution which will lead to other steps being taken which may bring about the reunification of Germany. At the moment, the question of Berlin has assumed very serious proportions. But this question, seen in the context of the unification of the two Germanys, becomes a little different. Our Prime Minister is going to Belgrade to attend the Summit Conference of the unaligned powers. From there he will proceed to Moscow. Our Prime Minister, fortunately for us, has acquired a kind of unique stature in the world today and I have no doubt that with his presence it will be possible for the Summit Conference at Belgrade to find out some solution of the problems that vex the world today. What that solution could be, it is indeed difficult for me to say. It is not for me to say anything with regard to a matter which is such a serious matter. But one thing is certain, that we should not depend too much on the deterrent of the nuclear warfare. Nobody is in a position today to say that a war will not break out if things go on like this. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that a calm atmosphere prevails

and an attempt is made by our Prime Minister—he of course is doing it—and others, to create a better atmosphere in which problems could be effectively tackled.

Sir, from time to time, suggestions have been given as to how the problem of Berlin or the problem of the two Germanys can be tackled. I came across a plan the other day which I would like to share with the House. It is a plan put forward by a German professor—Karl Jaspers—serving in a university of Switzerland. He has put forward a plan for a temporary period which may lead to some kind of solution of the problem with regard to Germany and Berlin. Broadly speaking, the plan is that there should be elections in East Germany with a view to setting up a government, an elected government which will declare neutrality for East Germany. That neutrality of East Germany should be guaranteed by the Powers on the two sides of the iron curtain. Meanwhile, if this becomes acceptable—and I am told that this plan has been seriously discussed among the German people—if this plan is accepted, then naturally, in the interregnum, there will be a lot of contacts between the people of East Germany and of West Germany and there will be unrestrained social contacts and a lot of cultural and economic contacts between these people, leading ultimately to some kind of unification of the two Germanys. Sir, in this process, as I have pointed out, the question of the great city of Berlin also will be automatically solved. The two sections of the city will automatically be united when East Germany becomes a free independent State. I do not know whether thereafter the powers would be able to agree as to the status of the city of Berlin. A number of suggestions have been given as to whether it should be part of East Germany or whether it should be a free city or whether it should continue to be part of West Germany. All these suggestions are there. I do not know how far this plan will be acceptable to the parties but the author feels optimistic. From

what little I have read about this Plan, I gather that a large number of people in Germany are giving attention to this and are scrutinising this plan and are also attracted by it. I do not know whether this Plan would also be there before the Belgrad conference. I hope that they will give some attention to this plan and make suggestions along these lines. I have every hope that the Belgrade conference will make valuable suggestions for the solution of this problem because this is a problem which confronts the world today more than any other problem. It is a matter of some satisfaction that although sabre-rattling has gone on on both sides in regard to this question of Berlin, the desire to have a settlement through negotiations is also present. In the talks that the American Vice-President, Mr. Johnson, had with Mr. Adenauer, they agreed that the question of Berlin should be solved through negotiations. The other day, yesterday perhaps, I read a statement made by the American Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk. He also talks of negotiations, I understand that the three Western countries have sent notes to the Government of the U.S.S.R. to the effect that negotiations should be opened. It is also a happy thing to note that Mr. Khrushchev has said, not once but more than once, that so far as the city of Berlin is concerned, access to West Berlin will be guaranteed. This is a good thing. I find from today's newspapers that the Deputy Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Mikoyan, while addressing a leftist rally in Tokyo has said that by the end of this year, the U.S.S.R. will sign a peace treaty with East Germany. Of course, that has been there all along, but the important thing is that after that permission will have to be sought for one to go to West Berlin. I do not know and I am not quite sure, but somehow feel that perhaps there will be some change in the position taken by Mr. Mikoyan from the position taken by Mr. Khrushchev. Mr. Khrushchev had made it absolutely clear that access to West Berlin would

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

guaranteed whatever the agreement that the U.S.S.R. Government might arrive at with East Germany, but Mr. Mikoyan does not seem to have made it quite clear. Maybe I am wrong; I hope I am wrong.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Mr. Ulbricht, Chairman of the State Council—I have got his statement—also says that it should be absolutely free.

**SHRI D. P. SINGH:** The Prime Minister has a somewhat guarded optimism about the whole situation, if I could put it like that. I am not able to share even that guarded optimism for the simple reason that this sabre-rattling is going on, preparations are going on, forces are being sent to West Berlin, mobilisation of Russian forces also is taking place in East Germany, and if you go on doing all this, I do not know how ultimately the breaking out of war can be prevented.

Sir, our relations with Pakistan, our neighbouring State, a State which was part of the sub-continent of India, have considerably deteriorated during the last few months and weeks. When President Ayub Khan was installed in office, all of us felt that a better chapter, a chapter of closer relations, of better relations, between India and Pakistan, had opened up. We were very generous in our utterances against Pakistan. We wanted to come to all kinds of reasonable agreements, generous agreements, with the Government of Pakistan. Whether it was the Canal Waters Treaty or the border agreement, in respect of all the agreements which we entered into during the last few months and years with Pakistan, we have been somewhat generous. We have not used very strong language even in spite of the fact that Pakistan has aggressively occupied part of our territory. We, of course, do not like it. We would like to get it back, but our Prime Minister, even today, said that so far as that territory is concerned, we will not go to war to recover it. Our attitude, the attitude of our Government, has been more than reasonable. Our

Prime Minister also offered from time to time to sign a No War Treaty with Pakistan which, of course, was spurned each time it was made. It appears to me that this reasonableness on our part *vis-a-vis* the territory in Kashmir which is under the occupation of Pakistan has not paid us. It is obvious that President Ayub Khan is playing a very dangerous game. He is indulging in all kinds of invectives against our leaders, against our Prime Minister, and even against this Parliament. Only yesterday or the day before he made a speech in Quetta in which he charged our Prime Minister with some kind of bigotry. Earlier he said that our Prime Minister was pursuing a childish policy in regard to Kashmir. He has taken to task our Parliament also for not opposing our Prime Minister's policy on Kashmir. This is an elected Parliament, a free Parliament and we say whatever we like. I feel that President Ayub Khan has done a signal disservice not so much to us but to the people of Pakistan by talking in this manner. This is not how a responsible statesman talks. When President Ayub Khan went on a State visit to America, he brought in all kinds of subjects and said all kinds of things against us. He is very envious of the fact that we are getting aid from America and other countries and he sort of made this out as a grievance. It hurt us very much. We have always disliked military aid being given to Pakistan or to any other Government by America. We do not like this idea of military aid because of its implications but we did not start a campaign against it. We did not like it and we expressed our displeasure but we did not kick up a row as President Ayub Khan has started in respect of our country. So far as Kashmir is concerned, we have always held that Kashmir is part of India after the decision of the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir. We consider that decision to be an irrevocable decision and I do not think President Ayub Khan's or anybody's threats will make any difference to this question. I be-

lieve, Sir, that President Ayub Khan is making a very sad mistake in underrating our strength. The strength of a democratic country is very considerable indeed and dictators in the past have mistaken the reasonableness of democracies for weakness at their peril. I still hope, Sir, that President Ayub Khan and other leaders of Pakistan will realise the grave and incalculable harm which they have done to their relations with us. I still believe that good sense will prevail with them and that they will desist from the kind of action and attitude which they have started taking and adopting although I know that it is difficult to expect this from them at this stage.

Sir, the other day in the other House our Prime Minister said something about the aid that is being given by India to Nepal. Nepal has a very poor standard of living; the people of Nepal are very poor, poorer than ourselves perhaps and any aid that our Government gives to Nepal is only proper and I very much appreciate what our Prime Minister said about giving more and more aid to Nepal. We have been giving aid to Nepal in the past and we have decided to continue to give that aid in the future but the point is that that aid has to be properly utilised. I do not say that if it is not utilised we should not give it but we have certainly a right to express ourselves on this question. I believe, Sir, that the aid cannot be properly utilised in the present context of Nepal. The elected Government of Nepal which was functioning very well there was dismissed, as the House knows, and the leaders were put in jail. The House also knows that the elected Parliament was dissolved and naturally a kind of emotional vacuum has been created in Nepal and there is great discontent. In this context of discontent I do not believe that the aid that we give or that any country gives to Nepal will be properly utilised. Again, Sir, the House knows that we have some kind of defence agreement with Nepal. With the seething discontent

that exists in that country the defence potential of Nepal is bound not to be very satisfactory. If the defence potential of Nepal is weakened, naturally and inevitably our defence also suffers. It is therefore of great importance and in the interest more of Nepal than of our country that a responsible representative and popular government is re-established in that country. Sir, it is not for me or anyone else to interfere in the internal affairs of an independent country. Nepal is an independent country like our country and we cannot possibly interfere. Nobody has any business to interfere but surely when something happens which affects us, we cannot but express our views in regard to it.

Sir, our Prime Minister has time and again showered panegyric on our diplomatic missions abroad. Sir, I do not wish to say anything in disparagement of our men who man these diplomatic missions but surely all is not well with some of the diplomatic missions, at least the diplomatic missions in our neighbouring countries in South East Asia. Sir, I have some knowledge of how our diplomatic missions function in some of these countries and I have some information on the basis of my own contacts and on the basis of some information which I have received from others. I think we can afford to neglect our bigger missions to some extent but so far as these smaller diplomatic missions in the neighbouring countries, in the smaller countries with which we want to develop friendly relations, are concerned, it is absolutely necessary that men who are properly equipped for the purpose are sent there, who will be able to develop friendship between our country and those countries and who will be able to explain to the Indian community which is there in most of these neighbouring countries the role which they have to play because much depends upon the relationship that exists between the Indian community in those countries and the people of

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

those countries. If the Indian community and the people of those countries go on quarrelling and go on misunderstanding each other, then whatever we do here, whatever our Government does, I have no doubt in my mind that our relations cannot improve. Therefore it is of the utmost important that the men who go there keep themselves in touch with the Indian community and explain to them what they should do and what their attitude should be to the different problems in those countries. Do we have such men these days in these diplomatic missions? I have very great doubts, Sir. I was even told that the Indian community everywhere dislikes the Embassies because they feel that they are treated with contempt whenever they try to establish some contact with the Embassy people. That is a very serious state of affairs and I would invite the attention of our Prime Minister to look into it. If necessary, he should appoint a high-power commission to go into the working of these Embassies with a view to suggesting ways and means for their improved functioning.

Sir, while on this topic I would like to mention a development that has taken place on the continent of Africa. Most of the countries of Africa have gained their freedom in the recent past and others are in the process of gaining it. But even in this Africa where there is so much turmoil at present, there is a tendency for the States to come together for closer co-operation among themselves. This topic has been taken up from time to time and I have myself tried to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this on earlier occasions but it appears to me that not much importance is attached to this subject by our Government. Sir, what I was going to say is this. The three States of Ghana, Mali and Guinea have come together and formed a union, a union of African States. One of the aims or the main aim of this union is to harmonise domestic and foreign policies of these States so that they might

come closer together, so that they might be able to make a bigger contribution to the solution of world problems that exist today. Now, whereas in Africa there is such a growing tendency for integration, in Asia the nations seem to be drifting apart. We are a big democratic country. Can't we play a role in this? Can't our Government take steps or initiate moves for greater and closer cooperation among the nations of Asia, at least among the nations of Asia which are our neighbours?

Sir, so much has been said about our relations with China that there is hardly anything that one can say profitably which will not be some kind of repetition. Nevertheless I feel that during the last few weeks and months some kind of complacency has set in regard to our attitude towards China. Sir, only the other day in the course of an interview that our Prime Minister gave to a correspondent of Link he said that the earlier aggressiveness of the Chinese was not there so much. I will quote from what he said at the interview. This is what the Prime Minister said talking to the correspondent of Link:—

"It was in 1950 that we first realised the possibility or the probability of a conflict with China. Whether anything has occurred recently to soften the Chinese attitude I do not know. I do not think that anything important has occurred and yet I feel that the earlier aggressiveness is not there but basically I see no difference."

Sir, the Prime Minister refers to the earlier aggressiveness not being there. In the light of this statement made by the Prime Minister the recent visit of the Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry to Peking acquires some significance. Perhaps there is a feeling growing now in the External Affairs Ministry at least that China's attitude is undergoing a change for the better. Sir, in 1950 as our Prime Minister himself has said, we thought

that there was a probability of conflict with China. But what did we do against it? It is obvious that we did not attend to our defences properly and adequately, that we did not strengthen our border defences and there can be no two opinions about it, whatever the Government might say. Now, it is said that this earlier attitude is not there, the earlier aggressive attitude of China is not there. It thus appears to me that a kind of psychology is being created which may prove dangerous for the defence of our country, because inevitably this will lead to a slackening of efforts and a weakening of our will to resist the aggressor. In this connection, I would like to refer to a public statement made by the Maharajkumar of Sikkim the other day. He said in that statement that the Chinese were building roads in a big way on the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan. In view of the fact that our intentions are peaceful, it does seem to me to be pretty ominous. It seems to me that the Chinese have not given up their earlier aggressiveness at all. All that they are doing at present is to consolidate the gains which they have made and after they have consolidated these gains they would again embark upon their earlier adventure of aggression against us. I would urge upon the Prime Minister with all respect and in all humility that he should not make statements which are likely to have the effect, howsoever unintended, of weakening our will to resist the aggressor, to resist the Chinese.

I would also, in this connection, like to refer to an exchange of letters which has taken place between our Government and the Government of China in the recent past. When the border agreement between Burma and China was signed, we were naturally concerned about this point of trijunction between the three countries. So, our Government wrote a letter to the Government of China protesting against showing the point of trijunction in a map attached to this agreement between Burma and China somewhere near Dipu Pass. Al-

though in the agreement itself it has not been mentioned, from the map it appears that the point of trijunction will be located in Dipu Pass. So, our Government pointed out in their letter to the Government of China that this point would not be at Dipu Pass, but somewhere five miles north of Dipu Pass. The Government of China wrote back indignantly saying that this point has not been settled and that this is a matter to be settled between the three Governments. The Chinese further pointed out in their reply that the point of trijunction would be far south of Dipu Pass, no even where it was indicated in the map. They have not reconciled themselves to the fact that we do not accept that position. So, all that I mean to say is that even today China has not at all given up its intransigence. It sticks to its old line, old point of view, and there is no reason for us to think that the earlier aggressiveness of China is not there. It is extraordinary that when Pakistan occupied aggressively a part of our territory Kashmir, we say we are not going to take up arms to recover that territory. Even in the case of China we adopt a similar attitude. Over 12,000 square miles of our territory has been occupied. Even with regard to this, we declare we are not having resort to arms in order to recover it. We say that it is only when the Chinese attack further that we will resist. In the case of Pakistan also we say the same thing. How can the House really believe that, with this kind of attitude that we adopt from time to time any aggressor can have any respect for us? I do not wish to indulge in a war-mongering. I know what it means. I know that our Prime Minister is wedded to non-violence in the sense that he does not want any war, any world-wide war. But alternative to war may be surrender. We cannot substitute surrender in place of war. We have to discard war, in giving up war we cannot surrender our rights, surrender our territory. After all there is something worse than war and we must be prepared to fight, if need be.

