

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF HINDUSTAN
ANTIBIOTIC (PRIVATE) LIMITED AND
AUDITOR'S REPORT

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY
(SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH): Sir, I beg to
lay on the Table, under sub-section
(1) of section 639 of the Companies
Act, 1956, a copy of the Fourth Annual
Report of the Hindustan Antibiotics
(Private) Limited, Poona, for the
year 1957-58, together with a copy of
the Auditors' Report and the Com-
ments of the Comptroller and Auditor-
General of India thereon. [Placed in
Library, See No. LT-1112/58.]

TRADE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN INDIA AND
THE U.S.S.R., POLAND AND EAST
GERMANY

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE
(SHRI N. KANUNGO): Sir, on behalf of
Shri Satish Chandra, I beg to lay on
the Table a copy each of the following
Agreements:—

- (i) Trade Agreement between
the Government of India and
the Government of the Union
of Soviet Socialist Republics,
dated November 16, 1958.
[Placed in Library. See No.
LT-1113/58.]
- (ii) The Protocol to the Trade
Agreement between the Gov-
ernment of the Polish Peo-
ple's Republic and the Gov-
ernment of India, dated April
3, 1956. [Placed in Library.
See No. LT-1114/58.]
- (iii) Supplementary Trade Agree-
ment between the Govern-
ment of India and the Gov-
ernment of the German Demo-
cratic Republic, dated Novem-
ber 3, 1958. [Placed in
Library. See No. LT-1115/
58.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF
MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (AMEND-
MENT) BILL, 1958.

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report
to the House the following message
received from the Lok Sabha, signed
by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provi-
sions of rule 96 of the Rules of Pro-
cedure and Conduct of Business in
Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose
herewith a copy of the Salaries and
Allowances of Members of Parlia-
ment (Amendment) Bill, 1958, as
passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting
held on the 11th December, 1958."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINIS-
TER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Sir, 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."

Almost in every Session, Sir, I move
such a motion and there is a discus-
sion which ranges over the wide
world but which rather tends to con-
centrate naturally on some matters
more intimately affecting India, some
matters in regard to our neighbour
countries, a little about Pakistan, a
little perhaps about Ceylon and a
little perhaps about Goa. Now,
naturally, a country's foreign policy
may be divided up into some parts,
namely two; one is particular matters
affecting its interests and the other is
the wider world matters which affect
it also in the wider sense that any-
thing that happens in the world affects
every country. In a sense some of the
bigger issues in the world are of high
importance to us. If there was a war,
we would, I am quite sure, keep out
of the war, but the whole world will

be affected and we will be affected. And if there is a war involving nuclear weapons there will not be much choice to anybody left as to whether he chooses to die or not. He may be eliminated in spite of his wish to keep apart from it. Therefore, because of the world coming rather closer together, these wider international questions assume a greater importance even to a State which does not wish to be entangled in those questions, and we have been compelled almost against our wishes in the matter to deal with these wider questions more and more. There is, of course, the United Nations where such questions do come up and every country and its representative has to express its opinion in regard to them and occasionally to vote. Apart from speeches and voting, there is a great deal of consultation done in the United Nations often behind the scenes.

Now, Sir, I do not know what turn the discussion on the subject will take in this House and what particular matters would agitate Members' minds more than others, and, therefore, it is a little difficult for me to deal with this in detail at the present stage, because I would rather try to meet the points raised by hon. Members than go into detail about some issues about which they may not have too much interest or about which they may not have much doubt in their minds.