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

Having said this, I now pass on to the great continent of Africa where big upheavals have taken place and are still taking place. A large number of the countries of Africa have gained their independence, but there are some countries still which are under the subjugation and control of other countries. In this respect, the most guilty country is obviously Portugal. The British attitude in respect of what Portugal is doing, in respect of what is happening in Kenya or the Central African Federation, is to be condemned. Mr. Jomo Kenyatta has been released. I think the restraint order was removed only yesterday. We are very glad that Mr. Kenyatta has been released. We have no doubt that Mr. Kenyatta will be able to bring peace and good government to Kenya. But so far as the Central African Federation is concerned, I have no doubt in my mind that trouble is ahead, that there is going to be serious unrest. Already there is unrest in Northern Rhodesia, in Southern Rhodesia also trouble is brewing and Dr. Banda's party has already said that they may not agree to be in this Federation. Trouble is brewing there. And in the interests of the white population of that area, an arrangement, a Prussian type of constitution is being imposed upon this part of Africa, which we all deplore. But the most regrettable development is in respect of Angola. Thousands and thousands of people have been killed. I read the other day that over a lakh and fifty thousand people have fled the country.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab):  
Over a lakh have been killed.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: So, that is the situation there. Whole villages have been wiped out and destroyed. Everyone who can read or write has been arrested or has run away. As a British Member of Parliament, a Labour Member, who visited the areas adjoining Angola said the other day, hell has been let loose in Angola. That is the situation in Angola. Now, the people of Angola are fighting very bravely and we have no doubt in our

minds that sooner rather than later Angola will become a free country, that it will free itself from the clutches of Portugal. Portugal is pursuing that kind of policy not only in Angola. Angola, of course, is a big country. In another territory, a small area of 2800 square miles called Cabinda, the whole population of nearly 60,000 has run away from that area and gone over to the former Belgian or French Congo. In Mozambique also they are pursuing a similar policy where a big revolt may break out. In Goa also repressive measures have been stepped up. Only the other day a Goan leader was tortured to death. I understand now that three other Goan leaders have been arrested and charged with treason. So, this is what they are doing. The people of Goa have, so far put up a brave fight. All honour to them. I have no doubt that Goa will be freed much sooner than some of us expect now. Our Prime Minister threw out a broad hint that our policy might undergo a revision in regard to Goa. I hope that this revision takes place as soon as possible. We have been free for the last fourteen years, and our people are enjoying the fruits of freedom for the last fourteen years, and Goa is a part of our country, the people of Goa are our kith and kin and we cannot allow them to go on suffering. Obviously they cannot fight against a superior armed force. I would therefore urge upon our Prime Minister that a revision of our policy should take place as soon as possible. The people of Goa should be armed or in the alternative there should be military intervention and Goa should be freed from Portugal. Maybe some time ago it was difficult to do that because of the international context, but the international context has undergone a very big change. Now as the House may remember, Dahomey, a very small State in Africa, could throw off the Portuguese from a small area which they were occupying, and nothing happened. The NATO alliance could not do anything. It is therefore absolutely certain, so far as I can think, that nothing will

happen if we free Goa. Sir, it is obvious that unless we help the people of Goa with arms they cannot obtain their freedom. They are a brave people and there is a great desire for freedom in them, but unless arms are given to them, they cannot obtain their freedom. We must see this obvious thing and shape our conduct and our policy accordingly.

Sir, we have always been of the view that the Provisional Government of Algeria should be given *de jure* recognition. I think that our Prime Minister is also thinking on those lines. It has been suggested to him that he should do so before he goes to Belgrade. I suggest that even if for some reason recognition is not given to the Algerian Government before our Prime Minister goes to Belgrade, surely on his return from Belgrade and Moscow this *de jure* recognition should be extended to the Government of Algeria. The people of Algeria have fought so valiantly and have made such tremendous sacrifices in the cause of their freedom that we all honour them. I think that no nation in the world perhaps has made such sacrifices in the cause of freedom as the people of Algeria. I hope and believe that President de Gaulle will soon realise the folly of continuing the control of France over Algeria and that the talks which were started by the French Government with the representatives of the Algerian Government will be resumed and a satisfactory settlement arrived at.

While talking about this question, I would also like briefly to refer to what France is doing in Tunisia. As the House knows, the people of Tunisia were particularly friendly to France. Now the kind of treatment that France is giving to the people of Tunisia is staggering and shocking. The base of Bizerta cannot be held for a long time against the wishes of the people of Tunisia. The matter has gone before the United Nations, and I hope that the United Nations will take a decision that the French should

vacate this base. I hope that negotiations will be started and that this base will be vacated. We are particularly shocked at the bombing of the population of Bizerta by the French

Sir, in this otherwise gloomy picture there are just two cheerful spots, if I may say so, and they are the Congo and Laos. When we met last and discussed the international situation, a crisis had arisen both in the Congo and in Laos, a very big crisis, and we could not see how these countries would be able to emerge from this crisis. Fortunately on account of the unremitting efforts of the United Nations and others it has been possible to revive the Parliament in the Congo and to get some kind of stable Government with Mr. Adoula as Prime Minister. It is also fortunate that Mr. Gizenga has agreed to make up his differences with Mr. Adoula, and I am told that even Mr. Tshombe is in a more reasonable frame of mind. I hope that the strife-torn Congo will get back to some kind of normalcy soon, if it has not already become normal, and that the country will march forward to prosperity.

So far as Laos is concerned, it is fortunate that the Fourteen-Nation Conference is making some progress howsoever slow it may be, both in regard to the question of the withdrawal of the foreign troops from the soil of Laos and in regard to the question of neutrality; as to what should constitute neutrality, some kind of agreement seems to have been hammered out or is soon going to be hammered out. That is the impression I get. It is also fortunate that the three Princes have agreed to have some kind of coalition Government. I think that very soon peace will return to Laos. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, independent India under the illustrious leadership of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has been following the policy of non-alignment in the conduct of her international affairs. This policy of



[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.] non-alignment and peace is nothing new to this ancient and great country. Sir, the genius, culture, traditions, beliefs and faiths of the people of this country, all lend support to this policy of non-alignment, and we have in the conduct of the affairs of this country drawn sustenance from the ancient Indian culture. Recently, Sir, Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, has in his own way, to win the independence of this country, practised these principles, and ultimately he won it with a glorious success, a success unheard of in the annals of the countries of the world. True to the traditions of this great country Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, our revered and respected Prime Minister has been adopting the policies that have been handed over to this country from time immemorial. I am sure, Sir, this policy of non-alignment will not be taken for a dead neutrality or for a policy of weakness. This policy of non-alignment is dynamic and positive in its approach. Whatever might be the country that is involved in assessing our approach to the problems, we invoke the aid of this policy of non-alignment and peace. Sir, in the early stages when this policy was thought of and applied, there were men who maligned India, who suspected India, but the subsequent events starting right from Korea down to the present day have shown in unmistakable terms the efficacy of the policy followed by our respected leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Sir, it has now ultimately come to pass this way in the words of Goldsmith: "Those who came to scoff have stayed to pray."

This is the position today which 3 P.M. has ultimately come true and this by itself is a glorious tribute to the policy adopted by India.

Now, Sir, many an international crisis have developed within the past few years, let alone Korea and the other events. Very recently in the Congo, a situation of a very critical nature developed and all the power

blocs were fishing in troubled waters in the Congo and they wanted to see the country torn to pieces though our Prime Minister steadfastly applied the principle of non-alignment and peace. It is not here for me to repeat or recount all the events that went to establish peace ultimately in the Congo which, in one form or the other, we are able to see today. He said boldly without fear or favour, without caring for the East or the West or for this power bloc or that power bloc, "The Parliament of the Congo shall be convened and the demilitarisation of Col Mobutu's forces should take place. Removal of military and paramilitary foreign forces should take place, and this is the way to establish peace and solidarity in the Congo". That was the remedy that was suggested by our leader which was ultimately accepted by that forum of international affairs, the United Nations. Therefore we see today excellent, glorious results in the Congo and I am sure that the Congo is almost coming to the end of its troubles.

Similarly, in Laos once again the second crisis within the last one year or so developed. There also the same policy was applied, the same remedy was applied. The result is that in Laos also the trouble seems to have come to an end. What was the solution that was offered by India? India offered the solution that the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Laos should be achieved, that non-interference in the internal affairs of Laos had to be agreed to. Cessation of hostilities, the neutrality of Laos, the withdrawal of foreign forces and the reconvening of the International Control Commission of which India is the Chairman, all these should be there. Sir, we are seeing all these happening in Laos and I am sure that before long, Laos will be a unified country without any work for these power blocs to create more troubles there.

Coming to the burning problem of the day, the Berlin issue, this morning we heard a very clear picture of

the situation that is obtaining in Berlin. Sir, as I was listening to our Prime Minister this morning, I felt whether this world was going to survive at all if the rate at which the countries of the Eastern Bloc and of the Western Bloc were arming themselves continued. They are bitter enemies of each other. In Berlin arms are being piled up; armies are called. And what sort of countries are they? They are no less than the Western Bloc comprising the United States of America, Great Britain and France and including West Germany and on the other side, there is the Soviet bloc with Mr. Khrushchev. Both of them have got weapons of enormous destructive power in their hands. We know—and it is not for me to say—if the situation, inflammable as it is, develops into a conflagration, what would be the fate of this world. I would like to request our Prime Minister to ask these powers what they want to do with this world. Do they want to let his world live in peace and plenty or do they want to destroy all the 2,500 million people that are inhabiting this planet? This is a very pertinent question that has got to be answered. But there is one silver lining in the darkest clouds that are hanging over Berlin. That silver lining is the fact that whether it be Mr. Khrushchev or Mr. Kennedy or whoever that talks of trouble in Berlin or Germany itself, everybody has admitted that there is room for negotiation. There is not a single speech which we can refer to, so far as Mr. Khrushchev is concerned, where he has ruled out the possibility of negotiation. Similarly, Mr. Kennedy also has admitted that the only way out of the present impasse or the present delicate situation in Berlin is the path of negotiation. That is the silver lining. Only today we read in the papers Mr. Dean Rusk, United States Secretary of State, mentioning like this:—

“There is no prospect that war will be the preferable, the beneficial, the real answer to any question in the modern world. But, on the other hand, neither is surrender.

So we hope we can find a basis for protecting our interests by peaceful means.”

Similarly, by the same peaceful means Mr. Khrushchev also is trying to end this very inflammable, destructive atmosphere that is today prevailing in Berlin. But the question is, who is to bell the cat? We have seen these four Powers meeting in a conference and deciding not to broach the subject of negotiation with Mr. Khrushchev. So far as the Western Powers are concerned, they think that that will be a point of weakness if they make the first approach.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Similarly, on the other hand, Mr. Khrushchev is not inviting the others and he is wanting that advances should be made by the other party. So an impasse has come in the situation. Now the problem is, who is to bell the cat? There must be someone to bell the cat. That is the position in which Berlin finds itself today, according to me. Fortunately, Sir, just at this moment, what is called the Neutral Summit Conference in other words, the Belgrade Conference, is being convened by fifty good Samaritans of this world. No other attempt is more auspicious than this, for these good men, with good and peaceable intentions, to assemble. I am sure that these men who meet there will have very useful and enlightening discussions and their decisions, if they at all come to any decisions, will be very fruitful in solving the burning problem of the day, namely, the Berlin or the German problem.

Now, Sir, another hopeful feature is that our Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, commands universal respect and regard from every quarter, whether it is the East or the West or the North or the South. Therefore, according to me, he is in a unique position to exert his benevolent influence over these countries which are almost mad with the great power that they have accumulated in their own hands. I am sure that Mr.

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.] Khrushchev also will not refuse to lend his ears to Shri Jawaharlal Nehru just in the same way as Mr. Kennedy also would not do it. According to me, in all the critical situations of the world, it was Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's voice that was uppermost, it was his voice that was heeded. Now destiny has cast its dies elsewhere. It is the destiny of India that has come to the rescue, and this great destiny has got to be fulfilled through this illustrious son of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Something tells me and I am feeling confident that this great purpose shall be achieved through Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. The fact that he is visiting, on his way back from the summit conference, Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow lends a greater chance, and a greater hope is roused, I am sure all over the world, that something very tangible will come out of the meeting of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru with Mr. Khrushchev. Similarly, Sir, I am also hopeful that when in next November our leader visits Mr. Kennedy, he would do his utmost to see that Mr. Kennedy hears the voice of reason, the voice of peace, and that they both will be made to listen to the good advice of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, if not the advice of the neutral nations' summit conference. I was very much delighted to hear the Prime Minister this morning and in a way our respected Prime Minister gave out his mind. He said that disarmament is the only remedy for the present situation. He has already hinted at the remedy. If disarmament is accepted as the Prime policy of every big power followed by the banning of nuclear tests and further followed by a *status quo* so far as Germany is concerned, I am sure the troubles that are heading to the great tragedy that is threatening the welfare of his world will be averted. This solution has got to be placed for the consideration of these two great men. More than that, Mr. Khrushchev cannot lightly brush it aside.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Only one minute more, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken two minutes.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Excuse me, Sir. I have never asked for time. This is the first time I am asking for time.

Now, Sir, Mr. Khrushchev, at least for the sake of the millennium he has promised to this world by the year 1980. He has promised the millennium to this world—to at least the Communist Party—where there will be no taxes levied, where food will be given free, transport will be free, everything will be free. Therefore he is going to create a heaven on earth by 1980. At least for the sake of that millennium to come and establish he must see that he sticks to peace. He cannot seek war, and if he seeks war, Russia will get destroyed as much as America or any other country in the world. At least for the millennium that he has promised to this world he must now—whatever might be the power that he has got—come to terms and make friendship with the Western Bloc. And thus peace has got to be established. I am sure to this end our Prime Minister will exert his benevolent influence, and once again fulfil the great destiny that is India's.

Thank you very much.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister dealt with the question of Berlin and East Germany at the very commencement of his speech because, in his opinion, they constituted the most burning international question that had to be dealt with immediately. The seriousness of the position created by the changes that are proposed to be made in the status of West Berlin and the future of East Germany cannot be doubted. It is rather hard to understand either why these changes are sought to be made or why they should be passionately resisted. There is

no doubt an agreement, written or unwritten, about these territories, and it is reasonable to ask that this agreement should not be altered without all the States concerned being consulted and that a common conclusion should be arrived at. The Prime Minister has dealt with most of the questions relating to Berlin, but there are one or two in regard to which I should like to ask for a little clarification. There is an agreement permitting the free movement of men and transport between the eastern and western zones of Berlin. This agreement was arrived at in 1949. Why has East Germany or, rather, Russia considered it necessary to go against this agreement and prevent the people in either zone from going to the other zone? There was no doubt that people from the eastern zone were leaving it and moving steadily into the western zone. Mr. Khrushchev has frequently said that he would like to see a friendly competition between the two systems of Government that exist in the world, the democratic and the communist. Here, East Berlin and West Berlin side by side can engage in friendly competition in order to attract the loyalty of the men not merely within their own borders but also outside them. The second question on which I want a little clarification is what is proposed that the future position of Berlin should be. Sometimes Mr. Khrushchev has spoken as if the consent of East Germany would be required by the Western powers in order to have access to West Berlin. At other times he seems to have offered an international guarantee for access to West Berlin. Now I should like to understand what the position is and how an international guarantee would give greater protection to West Berlin than the agreement that is already in force. But the main question is whether the responsibility for access to West Berlin should be shouldered by East Germany or by Russia. East Germany would exist hardly for a day but for the support of Russia. And I personally think, without taking sides in

this matter, that Russia cannot disclaim responsibility for any action that East Germany might take. Indeed East Germany would not dare take any action in this matter without securing full support or being instigated by Russia.

As regards East Germany, again, the position is not quite clear. I agree with what the Prime Minister said with regard to it. It would be good if both the parts of Germany could be re-united but while on the one hand it has been said that if re-unification is to take place it must be as a result of negotiation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, on the other hand it has been said by Russia in its note on the German question to the U.S.A. on the 4th August, 1961:—

“...It is not on the national question that the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany now differ. They are separated by deep-going differences in the internal way of life, in other words—by deep-going social differences. To try and counterpoise the slogan of self-determination to the struggle inside a nation for social progress means to juggle with concepts.”

This means that Russia is against re-unification of the two parts of Germany. Here again I should like to know whether this is the last word said by Russia on this subject or whether the Government of India has reason to believe that re-unification is still possible under certain circumstances. If it is said by Russia that East Germany being under a Communist Government cannot be allowed to unite itself with the Democratic Government, obviously the question of Germany would wear a different aspect from that which it has been supposed to wear so long.

I should like here to say a word also about disarmament and the nuclear test ban. Now it must be a matter of satisfaction to everybody,

[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]

however deadlocked the discussions on this question may be, that it is more than two and a half years since the hydrogen bomb was exploded. I do not want to question it. But while we are all interested in total disarmament, one has to consider whether as a first step it is a ban on nuclear test that would be more practicable or complete disarmament. In either case international control would be needed in order to ensure that no nation takes advantage of the nuclear test ban or of disarmament in order secretly to strengthen itself and later to spring a surprise on peace-loving countries who might give complete effect to any agreement that might be arrived at. Now, there were differences between the Western and Eastern powers and the interests of these countries are different, and it is not surprising, therefore, that their points of view should be different. But whenever any agreed settlement is arrived at, whatever form it may take, international control and supervision would be necessary in order to ensure the execution of the agreed plan.

Now, Mr. Khrushchev has said that he was not satisfied with the proposals made by the Western Powers on this question. He does not think that any single person can be found who would be absolutely impartial, and he, therefore, proposes that the International Control and Supervisory Commission should consist of three persons, a representative of the democratic powers, a representative of the Communist powers and a representative of the neutral countries. Now, if he sticks to this, I do not see how there can be either disarmament or a ban on nuclear tests. No agreement can be possible in these circumstances because a three-man commission, as Mr. Khrushchev would like it to be constituted, would never arrive at any agreement and consequently control and supervision would not exist in reality. These words would only be a cloak to enable either side to do what it likes with any agreement that might be arrived at.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think that . . .

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: I know what the hon. Member said and I fully understand it. But if there is anything left unsaid by him, I should be perfectly prepared to hear it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On that point the hon. Member has not correctly interpreted what has been said by the Soviet people.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: I give you a minute to explain it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All that I wanted to say was this. That point is important. The Soviet position seems to me, from what they stated to be this: Let the Western powers accept complete and general disarmament, they will also agree: The problem of control will not offer any difficulty whatsoever.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: Sir, when the question of nuclear test ban was under discussion, no agreement was arrived at and then suddenly it was proposed that instead of a nuclear test ban the powers concerned should consider total disarmament as if total disarmament was easier than agreement on a nuclear test ban. Now, obviously whatever may be said, it is clear that he tried, if I may say so, by resorting to achieve a device, virtually to make any discussion with fruitful results impossible.

Now, Sir, I should like to deal with one or two questions nearer home. Naturally, I shall deal first with China because the border dispute with China is perhaps the most important question that affects this country.

Sir, the report of the Indian and Chinese official teams was published some months back. I was surprised when I read it, to find an abundance of material bearing on the Indian claim and the practical absence of all material supporting the Chinese claim.

Yet, China continues her encroachment on our territory and not satisfied

with this, claims 30,000 or 40,000 more square miles of our territory and questions the propriety of our present relations with Sikkim and Bhutan. When Mr. Chou En-lai held talks with our Prime Minister last year, he had said that China respected India's relations with Bhutan and Sikkim. This is not the impression of those who listened to his words but the actual tape recording of his remarks. There can be no doubt about its accuracy. Yet, the Peking Review inserted the words 'proper relations', that is, Mr. Chou En-lai's remarks, as published in the Peking Review were: China respects India's proper relations with Bhutan and Sikkim. I am greatly surprised that Mr. Chou En-lai, who knew that every word of what he said was being recorded, should now attempt to go back on what he had said and make out that he only said that he would be prepared to respect India's relations with these countries if China regarded them as proper. In addition to this, we have to remember that China is still increasing her military strength. Can there be any reasonable hope that China would in the near future agree to settle the border dispute in the way dictated by facts? Yet, the Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry was asked by the Government of India to go to Peking on his way back from Outer Mongolia and hold talks with the Chinese authorities on this question. I do not blame the Government of India for trying to find out whether the Chinese Government was prepared to resume conversations with the Indian Government on the basis of the official report published last year but if this is all that they wanted to do, they could easily have asked the Indian Embassy to approach the Chinese authorities and find out their attitude. Why should the Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry have been specially asked to go to Peking for this purpose? What is our Embassy for if it cannot carry communications on behalf of the Government of India to the Chinese Government? What is our Ambassador worth if he cannot ask for an inter-

view with the Chinese authorities and make the position of India quite clear to them? The Secretary-General, I am sure, faithfully explained to the Chinese Government the attitude of India and her Government towards the border dispute but I fear that the visit of the Secretary-General has created an impression that India was importuning China to come to an agreement with her. I feel that this has been a humiliation to India. Like our Prime Minister, I also do not want war. I do not say that we should make military preparations with feverish haste in order to eject China from the Indian territory illegally occupied by her but our national self-respect should not be lost sight of in the quest for peace. I do not think that the attitude adopted by the Prime Minister would make a solution of this question easier than it was. I fear that the Prime Minister is still trying to convince the country that his policy in regard to China was not mistaken. He still thinks that he will be able to prove that the unbounded faith that he placed in Chinese goodwill and their desire to adhere strictly to principles would be justified by events. If that is his hope, I am afraid he is not looking at the question in a realistic way. Whatever may happen in the distant future—and we have to think of the distant future also, I admit—at the present time it is no use proceeding as if the questions at issue can be settled easily unless the position of India becomes stronger than it is. I therefore have to ask the Government what steps it is taking to strengthen our border defences. I know something about them but if the Government of India really means to assure the country of the adequacy of what it is doing for the defence of our border, it must tell us something more about it than it has done so far. I may go further and say that it must make greater efforts for this purpose than it has so far done.

Now I would like to say a word about Pakistan. Everybody must acknowledge America's friendly attitude to India. It is doing what it can

[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]

to provide us with the financial and economic help needed by us to carry through our Third Five Year Plan. Further, it is trying to persuade other countries also to take deep interest in the economic development of the country because that is the only means by which democracy can be strengthened in Asia but the military help that it has given to Pakistan has created difficulties for us and imposed a heavy burden on us. I do not want to deal with it because the Prime Minister and some speakers referred to it but I would refer to a statement made by President Ayub Khan at Beirut on 7th July on his way to U.S. At a press interview he said:

"We are concerned at recent events which have hurt the feelings of the Pakistan people, namely, increased aid to India."

He was afraid that this might disturb the balance of power between the two countries. Again in a television interview in London on the 9th July, he said:

"If India made a success of her economic planning and became strong and self-sufficient, her neighbours, Pakistan, Burma, Malaya, Sikkim and Bhutan, would feel very insecure because of India's aggressiveness and would turn to Communist China for protection."

Apart from the fact that this statement with the Beirut statement indicates an attitude of jealousy and hatred perhaps unsurpassed in international relations, President Ayub Khan has taken a most unrealistic view of India's relations with her neighbours. I cannot, of course, say anything about Pakistan, but to say that Sikkim, Bhutan, Burma and Malaya would turn to China for protection in case India became strong, is just to say something that does not make sense. I am sure no country

would be more delighted than these countries if India became stronger, for they are as much in favour of democracy as India. To say that they would turn to China for protection is to talk in the most unrealistic way possible. It seems to me, Sir, that the frantic efforts that President Ayub Khan made to persuade America to withdraw the aid that she had promised to give India and to raise the Kashmir question again in an acute form are due to the dissatisfaction in his country with his Government. That is a favourite trick of dictators. When they find that they cannot succeed, they try to divert the attention of the people to external questions. This has been done more than once in Pakistan, but so far these devices have not yielded any result.

Here again, I would like to draw the attention of the Government of India to the statement made by President Ayub Khan that practically the whole of the Indian Army was concentrated in Kashmir and the border of Pakistan. I am sure this statement is absolutely incorrect and I am surprised that the Prime Minister who has contradicted many of President Ayub Khan's statements has not referred to this matter.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab)  
He referred to it in the other House.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU:  
Anyway, I did not see any reference to it in the newspapers.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member is quite right. I did not contradict it. I forgot about it when I was speaking. It is obviously an incorrect statement. Normally speaking, not now, but from a long time past, a good part of the Indian Army is kept in what may be called North India. It has been so since pre-independence days, the pre-partition days, and it has always been there; and certainly a good part of it is in Kashmir, and part of it is in Punjab and other places, spread out there. What President Ayub Khan said is a gross exaggeration.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: I am glad that the Prime Minister said this, because otherwise it might have created an impression outside India that President Ayub Khan's charge against India was correct.

Whatever President Ayub Khan may have said, we have to take note of the fact that Pakistan has received military aid from America and that it has been supplied by America with some of the latest weapons of warfare. We have, therefore, to see that our military strength does not compare unfavourably with that of Pakistan in any respect. I refer particularly to the air arm. We have to see that in this matter we do not fall behind any of our neighbours. This is a matter which concerns the defence of India and the defence of India comes before other questions, even the economic development of India.

Lastly, Sir, as regards the question of internal interest, I should like to refer to our relationship with Burma and Nepal. I am glad that the relations of the Government of India with the Government of Burma are good and they are as happy now as they were formerly. But we all know that since the conclusion of the Sino-Burmese Agreement, China has been making active efforts to woo Burma. There is a large number of Chinese officers in Burma and I understand that offers of help are being made to Burma in order that Indian influence there might be lessened. I am more than certain that as soon as an agreement is concluded between Nepal and China, the same policy would be tried in Nepal. We have been consistently friendly with both these countries. But I think in view of what China is doing, we have to take more active steps in order to develop our friendly relations with these countries, Nepal and Burma.

Sir, this is most of what I wanted to say. It is necessary to say a word about Tunisia and Algeria. The Algerian question is an old one. The Algerians have been fighting for their

freedom for six years and more. At one time it was thought that General De Gaulle would be able to solve this question in a manner honourable both to Algeria and to France. Efforts have been recently made by the French Government to come to an agreement with Algeria. But I understand that the negotiations so far have not succeeded for two reasons. It seems to the Algerians that France desires to separate the northern coastal region of Algeria from the rest of Algeria. The European population is concentrated in this area and it does not want to live under the authority of an Algerian government and the French Government wants to respect its views in this matter. The other question on which there has been disagreement between the two sides is that of the Sahara. The Sahara question, if it stood by itself, I think, might have been settled by negotiations. In fact, the Algerian nationalists have said that on economic questions agreement is possible by negotiation but if an attempt is made to detach any part of Algerian territory from it for the settlement of Europeans, then I think that friendly agreement between Algeria and France would be virtually impossible. If France wants to protect the Europeans numbering about a million who agree to between Algeria, it can transfer them to France but it cannot reasonably ask that they should be settled in the Northern coastal region of Algeria and that the Algerians should lose part of their territory and be satisfied only with the hinterland and be hemmed in between the Sahara on the one side and the northern coastal region on the other, both of which will be under the control of the French Government. I hope, Sir, that the Government of India would be able to use its friendly influence with France to persuade it to come to an agreement with Algeria as soon as possible on this question because time is not on the side of France.

As regards Tunisia, Sir, it is surprising that Bizerta, which forms part of a territory the head of which was



[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]

extremely friendly to France and to the Western powers generally, should have been bombed by France. France has even gone so far as passively to decline to carry out the Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly with regard to the withdrawal of French troops to their old positions in Bizerta. Here again, right is completely on the side of the Tunisians and I am sincerely glad that the Prime Minister expressed himself in no uncertain terms on this question in the other House. Tunisia deserves our help in this matter and it should have it in the fullest measure. France may think that it needs Bizerta for its own protection but I am sure that the goodwill of the Muslim people of Northern Africa will in the end prove of greater value to it than the position of Bizerta.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in a few days our Prime Minister would be going to Belgrade for the summit meeting of the uncommitted nations. This is being held at a critical time in the history of the world. It will have to consider many questions of far-reaching importance such as those of disarmament, Germany and Berlin, colonialism and the Angola atrocities, Algeria and Bizerta and the future set-up of the United Nation, including the entry into that organisation of the legitimate Government of China. There is at the moment a war of nerves going on throughout Germany on the Berlin issue. Each, day, statements and counter-statements are made by Russian and American statesmen. Mr. Khrushchev has made his position clear and the American response to it is equally clear. It is true that neither side thinks that the other is prepared to go to war but the real danger is that the statements made on this assumption can lead to dangerous miscalculations. Take, for example, the Berlin issue. The crisis created by it cannot be met by standing on their legal rights by both the blocs. The foundation of these legal rights is the arrangement made among the

victors in 1945. Sixteen years have weakened the moral force of these legal rights. For well over sixteen years East Germany has been politically, socially and economically pursuing a policy vastly different from that of West Germany. It is part of the Soviet bloc. No doubt, German unity is desirable. All progressive-minded men sympathise with the aspiration of the German people for unity but the fact that profound differences of a political, social and economic character unfortunately divide the two Germanys cannot be ignored. Whether we like it or not, the existence of two Germanys is a fact of which we have to take notice just as we have to take notice of two Koreas. The political system of Eastern Germany may not be to the liking of some powers but likes and dislikes cannot and should not determine in international matters solutions to a problem. The Russian thesis is that within one generation Germany has twice disturbed the peace of the world. It is rearmament with possibly nuclear weapons of which the Eastern bloc is frightened. It may be that theoretically the correct and the right solution is a unified Germany on the basis of free elections but it is equally clear that there is little likelihood of the Soviet bloc accepting a solution which would add to the strength of the NATO powers. The genuineness of these apprehensions is a reality of which note has to be taken. It strikes me that a less rigid approach to the problem of German unity is indicated in the interests of world peace. No one now seems to be thinking of the Rapacki plan or the disengagement proposal in neutralised zones which was put forward by Mr. Gaitskell on behalf of the British Labour Party. One can sympathise with the desire of the German people as asserted by Western Germany for unity but it strikes me that that unity cannot be achieved by ignoring the existence of two Germanys which, for all *de facto* purposes are separate entities with separate and dissimilar systems, political, social and economic. Mr. Khrushchev has made it

clear that he is determined to have a peace treaty with East Germany and it is on the basis of this that solutions will have to be found of the Berlin problem. Surely, the price of free access to West Berlin should not be total annihilation, but that, one fears, is the price which both the East and the West may have to pay if they go on in this monstrous game of blood. It is heartening to note that negotiations have not been ruled out on this difficult question by both the sides. Clearly, the uncommitted nations will be faced with the problem of discovering solutions which both sides can accept with honour. They are in no sense a third bloc and they should not endeavour to form a third bloc. Hard thinking will have to be done. The zonal system was initially established in Germany as a temporary arrangement pending a Four-Power treaty which would recognise the reunification of Germany but this does not seem to be possible in the immediate future. It may become possible with genuine disarmament for, it is only in a disarmed Europe that Germany can find unity but the question to consider is whether the risk of total war should be faced for standing on supposed legal rights. In some way or the other the existence of East Germany will have to be recognised and a search should be made for a formula which would enable negotiations successfully to be carried out on that basis.