In the narrow issues affecting us—'narrow' meaning more intimate issues, not world issues—obviously the main issue is that of developments in our neighbour country, Pakistan. There have been strange developments there and we have followed them naturally with a great deal of interest and sometimes concern. Not that we wish to interfere in the slightest with what the people of Pakistan want to do in their own country, but whatever they do sometimes affects us or may affect us. There has been a good deal of discussion on this issue and various

statements have been made by me, and I believe in this House too many questions asked, and I do not propose now to cover the same ground unless some hon. Member raises some issue connected with it or emphasises some aspect of this question. There is one thing I should like to say. Two or three days ago, the President of Pakistan, addressing some kind of a gathering, accused India of trying to isolate Pakistan and he also accused India of encouraging border incidents on the border between West Bengal and East Pakistan. Now, among the many subjects that are constantly brought up before us—this House and the other House—is this question of border incidents. Naturally hon. Members are anxious to put an end to them. And it is an odd thing that while this question is always brought up here—because we feel, hon. Members feel, that those incidents are due to the aggression of Pakistan—even so, the President of Pakistan has referred to them as if they were due to the aggression of India. I have tried as far as I can to consider these matters objectively and factually. I cannot say that any one of us can always succeed in doing that, and even facts are not quite easy to obtain about minor incidents, and facts are often confused because they deal with, let us say, *char* areas or islands that come up after the monsoons. The river shifts, and every year after the monsoon this happens about those islands, and there is a dispute as to who owns them or who should occupy them while they are above water, because in the next monsoon they will go down under water again. Meanwhile, it is good soil. They yield crops and so peasants on both sides try to utilise them. It is my belief, after a good deal of consideration of all these problems as objectively as possible, that the attitude of the local people there on the Pakistan side and the local authorities has been often an aggressive one or they have encouraged aggression. I will not go into further detail about that, but I would like to say this that a number of incidents that are reported to us and, maybe, reported to the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Pakistan Government, petty incidents—I am not talking about any major ones—about boundary—are really rather confusing incidents, that is to say, confusing to the people who live there on either side. It is very difficult for them to know exactly where they are when the boundary shifts, the river shifts and all that, when islands come up, how the island is to be divided, whether the boundary would be in the middle of the island or where. The boundary was laid down by Justice Bagge, and all know that he drew a straight line between two points across the river, going along the length of the river. If the river shifts, if it is a river boundary, it is a shifting boundary. If it is a fixed boundary with a straight line, then as the river shifts, it may well happen that the river goes completely on one side of the boundary or the other. Or, when an island comes in between, it has to be carefully seen where that imaginary line is. You do not put boundary pillars in the middle of a river. These difficulties arise, and each side locally, specially the peasantry on either side, naturally think in terms of their own rights in the matter. I will not go into this matter unless hon. Members want me to say something or to give some information about it.

But about what the President of Pakistan said that we are trying to isolate Pakistan, I submit, Sir, that that is not only not a correct statement, but he is mistaken if he thinks so. Perhaps he thinks so because of a wrong line of thought that Pakistan has consistently followed. The first thing they have thought has been that India has never accepted partition, does not intend abiding by it and wants to weaken and possibly put an end to Pakistan as a separate State when things are feasible. Anything more unrealistic or devoid of fact I cannot imagine, and it is not a question of my expressing my opinion or this House expressing its opinion, but facts are facts. It is an inconceivable

thing that that kind of thing happens, and it would be a most undesirable thing strictly from the point of view of India if any such thing happens. I do not want that to happen, and any person who has any conception of the modern world can realise that such a thing would not be a matter between India and Pakistan but would be a world upheaval, further that the conditions, political or economic, that prevail in Pakistan have a powerful effect on India. So far as the economic conditions go, it is bad in that it is not good for us that the economic conditions in Pakistan are bad. Therefore, we have always wished and worked and so far as we can, we have directed our policy so that Pakistan may flourish. But naturally, we do not expect that Pakistan should commit aggression on us anywhere, whether it is in that part of India which is Jammu and Kashmir or in any other part of India. In fact, mentioning Jammu and Kashmir, I should like to remind the House something that the House knows very well that we made it clear long ago—and we have repeated it—that any kind of aggression on Jammu and Kashmir is obviously aggression on India and that aggression will have to be met anywhere any everywhere, not in a confined territory where that aggression takes place. That fact must be clearly understood. I hope no such occasion will arise because it would be most unfortunate for both our countries. But there should be no doubt in any person's mind in regard to that position. But I should like to disabuse President Ayub Khan again of this idea that we wish anything but well by Pakistan. We do wish it well because looking at it from our point of view, it is advantageous to us apart from any idealist things, and for us to try to isolate Pakistan does us no good. It is true that we believe in a policy which is called non-lining up with any military blocs. We think it is bad to line up with military blocs. We think it is particularly bad for a weak country to line up with a militarily strong country. If two strong countries line up, well, I do not