4 P.M.

Another question of great importance which the summit will have to consider will be the future of the United Nations. The situation as it developed in the Congo led to fierce controversies on both sides. Let me explain what I mean. Mr. Khrushchev has demanded a troika to replace the Secretary-Generalship of the United Nations. Administratively the proposal may be impracticable but it is not enough to dismiss it as impracticable. The United Nations will have to elect in about a year or a year and a half, that is to say at the autumn meeting of the Sixty-second General Assembly a successor to Mr. Hammarskjöld. For

him personally I have great respect. He had difficult tasks and he performed them ably and with efficiency. Now, the Constitution of the United Nations requires that the Big Five must agree before a person can be declared to be elected Secretary-General. That is because—and it is important to remember this—the United Nations is not in any sense the nucleus of a world federation. It is an organisation of sovereign States possessing equality of rights. The Soviet Union has taken the stand that it will veto the election of any single person as Secretary-General. If it carries out that threat the United Nations will not be able to function at all. It may well become paralysed and that may be the greatest calamity that can befall mankind. Even a United Nations with a troika will, some people think, be better than one with no Secretariat at all. That is what one great newspaper the *Guardian* thinks in Britain. The United Nations, when all is said and done, has done a good job in the Congo, in Korea and in Laos. The Russian insistence on a troika is due, one apprehends, to the fact that Russia finds herself in a permanent minority in the United Nations and particularly in the Security Council. The Russians look upon—and wrongly I think—the United Nations as a western stooge. It is possible that the Russian attitude on this question may change once they find that the arrangements in the United Nations are such that it cannot be looked upon as a western stooge. The Afro-Asian nations too have grievances in regard to the manner in which the United Nations functions. The Constitution of the United Nations was framed at a time when the Afro-Asians were in a small minority. There is no doubt that the west is over-represented in the Security Council. Since the United Nations was established many new nations have become members of it. Surely the Security Council should more faithfully represent than it does at present the existing political position in the world. That may even require a revision of the Charter but in an

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

case I see no reason why the legitimate Government of China should be refused admission in the United Nations. We have a serious dispute with China over our borders. We think—and rightly too—that her attitude has been aggressive but we do not think that Formosa can represent China and be vested with the veto power.

Coming to the question of the Secretariat, it was considered by a committee of the United Nations on which I think we were represented. But I think what is needed is a sort of cabinet system in the Secretariat of the United Nations. The Secretary-General should have three Associate or Joint Secretaries drawn from the various regions of the world including the Afro-Asian world. One of them of course should be from the Soviet bloc. Further he should have an advisory council representing fairly the various regions to advise him in regard to all matters. Where there is a difference between him and the advisory council, even if the matter is not of sufficient importance it should go to the Security Council. I would go a little further. If two of these three Joint Secretaries differ, the matter, unless it is of extreme urgency in which case action may be taken by the Secretary-General in his discretion subject to ratification by the Security Council, should go to the Security Council. On some such basis of a decentralisation of the functions of the Secretary-General a settlement of this question which threatens to break up the United Nations may be possible. Another solution is to have three Secretaries of equal status each presiding for a year or so.

Coming to some other matters, I would press for the recognition of the Algerian Government. Other countries including Pakistan have done so. We should also press for the withdrawal of French troops from Bizerta. The Portuguese authorities have refused the United Nations Mission to visit Angola. Untold miseries have been committed by that country in Angola. Should we not now think in terms of asking the United Nations

to expel Portugal from the United Nations?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Maharashtra): There is no infliction of pain; there is complete genocide.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am glad that you have used the correct word.

Now, I go on to disarmament. I do not propose to say much beyond this that it is of the greatest importance possible. It is bound up with the question of inspection and of control. What should be aimed at is phased disarmament and not controlled armament. Clearly—and here I must say that I have not been able to understand the Russian case at all notwithstanding the intervention of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta when Dr. Kunzru was speaking—the troika cannot work in a system in which we are seeking real disarmament. It is a matter for satisfaction that the situation in Laos has considerably improved and that there has been some improvement in the Congo situation but the question of colonialism cannot be completely ignored. Britain is now liquidating her colonies but I must stress that I do not feel happy at the arrangements regarding Northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia. We have to be firm in our policy towards Pakistan. Time will not permit me to go into that question but I endorse every word of what has been said about Pakistan by other speakers. I do not wish to go into the other questions as I have not got the time to do so.

Sir, the Prime Minister is going on a historic mission at a most critical time in the history of the world and we wish him all success in his noble effort in the solution of problems which threaten the peace of the world. For some time there has been talk of limited wars and I wish to emphasize here that in these days limited wars are not possible and the choice before mankind is between peaceful co-existence and annihilation.

Thank you very much, Sir.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we had the opportunity of hearing the

Prime Minister twice within a week surveying the international situation, on the 16th of this month in the Lok Sabha and today in our House. I feel very happy to see two changes of great significance in the policy of the Prime Minister. In regard to Pakistan we know that he has been very generous or over-generous and he has tried to help them. Not only has he tried to be fair to them, but has tried to help them to overcome many difficulties, and over-generous even at the cost of the interests of India.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** How? He must not make irresponsible statements. He must be bold and make a responsible statement to show how the Prime Minister has acted in regard to Pakistan against the interests of India.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I am sorry, my hon. friend . . .

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** It is an utterly irresponsible statement.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** My hon. friend has misunderstood me and has not allowed me to proceed further. I wanted to clear my position. I said that he is a very kind-hearted man and he feels that everybody is like him. In treating Pakistan one could very well understand if he was fair to them. But I can prove from the proceedings and from his speeches that he himself has admitted that he has been over-generous. And to be over generous means certainly, to a certain extent, that the interests of our country were harmed in minor matters. It certainly is not an irresponsible statement. I am sorry that a responsible man of the stature of Diwan Chaman Lall should make such a statement. Then, Sir, this has been reflected in the Canal Waters Treaty, whereby not only we paid large amounts to strengthen the hands of Pakistan, but literally Rajasthan has suffered from the supply of this water. We have also seen that a few months ago the Prime Minister went even to the extent of saying that to help Pakistan get over her difficulties, he even supplied them with funds i.e. with the sinews of war. Why? It is because he felt that by

love and by treating them as a good neighbour he would be able to assure them or convince them of the friendship of India and thereby they would live like two good neighbours. It is a matter of real satisfaction that now the Prime Minister has seen Pakistan in its true colours. It is a happy augury. Now, today in his speech he did not refer to this point. But in his speech in the Lok Sabha the Prime Minister has said that he is convinced that Indo-Pak relations are not dependant upon Kashmir. If the Kashmir question was solved, Pakistan would find some other pretext for continuing its anti-India policy. I feel happy that in the end he has realised and seen Pakistan in its true colours and that in dealing with Pakistan in future he will keep this point in view and treat Pakistan in such a manner. He is a man of great experience and he must know that the leopard can never change its spots. And, therefore, if we treat Pakistan with more and more kindness, they will feel more and more arrogant, taking our kindness to be our weakness. In the good old days it was a good policy to help an enemy to bring him on an equal footing and then start a noble battle. Our epics are full of such stories and examples. But then we have gone far beyond. We are in a different age. The Prime Minister always tells us that we can progress only if we can keep pace with the time. This outmoded and outdated policy and what was good in the good old days does not hold good now. An enemy has to be treated as an enemy and if he is strengthened, then one day we will suffer. Therefore, it is a good thing that he has now seen Pakistan in its true colours.

Then, Sir, I am absolutely certain that though Pakistan may have aggressive designs against us, it cannot afford to translate them into action. Ours is a very big country. They may have good friends and very resourceful friends with means of every kind. They may get all sorts of help from them, military or otherwise. But they dare not be aggressive towards our country.

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

But all the same, if they attain superiority in regard to weapons or armaments or in other ways over us, psychologically we suffer from an inferiority complex. Therefore, whether we have to beg, borrow or steal, whenever we find that Pakistan is stealing a march over us, it becomes necessary for us to see that we balanced our power with them. Again, the Prime Minister feels that it is not correct for this country to take military aid from any power. I do not mind even if he changes the policy in this respect. In such a case if he changes his policy in regard to taking military aid from some friendly countries, it will also be a good thing.

Then, Sir, in regard to Goa, the Portuguese possession, another happy event has taken place in the change in the policy of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister, over the past several years, has been telling us and the world in his successive policy statements that he is determined to deal with conflicts or matters of dispute with other countries on a peaceful basis, come what may. I again feel happy that circumstances have forced him to change this policy in regard to this matter also. We are very jubilant that Dadra and Nagar Haveli now form part of the motherland. But about Goa our policy is still uncertain. Our Government is still hesitating and the previous fear of international intervention is still haunting them. It is a matter of satisfaction that new light is being seen by the Government and they have now changed their policy and they feel that something needs to be done now. The Prime Minister in the other House has stated that he now realises that the time may come when a decision may have to be taken to use force in solving the problem. Then, he stated:—

“I cannot rule out the question of using armed force in regard to Goa”.

It is indeed a very happy thing and the country feels very happy that circumstances have forced the Prime Minister to change his policy, because the outmoded policy does not help

any country which is developing and which has a future.

Now, Sir, in regard to China, much has been said and I need not repeat what has been stated by hon. Members in this House. But our relations with China continue to be as bad as with Pakistan and so on and so forth. Here there are two points which I want to make. One of the points to which the Prime Minister referred in the other House, he did not refer here. Of course, naturally the question arises always that China is sitting tight over 12,000 square miles of our territory and they just do not bother. Now and then questions are being asked of the Prime Minister as to what he is doing in regard to this matter. Of course he gives various replies which do not seem to be satisfactory to various sections of the people. Now in regard to this question as to what we are doing in regard to China, the Prime Minister stated in Lok Sabha that “the Chinese exercised pressure on India because they were sitting on her territory, and India, in turn, exercised great pressure on the Chinese. It affected their prestige all over South East Asia and Africa”. Sir, I wish it was true. To me it is a wishful thinking which is sometimes good because it is a source of consolation when one is depressed and frustrated. Sir, what are we seeing? Here is Burma, our neighbour and China's neighbour. It was we who introduced the Prime Minister of Burma. Mr. U Nu, to Mr. Chou En-lai, according to the statement of the Prime Minister some time ago in this House, telling him that Burma, being sandwiched between two great countries, India and China, feels frightened about its position, and that it would be a good thing if Mr. Chou-En-lai asked him to come over there and talked over the matter. And what happened? Burma has stolen a march over us. They have settled many things with China, and these two are now great friends, while we are where we are and if anything, we have become more and more unfriendly and our relations have become more and more bitter. Sir, I feel a little humiliated to find a statement in the latest notes exchanged

between the two countries which were placed in the Lok Sabha on the 7th of August, 1961. It reveals a pathetic situation, and really anybody who is proud of his country will feel humiliated that the Government would feel so helpless that they would not hesitate even to tell these things to a country with whom they are not in friendly terms. Sir, in our note we have expressed surprise that the Government of China "persists in refusing to recognise the basic contradiction between their acceptance of the traditional boundary and the watershed principle which the so-called MacMahon Line confirmed as far as Burma is concerned, and their repudiation of the traditional boundary and that very principle with regard to India". What bigger humiliation there can be for a country that it has been placed in a position in which it has to tell the enemy that to a smaller country they have been just and fair, while in regard to us, who compare ourselves on an equal footing with China, they have not given the same justice to us. We have been placed in this position to tell them this. It is indeed a real humiliation. This is not the way in which in political matters one should accept defeat. We are losing to China, in matters relating to Burma, to Nepal and many other places, and the Prime Minister states that we have put pressure on them and that their prestige has suffered all over South East Asia and Africa. I think it was Dr. Kunzru who referred to the happy relations between the Governments of Burma and India. I agree that Mr. Nehru and Mr. U Nu are personally very great friends, but I am doubtful if that friendship exists between the people of Burma and the people of India because of our behaviour and treatment towards them. A large section of the people from my part of the country resides in Burma, and probably half of Rangoon is occupied by them as in the case of Calcutta. They are Baglas from Churu—I want you to believe me when I say that—and like them there are hundreds of families of Rajasthan who have got business in Rangoon and other places like Mandalay and in some other parts

of Burma. You ask them what their feelings are. Though Chinese are naturally feared, our Indian nationals are hated there. That is the position, and if we do not look out and are not careful, we will see what the consequences will be and what the results will be in the near future. There is available evidence which points to the fact that within a short time the scene has completely changed. China has signed new agreements with Burma, is about to sign agreements with Nepal, with Indonesia also they have got very good relations, and other countries have also been prudent enough to make such terms with China as were available to them.

Then, Sir, I would refer to our Secretary-General's visit to Peking. The Prime Minister referred to this point in some detail, and it has been touched by many other hon. Members also and therefore I need not go into details, but in this connection I would like to ask one or two questions, and I would be glad if information on these points is furnished to me while the reply is being given. Sir, I was very carefully listening to the justification of the Secretary-General's visit to Peking given by the Prime Minister. I was feeling that he was trying to justify what was obviously an unjustifiable case. Dr. Kunzru in his characteristic way referred to this question and said that it could very well have been entrusted to the Embassy at Peking. But I would like to ask two questions, and one is this. Shri Nehru is a politician and he would look at the events from a political point of view. But then there are experts both in our External Affairs Ministry and there are experts on the spot. My point is this. In our External Affairs Ministry we have got a China Division. Some papers state that they put up resistance to Mr. R. K. Nehru visiting Peking. It has appeared in some of the papers. I do not know whether it has come to the notice of the External Affairs Ministry or the Deputy Minister here. But then there are experts and if they have put up resistance to such a thing, it should carry some weight because, as

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

I was stating, Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister, is a politician, and in such matters the views of the experts should have more weight. I would like to know the real position. The second point in this connection is this. Our Ambassador in Peking had no knowledge or information about the visit of the Secretary-General to Peking. He came to know about it through Chinese sources.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Where did you read all these things?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: In papers.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): Which papers?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I do not remember which, but I saw in some papers.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Do you believe that?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am asking whether it is a fact or not.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Why such a childish thing? Is it possible that any Ambassador of India would not know that the Secretary-General is going to that country?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It may be possible. The hon. Member has been an Ambassador.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I tell you from personal experience. It is not possible.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: He may tell me from his personal knowledge. But still when I see something in the papers, I have the right to find out whether it is a fact or not. If it is not a fact, that is all right but if it is a fact, then it is a serious thing. I do not know why he should get irritated because I am not referring to him. I want to get some information from the Ministry. If they can give

me that information and if what I say is correct, then it is a bad thing; if it is not correct, then it is all right.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: You have done the damage all the same.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, it is understood that telegraphically he wanted the clarification and added that any show of Indian initiative for negotiations on the border question would be seriously detrimental to India. Therefore, if I can be told that this thing is not correct, I will be very happy but if it is correct, then it is a serious thing and the Ambassador should also not be treated in this manner.

These trouble spots naturally come up whenever the virile, proud nations, which are very keen to safeguard their interests; come into clash with others. But whenever a trouble spot comes up, my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, tries to force the External Affairs Ministry to make some statement or give replies and therefore they are placed sometimes in a very awkward position. Now, in regard to Cuba, Shri Bhupesh Gupta asked the Prime Minister to make a statement. Without dispassionately going into the pros and cons of the question, he made a statement here and criticized the action of the United States as setting up a bad precedent which was likely to result in far-reaching consequences. What happened? Within twenty-four hours, the Prime Minister praised the Kennedy administration for its dynamism in preserving peace. Surely, this is not the way of a mature statesman of the stature of the Prime Minister. Within twenty-four hours he made a statement that the dynamic policy of the Kennedy administration was for peace and order, while in replying to Shri Bhupesh Gupta, he criticized that the policy that the United States was following towards Cuba would set up a very bad precedent.

Now, going a little further, I would like to say that I am sorry that some of my friends and colleagues here feel a little agitated about my remarks. But I am given to free thinking and

free speaking. I am used to that and I have to say what I feel without fear or favour. Otherwise, how are we to know what is the correct position in regard to various matters?

In regard to the other burning issues, at present there are two or three of them. Firstly, I will refer to the Congo. It is a matter of some satisfaction that things are settling down there but still it will take a long time for matters to be settled to the satisfaction of the people of the Congo and the statesmen of the world. But here we have sent our troops to strengthen the hands of the United Nations. It is indeed a very laudable object but what is the position of the United Nations? As far as I can see, it has now become more or less a debating society. It can be effective only if the two powers take joint action, that means, the United Nations and Russia. If these two nations do not take joint action in regard to any decision, the United States becomes a defunct body and it cannot function effectively in regard to any issue that is before it. We are, of course, one of the staunchest believers in the United Nations. But there are even small—or big—powers which feel that their interests are not being properly safeguarded by the United Nations and they do not care for it. Take the case of the U.A.R. The United Nations have passed certain resolutions but they do not care for them. South Africa did not care. Of course, Russia and the United States are very big powers. Naturally they would not care for anything. The United Nations has become a defunct body. It can be strengthened only if these two powers join together in any action. Of course, we are great believers in the United Nations. Very good, but what is the result? Our troops there are not liked by the people of the Congo and by the Government of the Congo, a Government which has been recognised by the United Nations. In this connection, what happened to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal? Simply because he was an Indian, he

had to be withdrawn, and we know the circumstances under which he was withdrawn, and it is indeed a very great humiliation to us.

I want to say something in regard to the Berlin problem. The Berlin crisis is nothing but a reflection of the clash of two ideologies. It is not only in Europe that the geographical fact of the two States of East Germany and West Germany existing has come into being. And the other places where there is this clash of ideologies are Korea and Vietnam, but the States in Europe have greater stake and therefore the crisis there is also proportionately grave. The Berlin crisis has been raising its head ever since November, 1958, when Mr. Khrushchev gave the initial threat, with a six-month deadline, that he would sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, altering the West Berlin status. This issue is assuming great importance because time is running out against the Soviet Union. Even though it may imply the repudiation of the Big Four agreements on Germany and Berlin solemnly entered into after the Second World War, the Soviet Union has to force the issue. Mr. Khrushchev has lately been showing great keenness on co-existence. He is having it with a vengeance in Berlin. Thousands of people every day are deserting the Communist Paradise for the capitalist West. This is naturally upsetting the Soviet Union. Another factor appears to be the revival of German militarism. They have to act before it is too late. But the West also owes a sacred duty to the Germans and the Germans cannot for ever be kept unarmed. They are a virile nation. The Prime Minister has stated that it was a desirable and a normal development that the two States should come together. But can any State, when it has come under the hegemony of a Communist country, ever dream of self-determination? The Prime Minister feels that one obvious way to solve this problem and to lessen the tension is to have disarmament on a very considerable scale. This is not a practical proposition. Also the destructive



[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

nature of the weapons prevents war being unleashed. No Hiroshima or Nagasaki would have happened if the other party also had the same weapons and if complete disarmament takes place, then the smaller nations will have no chance. Therefore, Sir, I feel that as long as there will be two ideologies facing each other, these crises will take place, and this disarmament or the banning of the use of nuclear weapons is not a practical proposition.

Thank you.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Sir, my hon. friend who has just spoken used a phrase which I would like to repeat. He said: There are troublous spots in this troublous world. What he meant probably was trouble spots in this troublesome world. As far as I am concerned, after listening to his speech, I believe, he is undoubtedly one of those troublesome spots in this troublesome world. I have no doubt in my mind that he has not read the very classical book called 'Don Quixote' by Cervantes, which shows how the Don was in the habit of tilting at windmills, imaginary windmills, with his lance. And what my friend has been doing is tilting at imaginary windmills of his own creation or the creation of the particular newspapers that he is addicted to. Now, Sir, his speech has no relevance to the realities of the situation. For instance, he has just said that if disarmament comes about, there will be no place for small nations. I do not know what he means. After all, he is a statesman who has been a Minister . . .

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: He has been Prime Minister.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He has been Prime Minister, I am told by my friend, Dr. Hriday Nath Kunzru, and it is expected of him at least that he would make statements on the floor of this House which have some aspect of responsibility attached to them, and not statements of this nature, merely because he happens to be against the

Government. He may be against the Government . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not against the Government.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Then he may probably be against the Prime Minister—I do not know. But his speeches on the floor of this House, and this last speech of his cannot be construed in any other light whatsoever.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This is your opinion.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It is an ignorant speech in the context of the very important and serious problem that affects the world. And what is that problem, Sir? I am quite sure that this House and indeed the entire nation welcomes the initiative that has been taken by some of the nonaligned powers for the calling of a conference in Belgrade, and I have not the least doubt myself that the entire nation welcomes the move of the Prime Minister of India when he decided to attend this conference.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I have not criticised it.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: This conference is not going to deal with small matters of no consequence. One of my friends said just now that this was a historic occasion. It is a historic occasion; it is much more important than the Bandung Conference, which was held a few years ago. Indeed the subjects of war and peace are on the anvil of this particular conference, and we are very happy in that our Prime Minister is going to this Conference because, at this conference, questions of world importance are going to be discussed, questions relating to colonialism, to disarmament, to peaceful co-existence and, above all, the question of war and the question of peace, and with his vast experience, his wisdom, his statesmanship and his ability to bring people together it is obvious that these questions will be stretched to the extreme limit and utilised for the purpose of ensuring that the world does not blow up.

Now, Sir, my learned friend, Dr. Hriday Nath Kunzru, referred to many matters, and one of the matters he referred to was the German question, which was also referred to by the Prime Minister, and in regard to the German question he also referred to the Potsdam Agreement. He did not use the word Potsdam but he referred to the agreement, referred to also by my friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh. Now it is not generally recognised or known that there was this agreement but that this agreement was broken immediately Germany was rearmed. One of the bases of this agreement was the non-militarisation of Germany. And when you talk about the breach of this agreement, you must realise that the breach was committed the moment Germany was rearmed and the main question that is affecting the world today is the question of the rearmament of Germany. During my learned friend's lifetime and mine, two world wars were started by Germany.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: This is not quite correct. The agreement broke down when at an international conference it was found that the Allied Powers and Russia could not agree on any question. This agreement was arrived at on the basis that these powers would continue to work together. But they failed to work and consequently the agreement broke down.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My learned friend is mixing events together. The fact of the matter is that the basis of the agreement was the non-militarisation of Germany—nobody can deny that—and that basis was denied the moment West Germany was armed or, rather, Germany was given arms, that was the signal for the breach of this agreement and nothing else was the signal for the breach of this agreement. And now, to try and cry over spilt milk over this agreement is, I think, utterly unrealistic. It is asking for excuses for action, which should not be asked for. For instance, now it is said that egress or ingress from or into Berlin is at stake. What

is also at stake is the fact that the three corridors—the air corridors—going into Berlin will probably be blocked. What is also at stake is that the status of West Berlin will be changed. Further with troops, 11,000 originally, and now about 12,500 with the influx recently—two days ago—of American troops into Berlin, the demand will be made for the throwing out of these troops out of Berlin. Now, Sir, it is not generally realised that Mr. Khrushchev has offered, and offered what? He has offered, number one, that there will be no change in the entry into or the exit from Berlin of the military personnel that used these highways or used these corridors. He has guaranteed that the number of troops that existed in Berlin will continue to do so. He will not change the status of Berlin from that point of view nor will he change the economic or the political status of Berlin. And further he has offered to leave Berlin a free city under international control. Now what is there to fight about? He has offered everything that could be demanded by the Western Powers in regard to West Berlin. You may believe him or not—that is a different matter altogether. But this is a fact that has been stated by Mr. Khrushchev. He has offered these four things with regard to Berlin, practically everything that was demanded in regard to Berlin. Yet the picture is not complete. Now this reminds me of a cartoon that I saw on the eve of the War, on the eve of World War II. I happened to be in Nice at the time, and in a French newspaper published in Marseilles I saw a little cartoon about two friends, two charwomen, one with her hands on her hips saying to the other: "My dear, Mr. Chamberlain has offered this, has offered that and has offered the other to Monsieur Hitler. If I were in the place of Mr. Chamberlain, I would ask Monsieur Hitler, 'would you also like to have the hand of my sister.'" Now Mr. Khrushchev, having offered everything else, the only thing that remains for the Western Powers to ask for is the hand of a Russian girl in order to complete the process. But this is a

[Diwan Chaman Lal.]

very serious matter indeed. A reunited Germany is not possible. The Prime Minister has said quite clearly that probably everybody wants a reunited Germany. But in the present circumstances of the cold war, when the Western Powers are wanting to protect the interests of 2½ million Germans in Berlin—quite rightly they want to protect their interests—how do they expect the Eastern Powers not to protect the interests of the 18 million Germans living in East Germany? And how do they expect it in the state of the cold war that exists today? If East Germany is to be united with West Germany, the only way in which the question of re-unification can be taken up is when the cold war ends and when total disarmament is achieved. Not until then will there be any chance of the balance of power in Central Europe being obtained. What is happening in Germany? What is happening there is the fear that the Russians have got, that the West German militarisation and the offer to them of the use of nuclear weapons or the possession by them of nuclear warheads would be a most dangerous thing.

Not only that, but not one important German in the West German Government has to this day accepted the Oder-Neisse line. You know, Sir, that as a result of the Oder-Neisse line, there are certain areas that have gone to Czechoslovakia, there are certain areas which have gone to Russia and certain other areas have gone to Poland. Unless and until stability is achieved in Central Europe, there is no possibility of the East European powers giving up the Oder-Neisse line. The Oder-Neisse line is now the final line of demarcation as far as the Eastern powers are concerned. Now in view of that and the danger that the Eastern powers see in West German re-armament, how is it possible for them not to take further steps in order to assure their own position? I think that the step that they are taking, namely, of effecting a peace treaty with East Germany is in line with that particular thought.

Now, Sir, apart from this question of effecting a peace treaty with East Germany, there is the question again of assuring that in any future negotiations that there may be, the peace of the world will be assured. But how is that to come about? Having been to Russia two or three times myself and having talked to Mr. Khrushchev, as I am standing here, I am quite convinced that the Soviet Union does not want war. On the last occasion it was when Mr. MacMillan was visiting Moscow that Mr. Khrushchev came from a meeting with Mr. MacMillan to tell us that he had just informed Mr. MacMillan that he was determined to effect a peace treaty with East Germany. Whereupon Mr. MacMillan said, turning his back on Mr. Khrushchev, 'We will not accept it'. And Mr. Khrushchev said to Mr. MacMillan, 'You will not accept it? May I remind you, Mr. MacMillan, that you did exactly the same thing to us when you unilaterally effected a peace treaty with Japan? Now we are going to do exactly the same thing.' Mr. Khrushchev's comment was—'there was a very long pause'—Obviously this matter was not considered on these lines. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, permit me a couple of minutes. I am quite convinced that the Soviet Union does not want war. The reason has been given on the floor of the House. Somebody pointed to the millennium that the Russians were wanting. If they want the millennium, if they want prosperity of their own people, war is a thing that would destroy all hopes of creating that millennium in their own country, bringing in an era of prosperity in their own country. I am quite convinced in my own mind, come what may, the Soviet Union does not want war in spite of the fact that they possess today the most terrible weapons. **Nobody wants war. War would mean the negation of everything that anybody stands for.** In the olden days you could fight a war for the sake of Asia or Africa, for the exploitation of Asia and Africa, for the cheap labour of Asia and Africa. Today there will be

no survivors. It is a point of no return that has been reached as far as armaments are concerned.

One word more before I sit down. There are many subjects that I would have liked to touch upon, like China and so on and so forth, but let me say one word about Pakistan. Do not let any hon. Member get away with the idea that the Prime Minister of India, or this Parliament or anybody in India, excepting perhaps those people who do not agree entirely with our policies, is capable of letting down the interests of India, or letting down our own people. Our policy has been to judge every issue on its merits. That is why the Prime Minister goes to praise America and American friendship with us. But immediately on the question of Cuba he goes out of his way to condemn what has happened in Cuba. The whole world has condemned what has happened there. You may consider and understand . . .

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** Then he comes and corrects himself.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** He never needs to correct anything. You read the wrong papers, Mr. Jaswant Singh. Read the right papers. You do not know what is happening. You must understand our policy. Our policy is to judge each issue on its merits, as it arises. That is the policy of non-alignment.

Sir, the Prime Minister goes to Belgrade. Remember, Sir, originally we were all alone in the matter of non-alignment. We were the only nation in the world and my friend, who now condemns India's foreign policy, will at least agree with me that although a few years ago we were alone, today we are thirty or more than thirty in number, and tomorrow, I hope, the time will come when we will be in the majority in this world, and then there will be no question of any war, no question of any threat to the peace of the world. My hon. friend should, therefore, study these questions in the light of the world events as they are taking place, that India's policy is a

policy of peace, a policy of non-alignment which has now been recognised even by the bigger powers. What did the big powers do in Laos? What did they suggest? 'Laos must remain non-aligned'.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Neutral.

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** Some hon. friends say, neutral. It is the big powers, the big powers under the regime of Mr. Kennedy, whom we consider very friendly to us, who have declared that non-alignment is a policy which ought to be accepted by the big powers as far as Laos is concerned. Therefore, our policy, the foreign policy that we are discussing today, has been very eminently successful and I do hope that the further steps the Prime Minister takes in regard to this policy will result in bringing the different nations of the world nearer to each other and bring peace to this world.

**SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, mysterious are the ways of nature. It looks as if Providence has chosen Berlin as the instrument to destroy the world. Germany was responsible for the first world war. The Second World War was also Germany's responsibility and God forgive lest history should repeat itself. Let us hope that by our Prime Minister's visit who goes to attend the Neutral Summit Conference, this crisis will be averted. Our Prime Minister goes with the blessings of the nation. The whole nation is behind him in his vow to solve the great problem. As the Prime Minister says, by means of negotiation all the problems, however delicate, however burning they may be, can be solved easily. I am sure on Berlin issue, Sir, wiser counsel will prevail and the tragedy will be averted and harmony will be restored.

Now, Sir, we Indians are confronted with three problems. One is the Chinese aggression. The other is the Goan problem and the third is the

[Shri D. A. Mirza.]

Pakistan aggression. Sir, the Chinese problem is a very delicate problem. China has committed aggression against innocent and non-violent people. When I heard the speech delivered by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the leader of the Communist Party, I was reminded of a hurricane. He was very vehement in his criticism on the Goa issue as well as on Pakistan, but it pains me most to say that not a word of protest, not a word of condemnation, was uttered about the Chinese aggression against India.

There are only two sets of people to justify aggression by China on Indian soil. One is Pakistan and the other is the Communist Party of India. Sir, let me make the world understand, especially the Communist Party of India, that the day is not far-off when China will be forced to vacate the aggression.

Sir, the Goa issue is like this. With regard to the liberation of Goa, it is not a question of days but it is a question of hours. But according to the policy of *Ahimsa dharma*, a policy of non-violence, a policy of peace, that is pursued by our Indian Government, by our Prime Minister who is the ambassador of peace, today we have to pursue peaceful policy. If India is determined to liberate Goa, just as the morning mist disappears before the rising sun, the Portuguese will disappear from Goa. The liberation of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is the first nail in the coffin of Portuguese colonialism in India.

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

5 P.M.

The liberation of Goa will be the last stage and it will mean the end of the Portuguese possessions in India. The very problem today is this.

Let me make a reference to our neighbour on the other side of the border, I mean Pakistan, a State that was built on hate and conflict. From

the day Pakistan came into existence it has had nothing but hatred for India. The policy that Pakistan is pursuing since its very inception is a policy of hatred or conflict, hatred for India and conflict with India. Pakistan has committed aggression against our land. Pakistan has illegally occupied a vast area of land in Kashmir which is India. The world knows, and history says, that geographically and legally Pakistan is not justified in occupying that portion of Kashmir. Kashmir is India and India is Kashmir. Aggression against Kashmir is aggression against India but you know, to stop all this, to cry a halt to the conflict that was going on before, in the pre-independence days, we conceded Pakistan. We conceded Pakistan with our blessings. We thought that everything would end—hatred, disharmony and discord—and Mahatma Gandhi attained martyrdom because of his sympathy for Pakistan. What do we get in return? Hatred from Pakistan.

Here are the statements made by \* \* \* President Ayub Khan \* \* \* \* against our Prime Minister who is greater than Asoka today. Asoka attained greatness and renunciation after fighting the battle of Kalinga, after sacrificing his 99 brothers at the altar of war. Here is a Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, who has conquered the world without firing a shot and shedding a drop of blood. He is the conqueror of this world. He has conquered the heart of every man. Today he is going with our blessings to solve the Berlin.

India is a nation of heroes. Here is our contribution to world peace. Our contributions to peace and prosperity today have made us heroes and today we have produced a hero who continues to be our Prime Minister for the past 14 years, an unbroken record, which no Prime Minister in the history of the world could boast of. Today take the instance of Pakistan.

\* \* \* \* \*

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** May I say a word? I would submit that it is not proper in our House for the Head of a State to be mentioned in the language that the hon. Member is using. It does not matter whether we agree with him or not. There are certain proprieties which have to be observed.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** The hon. Member will take care that he should not refer to the head of a neighbouring State like this. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI D. A. MIRZA:** The Geeta says that when an enemy is not destroyed it is adharma. The Quran says: God's curses are on those who are aggressors. Pakistan is an aggressor.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** There are certain Rules of Procedure which preclude us from referring to the Head of a neighbouring State in such terms.

**SHRI D. A. MIRZA:** I ask President Ayub Khan, can he use these words against the Prime Minister of a neighbouring State.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** I hope the hon. Member will take care and he should not use such disparaging words.

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** He was speaking in this House of Parliament where we have to observe certain proprieties. We have to observe them outside too but outside, there is no Speaker or Chairman to control them. Here we should observe those proprieties anyhow.

**SHRI D. A. MIRZA:** So the return that we get for our indulgence and for our forgiveness and for our liberal views is hatred from Pakistan but what I want to impress on Pakistan is, we are pursuing the path of righteousness. We are pursuing the path

of peace under the guidance of our Prime Minister but one thing is certain. Kashmir is India and India is Kashmir and the time is not far off when at the very call of the Prime Minister the whole of India will rise as one man—Hindus, Muslims, Christians—'o back the Prime Minister in his policy towards Kashmir, not only towards Kashmir but towards Goa and China.

**SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, much has been said in this debate on the forthcoming Conference at Belgrade, what is called the Neutral Summit Conference. I join my hon. friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, and others who wished godspeed to the Prime Minister on the occasion of his journey to Belgrade for participating in the forthcoming Neutral Summit Conference. I would like to mention that there is a substantial section of opinion in the country which has not been over-enthusiastic about this Neutral Conference. We do not doubt the sincerity of the Members who are going to attend the Conference or the sincerity of the signatories who extended the invitation to this Conference at Belgrade but neutralism by itself cannot produce a philosophy. It is an attitude of mind dictated by the requirements of every country. It is a matter of satisfaction that the unaligned policy which was formulated by the Prime Minister many years ago has now come to be accepted as the principal tenet of the foreign policy of many countries but beyond that, we cannot formulate any definite political philosophy on the basis of neutralism. I do not know what the agenda of the Conference is going to be. We heard from the Prime Minister this morning that the agenda would include matters relating to peace and perhaps Germany. If he replies tomorrow, we should like to have a little more information on the agenda of this Conference because it is most essential that the discussions of this Neutral Summit should be confined to those matters which will strengthen neutral nations. For example, there is the

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

question of colonialism in the Portuguese territories. There is the question of the colour bar. A Neutral Summit Conference can do a lot of work as Bandung did some years ago in mobilising public opinion on these issues but we are told that this Conference is going to discuss matters relating to the reorganisation of the structure of the United Nations. There are a number of proposals now in the field for amending the U.N. Charter and I believe that last year the Prime Minister declared that he was not in favour of an immediate change. I am not quoting exactly his words but that is what he said last year. But if it is a question of the amendment of the U.N. Charter, we should like to tell the Prime Minister that this is a matter on which Members of Parliament would like to express their views before the Government takes a decision. It is not likely that the Prime Minister of the Indian Government will be hustled into taking a decision on this important question. But if at all this question is raised at the Neutral Summit Conference, we would like the Prime Minister to consider the fact that there are many on this side of the House who would like to join the Government with regard to fundamental modifications of the U.N. Charter and we do not want that a question of this kind should be decided at the Neutral Summit Conference.

Sir, there is another point which is seriously engaging the public mind and that is that there is a move on the part of some of the neutral nations to make these Neutral Summit Conferences as almost a periodical affair to discuss the U.N. agenda in advance. I do not know whether my information culled from newspaper reports is correct; but if it is so, I think that we should avoid getting involved in such previous discussions of matters relating to the U.N. agenda, because that would amount to the formation of a group and I believe that the foreign policy of the country has been based

on the fact that we would not like to get aligned with other people even with regard to previous discussions.

Next I would like to go on to the question of West Germany. The Prime Minister said that the problem is connected with the problem of disarmament. If I may say so with great respect to him, that is a little over-simplification of the matter. He is aware of the complexities of the Berlin problem, much more perhaps than many in this House, or for that matter, anywhere. But as one who has studied this problem, I should like to say that there is in West Germany itself a body of opinion—I would not like to call it substantial, but it is there—a body of opinion which feels that the United Nations should give a guarantee about the neutralisation of Germany. The eastern part of Germany is part of the Warsaw Pact and the western part of the NATO, and it has been the considered policy of the Government that we would not like all these pacts to function as they would endanger world peace. I should like the Prime Minister to consider, not at the Summit Conference, but later, the question of supporting the proposal for the neutralisation, the demilitarisation of Germany, backed by the U.N. guarantee. I may inform the House that the Western powers are not enthusiastic about this proposal, because they consider that any neutralisation of Germany would not be respected by the Soviet Union. Therefore, I think the neutralisation proposal would not be acceptable to the West German government.

I would like to make a further point on this question of West Germany. So far, I believe, the policy of the Indian Government has been to regard West Germany as a European problem. It certainly was so till the other day. But the dimensions that this problem is assuming now threaten world peace. If a war breaks out in the future—I do not want to be an astrologer and I do not want to make any forecast—it would be on the issue

of Berlin and West Germany. In view of the importance of the West German and Berlin problems, to world peace, we might not take a detached view of the German affairs, because there is a lot of feeling in West Germany that we do not take a positive line with regard to West German affairs or on the question of Berlin. So far, we have regarded it a European problem. But, Sir, I believe there is a move now on the part of Brandt, the contender for the Chancellor's nomination in West Germany, to call a conference of 52 nations to consider the West German question. If at all the West German question assumes an importance far beyond what it was last year, we would like this country to take an active part, as it did in the Congo and suggest measures for a solution because what affects Germany affects all of us.

There is one further point that I would like to make about West Germany. There is growing pressure on the part of the Soviet Union for getting recognition on a unilateral basis, for East Germany. We have our trade contacts with East Germany. We recognise the West German Government. But we should inform at some stage the leader of the Soviet Union—Mr. Khrushchev—that much as we would like East Germany to develop its own traditions, we would not like to see a unilateral decision taken for that does not solve the German problem. Let not Mr. Khrushchev feel that if he recognised East Germany, in course of time, India and other countries would follow because they are most anxious that the problem of Germany should be solved. I do not think there is the possibility of the reunification of Germany. I believe, this is also the informed view of the United Kingdom where it is felt that as a result of the continuous indoctrination for the past fifteen years, East Germany has developed a frame of mind which shall not permit the unification of the two Germanys.

There is one other point which I would like to make and that relates

to China to which references has already been made by other speakers. The Prime Minister said that when the Secretary-General in the External Affairs Ministry visited China, it was in the nature of a courtesy call. Sir, courtesy is always on a reciprocal basis. It is not unilateral. In the case of China we have had repeated cases of diplomatic discourtesies. Tape-recorded conversations have been denied. Letters have not been answered in time. And I think the Prime Minister will agree that China knows our case and it is not a matter of ignorance on their part that they have been taking a certain stand with regard to the border dispute. We have placed our cards on the table and they know very well what our case is, and it is not necessary for us to go and talk to them about this matter. I should like to ask the Prime Minister, if he agrees on this point, whether the External Affairs Ministry would send somebody to Pakistan to talk to President Ayub Khan on the Kashmir affair. We have taken a certain stand on the question of the border dispute and we have been disappointed by the reaction of the Chinese Government. Has there been any question from the side of China, asking for clarification of matters of detail? In that case, Sir, the Secretary-General in the External Affairs Ministry could have gone there to explain the point. But there has been no enquiry from that side, and we have gone, more or less, out of the way to explain things which did not require much explaining. I have no doubt that the Government is quite keen on the stand it has taken with regard to the border disputes and that there is no resiling from the findings of the officials who went to enquire into this matter. When that was the position, why should we create an impression in the country that we keep this matter, more or less, as a matter for further negotiations? I do not know whether the problem of China is going to be solved in the time of our revered Prime Minister. I am afraid it is going to be one of the unsolved problems of this generation.



[Shri A. D. Mani.]

Sir, whatever it is, we must build up a will to resist China and any such exploratory visits on the part of the Secretary-General would make the people feel that after all, we are not going to fight China if necessary. Of course, we do not want to go out of the way and fight for the solution of the border question.

Sir, one final point. There has been substantial agreement as the debate has revealed between this House and the other House on broad questions of foreign policy which is again a vindication of the policy followed by the Prime Minister and on this occasion of his visit to Belgrade may I say from this side of the House—to use a very old-fashioned phrase in this nuclear age—we wish him Godspeed and we hope that he will return to India after guiding the enthusiasm of that neutral summit conference into constructive and reasonable channels?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a matter of satisfaction for members of this side of the House that so far as the foreign policy of our Government is concerned, it has received unanimous support from all parties in this august House. Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta while discussing the matter referred particularly to the question of the change in the attitude of the U.S.A. He actually read out a passage where the Prime Minister had said that after the change the policy of the U.S.A. had been more friendly. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta criticised it and said that it was incorrect. Sir, my learned friend forgets that while we deplore the latest military aid to Pakistan at the same time we welcome the change in the attitude of the Kennedy Administration. In the previous regime the policy was: Those who are not with us are against us. The Kennedy Administration has given a definite blow to that principle and has said that those who were not

with them, that is, the non-aligned nations, could also be their friends. But my learned friend has missed that point completely.

Now, I will confine myself mainly to two things. The first is about this Belgrade conference. Everyone in this House—and I am sure everyone who thinks about this matter in the country—would welcome this historic conference. We further welcome the fact that our Prime Minister has decided to go there personally; we also welcome that he has declared in unequivocal terms that this would not be a third bloc but it would be only to consider certain problems which affect the peace of the world. And certainly non-aligned countries are also vitally interested in maintaining peace and if I may say so, more interested because we have to develop our countries and development will not be possible if unfortunately peace is disturbed. This conference of non-aligned countries is really the evolution of the policy that was adopted by India soon after its independence. We were, if I may say so, alone after the defeat during the course of the war by Japan of the colonial powers in South East Asia. When after the war the nationalist movements pushed aside the colonial powers, there was a vacuum and the two ideologies one from the side of China and the other from the side of the Western bloc, particularly the U.S.A., were trying to create a sphere of influence. It is then that we said that it would not be right to create these military pacts because they thought that notwithstanding the U.N.O. they could create these SEATO's and CENTO's but we stood against them. We said that that would go against the nationalist aspirations of countries which were rising in that part of the world. Sir, we are happy to note that our forecast and our calculations so far as Korea is concerned, so far as Laos is concerned and so far as other countries in that part of the world are concerned, has come true. This is a sort of progressive step after Bandung that we are

meeting at Belgrade. And I am glad that about 30 countries are to take part in it. May I respectfully suggest to our Prime Minister that in this conference, certainly while we will take up the question of Berlin, we will have to see that this balance is kept up because there are two Germanys whether we like it or not? At the same time they are ticklish questions. Firstly there is the question of Berlin and then there is the question of the reunification of Germany. It is not for me to suggest to you but I do feel that some *via media* will have to be found. We have to bring together these two blocs and solve this difficult problem which at any moment may develop into a shooting war.

The other suggestion that I would place before him for his consideration is this. For a long time now the question of amending the Constitution of the U.N.O. has been pending and I think here unprejudiced men, unaligned to any bloc, could consider this matter dispassionately and suggest something which will be constructive and which will help in maintaining the peace of the world because it is a fact that the U.N.O. today with its 99 members does not reflect properly in its different organs the present position, whether it is Security Council, whether it is Trusteeship Council or whether it is the Secretariat. So this will also be a great service if some constructive suggestion is given in this matter.

Then there is the question of cessation of nuclear weapons. They have stopped the tests but we do not know when this agreement to stop the tests will be broken especially when France has already defied it. So we have to see that such effective and constructive suggestions are given as would make this disarmament question and the question of prohibition of nuclear weapons something real, something which would save the world from disaster.

Then the genocide in Angola, the attitude of France so far as Algeria and Bizerta are concerned, the insult

that has been offered to the Secretary-General by South Africa in matters relating to South West Africa, by France in regard to the Bizerta issue are all matters of very serious concern and if something effective is not done, I am afraid the U.N.O. will also go on the lines of the League of Nations and it will be a bad day for the whole world.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of utterances of Field-Marshal Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan. Sir, our education, our political thinking and especially the dignity of this House do not permit us to give answer to all those things in the way that he has done but I can tell him that the regard, the respect, that we have for our leaders is something beyond the positions that they occupy. Whether they occupy those positions or not, we will always have the greatest respect and greatest affection for our leaders who are guiding the destiny of our country today.

Now, I will take the problem of Kashmir. We thought it was a closed matter and that was why we did not give our attention to this problem.

Now, for the last two months and since his visit to the United States, he is carrying on a campaign that Kashmir should go to him. And he also suggests certain measures. I want to bring this to the notice of the Members of this House, and if my voice could reach the President of Pakistan, I would say, please consider this matter dispassionately. So far as the question of Kashmir is concerned, two things are prominently mentioned by them. One is that it is a State which has got predominantly a Muslim population. The other is the question of plebiscite. I want to answer these two questions. As regards the first question, if any one studies the position of Kashmir and the political movement there, it will be accepted that Kashmir during the freedom struggle has always stood for non-communal politics, for national politics and has not given way to the

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

Muslim League in their own State. So much so, all the activities there were conducted in consultation with and on the lines of the Congress activities. Now, Sir, not only that. When aggression took place, then they stood against the aggression. Of course, our military went there later, but the people of Kashmir faced them and established by their sacrifice that they were against the two-nation theory or communal outlook. Having that background, could anybody say, simply because it has got preponderantly a Muslim population, that it should go to a country that has got a communal ideology, a theocratic State, a Fascist State? I would like this matter to be coolly considered not only by the Field-Marshal but also by the authorities and the President of the United States, who considers their case more sympathetically than it really deserves.

Now, the other question is plebiscite. I would submit that so far as this question is concerned, legally, constitutionally, through Constituent Assemblies and through elections, this matter has been settled. But now why does Pakistan want a plebiscite? Plebiscite means that they want a democratic decision. With due respect after the Field-Marshal became President, just after he had taken oath according to the Constitution, the very next day he scrapped the Constitution. Not only that. The founder of Pakistan, Mr. Mohammed Ali Jinnah, had made a declaration that Pakistan would be governed according to democratic principles and according to modern notions of democracy. And Field-Marshal Ayub Khan says: No, I do not accept modern democracy. I do not want to have that pattern. I want a sort of controlled democracy or dictatorship. Either they believe in democratic principles or they do not. Suppose Kashmir goes to them, will they have controlled democracy and abolish all the democratic institutions?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: They talk of basic democracies.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I know what that basic democracy is and you also know it. And this is a matter for the democratic countries. Of course, the United States is one of the biggest democracies. They have to consider this. Here is a democratic country and Kashmir with all its democratic institutions is progressing economically, educationally and socially. On the other side, what is the position we see in the occupied area of Kashmir, in the area occupied by Pakistan? There is no political institution, no freedom of expression, no economic progress. I would say let any commission come and decide this matter. Let the United Nations send it and see what is in the best interests of the country. I would submit that if this plebiscite question is taken up, it is only to rouse the passion and we cannot afford to allow it again. We have had enough of it after the partition. Even if the Government of India says that they will have a plebiscite, we, the people of India, and especially the Muslim community, will stand firmly and say, no, because we know the idea is to rouse communal passions there. After communal passion is roused, it would not only disturb the life of Kashmir, but the life of the people, of the minorities here and in Pakistan, will be disturbed. Are we going to play with human beings? Are human beings to be treated as chattels to be placed this way or that way? I want that this matter should be clearly understood by the Field-Marshal. I know that after Jinnah he has got the greatest power in his hands. This is a trust and he can utilise it in the best interests of his country and he can cultivate the best friendship with India. If he understands in the correct perspective the question of Kashmir and

gives up the Kashmir question and tries to be friendly, that will be really in the best interests of Pakistan. I support the motion.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA** (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, when World War II ended in 1945, the world had to choose between disarmament and a continuation of the war or an atmosphere of war. Unfortunately for us the Allied powers, which defeated the Fascists were not united and disarmament was ruled out. In practice, it was ruled out, though disarmament conferences are usual features of our lives. Instead of war, we had the beginnings of the cold war. The moment World War II came to an end, there were some mad Generals in America who proposed: Let us atom bomb the Soviet Union before the Soviet Union has atom bombs. Fortunately for the world those mad Generals were ruled out by less mad politicians, who substituted cold war for hot war. The war which Hitler unleashed in 1939 thus never came to an end. Only the hot war was replaced by a cold war in 1945 itself. We have since seen local wars—war in Korea, war in Indo-China, war in the Middle East, even in Africa. Even in the case of the African peoples' struggle for liberty, we find expressions of cold war, the two power blocs struggling and striving to get a bigger and bigger hold over the African people. So, the war never came to an end. It continues in the shape of cold war. The conference at Belgrade, which our Prime Minister is attending, if it is to succeed in making the world a safe place for peace, it has to succeed in finding some way of ending the cold war. I am afraid that the last few years have seen such an accentuation of the cold war that a number of partitions of various countries have taken place. Korea, Indo-China and even the Congo are divided. Algeria is threatened to be divided. Thus it appears that the imperialist powers and the power blocs are only manoeuvring for strategic positions and for getting more and more parts of the world under their control. Peace constantly remains in danger. I

do think that through the efforts of our great Prime Minister and others of the non-aligned nations, the Belgrade conference will strive to put an end to the cold war.

Sir, it has to be emphasized that cold war can be brought to an end only if the power blocs are dissolved, only if the peoples of the world accept the policy of co-existence, Panchsheel, enunciated by our country. It is only then that cold war can come to an end. We must see to it that the Belgrade Conference does not lead to the birth of a third bloc. There are some people who have been dreaming of a third bloc. They want to join neither the American bloc nor the Soviet bloc, they think of a third bloc of non-aligned nations. I must submit that that is a contradiction in terms. There can be no bloc of non-aligned nations. It will only become a third power bloc, whatever name we give it. It is, therefore, necessary that our learned Prime Minister should see to it that the Belgrade Conference does not lead to the beginning of the foundations of a third bloc.

Today we are naturally worried about the situation in Berlin. Berlin has been a constant headache ever since the war ended in 1945. It was as early as in 1949 that it appeared that the powers will quarrel over Berlin. There was the blockade of Berlin and there was the great airlift by the western nations, but fortunately a peaceful solution was found. But Berlin is again, after twelve years, a source of great worry. I am one of those who do feel that a peaceful solution of the issue can be found and it will be found. This morning's news is that Mr. Khrushchev is not going to sign a peace treaty with East Germany before our Prime Minister has visited Moscow. I am sure Mr. Khrushchev who calls himself a peace lover will listen to the greatest peace lover, our Prime Minister, and will not do anything which may precipitate matters. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that Mr. Khrushchev is willing to wait for the visit of our Prime Minister. Of course American

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

troops have been strengthened in Berlin. I am sure the Red Army which is stationed in Berlin has also been strengthened. But we find that instead of big Generals moving there, it was the American Vice-President who went to Berlin, and now the report is that some of the Soviet leaders are going to Berlin. The visit of Mr. Lyndon Johnson and the impending visit of Soviet leaders are only morale boosting visits, not visits which will start a shooting war. They may do that. The cold war does continue, and morale boosting at strategic points is one of the strategies of the cold war. But I do hope that Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy will listen to the voice of peace and that there will be no shooting war over Berlin. I do hope that this conference of non-aligned nations—it will be bad to call it a conference of neutral nations, I do not know how the word 'neutral' has come in, it is a conference of non-aligned nations—will give a positive approach to problems of peace and that it will adopt a positive attitude towards the colonial powers against the perpetuation of their rule. With these words I support the foreign policy which this country has adopted and which has, if at all it has done anything, enhanced the prestige of India.

شری پیر محمد خان ( جموں )

ایڈکٹ کشمیر: جذاب وائس چیرمین صاحب - قریب دو ماہ ہوئے جب پاکستان کے پریسیڈنٹ امریکہ گئے تھے۔ وہاں اور وہاں سے آنے کے بعد انہوں نے انڈیا اور اس کے پرائم منسٹر اور پارلیمنٹ کے متعلق جو اسٹیجیں دیں، وہاں ان کے شایان شان نہیں ہیں اور ہم ان کو ناپسند کرتے ہیں۔ اس قسم کی اسٹیجیز کی جو وجہ وہ بیان کرتے ہیں وہ کشمیر کا معاملہ

ہے۔ اور کشمیر کے معاملہ میں وہ چاہتے ہیں کہ وہاں پر پالیسیسٹائٹ ہو۔ جب کشمیر کے مہاراجہ نے لیگنٹی -- قانونی طور پر -- انڈیا کے ساتھ ایکسیشن کیا اور اس کے بعد وہاں کی کانسٹیٹیوٹ اسمبلی جو کہ ایک الیکٹڈ باقی تھی اس نے اس ایکسیشن پر ایڈی ممبر تصدیق کر دی اور وہ کانسٹیٹیوٹ اسمبلی تمام ملک کی آواز تھی۔ پھر یہ سمجھ میں نہیں آتا کہ اب کون اس کے متعلق مزید رائے دے گا۔ اس کے بعد وہ کم سے کم یہ تو سمجھیں کہ اگر فرض کرو کہ ان کے خیال میں اب بھی پالیسیسٹائٹ کی ضرورت ہے تو کیا وہ اس بلایہ پالیسیسٹائٹ کو ماننا چاہتے ہیں کہ جو ہمارا علاقہ ناجائز طور پر ان کے قبضہ میں ہے وہاں بڑی پراسپراٹی ہو گئی ہے اور وہ بڑی ترقی کر گیا ہے۔ لیکن ہم جانتے ہیں کہ وہ علاقہ جو پاکستان کے قبضہ میں ہے نہاد و برباد ہو چکا ہے اور ہمارا علاقہ جو ہمارے پاس ہے وہ دن بدن ترقی کر رہا ہے۔ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی مدد سے اور بخشی فلام محمد کی رہنمائی میں ہمارا علاقہ دن بدن اور رات چوگنی ترقی کر رہا ہے۔ اگر کوئی آدمی اس علاقہ کو دیکھے گا تو دوسری طرف کے علاقہ کا جو پاکستان کے قبضہ میں ہے کوئی نام بھی نہیں لے گا۔

اس کے علاوہ پاکستان نے ایک بات اور شروع کی ہے اور وہ یہ کہ وہاں پر قاتل و غارت سیدھوتیج وغیرہ اس قسم کی حرکتیں شروع کی گئی ہیں۔ تو اس سے معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ اور جیسا کہ ہمارا تجربہ ہے بارہ چودہ سالوں کا کہ جب بھی پاکستان میں جو بارتی پارو میں ہوئے ہیں اس کے خلاف وہاں پر کوئی گڑبڑ ہوتی ہے تب ہم یہ دیکھتے آئے ہیں کہ کشمیر کا معاملہ پھر پیش کر دیا جاتا ہے ناہ گڑبڑ کرنے والوں کا خیال کسی دوسری طرف ہو جائے اور کسی طرح ان کی حفاظت ہو جائے۔ آجکل جو کچھ میں سمجھا ہوں اس ملتوی دول کے خلاف پاکستان میں کافی آواز اٹھ چکی ہے اور چندی ہی وہ آوا اٹھا رہی ہے اتنی ہی وہاں کے لیڈران کے اسپیکرز میں کشمیر کا معاملہ تیز ہوتا جا رہا ہے۔

اب صرف ہمارا جھگڑا پاکستان سے یہ باقی رہ گیا ہے کہ جو علاقہ ہمارا ان کے ناجائز طور پر قبضہ میں ہے وہ اس کے متعلق بات چیت کریں اور بات چیت کرے وہ علاقہ ہمیں واپس کریں کیونکہ ہم کسی بھی قیمت پر یہ منظور نہیں کرتے کہ وہ علاقہ پاکستان کے پاس رہے اس کی اسٹیٹیوٹھک امپارٹنس اس طرح کی ہے کہ جیسے نقشہ میں

کشمیر کو ہندوستان کا سر بتایا گیا ہے ویسے ہی وہ علاقہ کشمیر کا سر ہے۔ اس علاقہ میں کلکتہ، اسکاردو، حضہ، نگر، گردیس اور چلاس ہیں جو کہ کشمیر کے سر ہیں۔ ریاست نے بیس پچیس برس کی لڑائی کے بعد یہ علاقہ اپنے قبضہ میں کیا تھا اور یہ سب کرنے کا مطلب یہ تھا کہ سریلنگر ویلی کا پروٹیکشن ہو۔

مغل، پٹھان اور سکھوں کی حکومت کے زوال کے بعد وہ علاقہ جو کہ پہلے ان حکومتوں کے پاس تھا کچھ آزاد اور کچھ خود مختار ہو گیا تھا۔ جس وقت کشمیر ہمارے پاس آیا اس وقت ہم نے یہ مناسب سمجھا کہ جب تک یہ علاقہ قابو نہ کریں گے کشمیر ویلی سیف نہیں اور اگر کشمیر ویلی سیف نہیں تو جموں سیف نہیں۔ اس طرح بیس پچیس سال مسلسل لڑائی کے بعد ہم نے وہ علاقہ قابو میں کیا اور وہاں اپنا عمل دخل قائم کیا۔ اب وہ علاقہ ہمارے ایک مخالف کے پاس ہے جو ہمارے لئے ہر وقت ایک خطرے کی بات ہے کیونکہ ویلی پھر پورے طور پر سیف نہیں اور اگر ویلی سیف نہیں تو پھر اندیا سیف نہیں۔ تو میرے کہنے کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ گورنمنٹ آف اندیا مناسب طریقے پر یہ کوشش

[شری پیر محمد خاں]

کرے کہ وہ علاقہ جو پاکستان کے ناجائز قبضہ میں ہے اس کو واپس لے لے۔ ہمیں جہاں تک معلوم ہوا ہے کہ ہمارے بہترین قسم کے جنگل دیودار کے درخت جو کشن گنگا مطفر آباد میں ہیں ان کی بلا اچھا برا دیکھ کر کٹائی شروع ہے۔ وہ ایک مہاجر آمدنی کی مدد سو کالڈ آزاد کشمیر کے لئے ہے۔ اس سے کہیں یہ نہ ہو کہ وہ علاقہ ہمارے پاس اس وقت آئے جب وہاں درختوں کا نام و نشان نہ رہے۔ اس واسطے یہ دو پوائنٹس ایسے ہیں جن کی بلیڈ پر گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کو اس معاملے کو جلدی نہٹانے کی کوشش کرنی چاہیئے۔

چائنا کے متعلق میں نے اندو چائنا ڈیپٹ میں بہت کچھ کہا تھا۔ میں اب بھی یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس وقت تک ہم نے دیکھ لیا کہ کسی سمجھوتہ پر آئے کی بجائے ان کا کلیم لدا ہوتا جاتا ہے۔ آفیسر کانفرنس کے بعد وہ کلیم ۵۵ ہزار مربع میل تک چلا گیا ہے۔ اس سے آپ اندازہ کر لیں کہ یہ کلیم کیا ہے اور کس طرف اشارہ کرتا ہے۔ یہ ہمارے واسطے ایک خطرناک صورت ہے کہ پاکستان اور چائنا ہمارے سر پر آکر بیٹھ جائیں۔ یہ علاقے ہمارے بالکل سر پر ہیں۔

ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہمارا جو بارہ ہزار مربع میل کا علاقہ چائنا کے قبضہ میں ہے اس کو گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا مناسب طریقہ سے آزاد کرائے۔

گوا کے متعلق ہمیں بڑی خوشی ہوئی ہے کہ پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے اپنے اس خیال کا اظہار کیا ہے کہ ہماری پالیسی تبدیل ہو سکتی ہے یا کی۔ یہ بڑی اچھی بات ہے۔ پرتگالیوں کے ظلموں کے خواہ وہ گوا میں ہوں یا انگولا میں ہوں اب اس کی انتہا ہو گئی ہے اور یہ قدرت کا قانون ہے کہ ایک ظالم جب اپنے ظلم کی انتہائی حدوں تک پہنچ جاتا ہے تو وہ وقت اس کے قارن فال کا ہوتا ہے۔ میرے اپنے خیال میں اب اس کا قارن فال شروع ہو گیا ہے۔

ہم بہت خوش ہیں کہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب ناظرین ملکوں کی کانفرنس میں جا رہے ہیں اور ہمیں امید ہے کہ ان کی رہنمائی اور ان کے تجربہ سے وہ لوگ کافی فائدہ اٹھائیں گے اور کوئی ایسا راستہ دنیا کے لئے نکل آئے گا جس سے دنیا امن اور چین سے رہ سکے گی۔ ہم امید کرتے ہیں کہ وہ اس میں مہیا ہوں گے۔

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री नफीसुल हसन) : आपका वक्त खत्म हो गया ।

شری پیر محمد خاں : مہرا وقت ختم ہو گیا ہے تو میں اتنا

ہی کہہ کر کہ میں گورنمنٹ کی  
فائن پالیسی کی تائید کرتا ہوں  
ایلی اسٹیج ختم کرتا ہوں - شکریہ -

†[श्री पीर मुहम्मद खान] : (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : जनाब वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, करीब दो माह हुए जब पाकिस्तान के प्रेजिडेंट अमरीका गये थे वहां और वहां से आने के बाद उन्होंने इंडिया और उसके प्राइम मिनिस्टर और पार्लियामेंट के मुताल्लिक जो स्पीचें दी हैं वह उनके शायान शान नहीं हैं और हम उनको नापसन्द करते हैं। इस किस्म की स्पीचिज की जो वजह वह बयान करते हैं वह काश्मीर का मामला है। और काश्मीर के मामले में वह चाहते हैं कि वहां पर प्लेबीसाइट हो। जब काश्मीर के महाराजा लीगली ने कानूनी तौर पर इंडिया के साथ एक्सेशन किया और उसके बाद वहां की कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली जोकि एक अलेक्टड बाडी थी उसने इस एक्सेशन पर अपनी मोहर तसदीक कर दी और वह कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली तमाम मुल्क की आवाज थी। फिर यह समझ में नहीं आता कि अब कौन इसके मुताल्लिक मज्जीद राय देगा। उसके बाद वह कम से कम यह तो समझें कि अगर फर्ज करो कि उनके ख्याल में अब भी प्लेबीसाइट की जरूरत है तो क्या वह इस बिना पर प्लेबीसाइट कराना चाहते हैं कि जो हमारा इलाका नाजायज तौर पर उनके कब्जे में है वहां बड़ी प्रोस्पेरिटी हो गई है और वह बड़ी तरक्की कर गया है। लेकिन हम जानते हैं कि वह इलाका जो पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है तबाह व बरबाद हो चुका है और हमारा इलाका जो हमारे पास है वह दिन ब दिन तरक्की कर रहा है। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की मदद से और बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद की रहनुमाई में हमारा इलाका दिन दूनी और रात चौगुनी तरक्की कर रहा है। अगर कोई आदमी इस इलाका को देखेगा और

दूसरी तरफ के इलाके का जो पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है, कोई नाम ही नहीं लेगा।

इसके अलावा पाकिस्तान ने एक बात और शुरू की है और वह यह कि वहां पर डाका व कत्लोगारत, सैबोटेज वगैरह इस किस्म की हरकतें शुरू की गई हैं। तो इससे मालूम होता है कि और जैसा कि हमारा तजुर्बा है १२-१४ सालों का कि जब भी पाकिस्तान में जो पार्टी पावर में होती है उसके खिलाफ वहां की कोई गड़बड़ होती है तब हम यह देखते आये हैं कि काश्मीर का मामला फिर पेश कर दिया जाता है ताकि गड़बड़ करने वालों का ख्याल किसी दूसरी तरफ हो जाये और किसी तरह उनकी हिफाजत हो जाये। आजकल जो कुछ मैं समझा हूं उस मिलिट्री रूल के खिलाफ पाकिस्तान में काफी आवाज उठ चुकी है और जितनी ही वह आवाज उठ रही है उतनी ही वहां के लीडरान की स्पीचिज में काश्मीर का मामला तेज होता जा रहा है।

अब सिर्फ हमारा झगडा पाकिस्तान से यह बाकी रह गया है कि जो इलाका हमारा उनके नाजायज तौर पर कब्जा में है वह उसके मुताल्लिक बातचीत करे और बातचीत करके वह इलाका हमें वापस करे क्योंकि हम किसी भी कीमत पर यह मंजूर नहीं करते कि वह इलाका पाकिस्तान के पास रहे। उसकी स्ट्रेटिजिक इंपोर्टेंस इस तरह की है कि जैसे नक्शा में काश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान का सर बनाया गया है वैसे ही वह इलाका काश्मीर का सर है। इस इलाके में गिलगित, इस्कारत, हमजानगर, गोपस, चलास हैं जो कि काश्मीर के सर हैं। रियासत ने बीस पचीस बरस की लड़ाई के बाद यह इलाका अपने कब्जे में किया था और यह सब करने का मतलब यह था कि श्रीनगर वैली का प्रोटेक्शन हो। मुगल पठान और सिखों की हुकूमत के जवाल के बाद वह इलाका जो कि पहले इन हुकूमतों के पास था कुछ आजाद और कुछ खुदमुख्तयार हो गया था। जिस वक्त काश्मीर हमारे पास



[श्री पीर मुहम्मद खान]

आया उस वक्त हमने यह मुनासिब समझा कि जब तक यह इलाका काबू न करेंगे काश्मीर वैली सेफ़ नहीं और अगर काश्मीर वैली सेफ़ नहीं तो जम्मू सेफ़ नहीं। इस तरह बीस पचीस साल मुसलसल लड़ाई के बाद हमने वह इलाका काबू में किया और वहां अपना अमल दखल कायम किया। अब वह इलाका हमारे एक मुखालिफ़ के पास है जो हमारे लिये हर वक्त एक खतरे की बात है। चूँकि वैली फिर पूरे तौर पर सेफ़ नहीं और अगर वैली सेफ़ नहीं तो फिर इंडिया सेफ़ नहीं। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह कि गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया मुनासिब तर्र के पर यह कोशिश करे कि वह इलाका जो पाकिस्तान के नाजायज कब्जे में है उसको वापस ले ले। हमें जहां तक मालूम हुआ है, कि हमारे बेहतरीन किस्म के जंगल देवदार के दरख्त जो किशनगंगा, मुजफ़्फराबाद में है उन की बिला अच्छा बुरा देखे कटाई शुरू है। वह एक मेजर आमदनी की मद सो काल्ड आज़ाद काश्मीर के लिये है। इससे कहीं यह न हो कि वह इलाका हमारे पास उस वक्त आये जब वहां दरख्तों का नामोनिशान न रहे। इस वास्ते यह दो पाइंट्स ऐसे हैं जिनकी बुनियाद पर गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया को इस मामले को जल्दी निबटाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

चाइना के मुताल्लिक मैंने इडो-चाइना डिप्रेट में बहुत कुछ कहा था। मैं अब भी यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त तक हम ने देख लिया कि किस समझौते पर आने की बजाय इनका क्लेम लम्बा होता जाता है। आफ़िसर्स कांफ़्रेंस के बाद वह क्लेम ५५ हजार मुरब्बा मील तक चला गया है। इससे आप अंदाज़ा करें कि यह क्लेम क्या है और किस तरफ़ इशारा करता है। यह हमारे वास्ते एक खतरनाक सूरत है कि पाकिस्तान और चाइना हमारे सर पर आकर बैठ जायें। यह इलाक़े हमारे बिल्कुल सर पर हैं। हम यह चाहते हैं कि हमारा जो १२ हजार मुरब्बा मील का इलाका

चाइना के कब्जे में है उसको गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया मुनासिब तरीके से आज़ाद करायें।

गोवा के मुताल्लिक हमें बड़ी खुशी हुई है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपने इस ख्याल का इज़हार किया है कि हमारी पालिसी तबदील हो सकती है या होगी। यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है पुर्तगालियों के जुल्मों के ख्वाह वह गोवा में हों या अंगोला में हों, अब उसकी इंतहा हो गई है और यह कुदरत का कानून है कि एक जालिम जब अपने जुल्म की इंतहाई पर पहुंच जाता है तो वह वक्त उसके डाउन फॉल का होता है। मेरे अपने ख्याल में अब उसका डाउन फॉल शुरू हो गया।

हम बहुत खुश हैं कि हमारे प्राइम-मिनिस्टर साहब नातरफ़दार मुत्कों की कांफ़्रेंस में जा रहे हैं और हमें उम्मीद है कि उनकी रहनुमाई और उनके तज़रबे से वह लोग काफ़ी फायदा उठावेंगे और कोई ऐसा रास्ता दुनिया के लिये निकल आयेगा जिससे दुनिया अमन और चैन से रह सकेगी। हम उम्मीद करते हैं कि वह इसमें कामयाब होंगे।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री नफीसुल हसन) :** आपका वक्त खत्म हो गया।

**श्री पीर मुहम्मद खान :** मेरा वक्त खत्म हो गया है तो मैं इतना ही कह कर कि मैं गवर्नमेंट की फारेन पालिसी की ताईद करता हूँ अपनी स्पीच खत्म करता हूँ। शुक्रिया। ]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Mr. Gopikrishna Vijayvargiya, please take only five minutes.

**श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय :** (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं पांच छः मिनट के अन्दर ही खत्म कर दंगा। मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आपने कुछ वक्त दे दिया,

वरना मैं समझता था कि मेरे सिवाय मेरा कोई मुनने वाला भी न रहेगा इस हाउस में ।

पहले मैं व्हेटिल से गवर्नमेंट की फारेन पालिसी की तारीफ करता हूँ । पिछली बार जब हाउस में हम लोगों ने फारेन पालिसी को डिसकस किया था तो उस वक्त दो बनिंग सवाल थे, कांगो और लाओस । हम समझते थे कि दुनिया आन दि ब्रिक आफ वार यानी लड़ाई के कंगार पर खड़ी है । वह मसले हल हुये तो अब जब हम डिबेट कर रहे हैं तो नया मसला यह आ गया बर्लिन का । कोई न कोई मसला दुनिया के सामने रहता है । पिछली लड़ाई के बाद जो मसले पैदा हुये उनमें बहुत से हल हो गये, लेकिन जो बाकी रहे उनमें जर्मन युनिफिकेशन और बर्लिन के सवाल पेचीदा सवाल हैं । वियना में जिस वक्त कैंनेडी और ख्रुश्चेव साहब की मुलाकातें हुईं तो उम्मीद थी कि दुनिया को कुछ राहत मिलेगी, लेकिन उसके इतनी जल्दी बाद ही हालत इतनी खराब हो जायेगी, यह उम्मीद नहीं थी । वियना कांफ्रेंस को हुये बहुत कम अर्सा गुजरा है और फिर लड़ाई के हालात पैदा हो गये हैं । इस वक्त बर्लिन के मसले पर अमेरिका की फौजें पहुंच गई हैं और रूस की भी फौज पहुंच गई है । और बहुत हालत खराब है ।

कुछ दीगर मामलों में भी हमारे भाइयों ने अपने विचार प्रगट किये हैं । पाकिस्तान के मुताल्लिक प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की पालिसी का पूर्ण समर्थन मैं भी करता हूँ ।

गोआ के सम्बन्ध में हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने जिम नई पालिसी का इशारा किया, वह भी बहुत मुनासिब है कि हम खामोश नहीं बैठ सकते, गोआ को किसी न किसी वक्त जरूर आजाद करायेंगे ।

चीन के बारे में हमारे पी० एस० पी० के एक फ्रेंड ने कहा कि नेहरू जी ने कुछ रिमार्क्स किये थे और उन रिमार्क्स में यह

था कि हम चीन के मामले में नहीं लड़ेंगे । यह एक आरजी पालिसी हो सकती है इसके साथ हम चीन पर अपना दब्लेम कभी नहीं छोड़ सकते हैं और न इस बारे में हम लड़ाई का हक छोड़ सकते हैं ।

एक बात खास तौर से फारेन पालिसी के मामले में यह कहूंगा कि अमेरिका या और दूसरे जो बड़े बड़े मुल्क हैं वहां एक बाईपार्टिजन पालिसी रहती है अर्थात् देश की फॉरेन पालिसी में कितनी भी पार्टियां हों उनकी अलग अलग न रह कर एक आवाज रहती है । वैसे ही हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी पार्टियां हैं, सब की फॉरेन पालिसी के मामले में एक आवाज होना चाहिये । कभी कभी स्वतंत्र पार्टी वाले, कभी जनसंघ वाले और कभी हिन्दू महासभा वाले हमारी गवर्नमेंट की फॉरेन पालिसी को बहुत क्रिटिसाइज किया करते हैं । हिन्दुस्तान की निगाह से वह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है । जो पालिसी हमारे पार्लियामेंट में पास हो जाती है उसको हर एक पार्टी को सपोर्ट करना चाहिये ।

कुछ और मसलों पर बोलना चाहता था, लेकिन समय न होने के कारण इतना ही कहूंगा कि गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी बिल्कुल दुरुस्त है और उसको मैं पूरे तौर से सपोर्ट करता हूँ जो आपने समय दिया, उसके लिये फिर शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Before we rise, I have to inform the House that I have directed that some objectional words used by Shri D. A. Mirza in his speech be expunged.

The House stands adjourned till 11.00 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 23rd August 1961.