think it is a good thing. But they pull their weight. If a militarily weak country lines up with a militarily strong country, well, it ceases to function in that independent way as an independent country ought to function. The odds may be against us and we have not favoured the idea that Pakistan should go in for these military alliances. But, after all, it is for Pakistan to decide this and not for us to decide. Past experience has shown not only in regard to Pakistan, but in regard to other countries in Asia that these military alliances called the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO, have failed to serve any good purpose whatever, and they have brought insecurity and often conflicts in those regions. Well, if people and countries do not learn even from their experience, it is a little difficult for anyone else to do anything in the matter. I suppose the President of Pakistan said that we wish to isolate it because we have often criticised the Baghdad Pact and if the Baghdad Pact goes—and indeed, it is not exactly in a very vital and living condition, rather moribund even now—they seem to imagine that they will be left helpless. Well, I can assure them that our policy in regard to the Baghdad Pact certainly takes into account that Pakistan is there. It is based on wider considerations, and anyhow, all this past experience of a few years has shown that the Baghdad Pact has no significance as a Pact. There is the other significance, of course—arms, exchange of arms, apart from the Baghdad Pact. That is significant for us as for others.

Now, our policy has been—and we shall continue to follow it even though there might be difficulties—of friendship with all countries even though we do not agree with them and that includes Pakistan, always, of course, guarding our own interests. At the present moment, the House knows that our President is on a visit to the Republic of Indonesia where he has received a quite extraordinarily warm and cordial welcome from the people and from the Government. Lately,

before that, he was in Malaya where also he received a warm welcome and some months back—two or three months back—he visited Japan. The President has been functioning not only as our President, but as the most outstanding ambassador of this country carrying our goodwill to the people of these other countries and thereby helping in promoting that atmosphere of international goodwill and, more specially, of closer relations with these neighbouring countries of ours. I wish that the same relations subsisted with Pakistan.

Going to broader issues, one of the most striking things today—although it may not receive very much public attention—is the gradual development of what has been called the 'African personality'; it is emerging, and I have no doubt that it is going to play a vital role in the future; whether it can play that role through peaceful development or not I cannot say because in this very Africa, where this African personality is emerging, there are other forces down south and south-west which are not only opposed to that African personality but are ranged today in complete opposition to any idea of race equality, political equality or any equality. Of course, the most outstanding exponent of this doctrine of racial inequality is the Union of South Africa. But there are some areas north of it, north-west of it, where, though the Government has not expressed those opinions, the people there, that is, the European people who are dominant there, often express the very ideas that the South African Government expresses. It is a long story about the people of Indian descent in South Africa. That question has really merged into bigger questions where not only Indians but the whole African population and the Chinese and the Japanese and whoever may go who is a non-European or a non-American is affected. Recently, only a few days ago a Resolution came up before the United Nations' General Assembly, as it comes up every year, and I do not know

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

what more we can do about it however strongly we feel—as we do feel strongly—about this matter. This Resolution, is interesting to note, was passed with the biggest majority that it has had in the past few years, and gradually countries that were opposed to this type of Resolution were now supporting it or at any rate not opposing it. But I am sorry that among the countries that still oppose that Resolution are one or two Commonwealth countries of note, but I am glad to note that other Commonwealth countries have supported it, some which did not previously support it. In fact, one might almost say that there is worldwide opinion today against the apartheid in South Africa, and those countries that support that are a few, I believe five countries out of eighty or so in the United Nations voted against that Resolution. Those countries too do not really support that principle of apartheid but for political reasons and for other reasons they do not wish publicly to oppose it although privately I believe they disapprove of it. So we have been building up in the United Nations, we and other countries, world opinion against this, and we have been building it up not only because we object to it but what is much more important, if this kind of thing continues in the Union of South Africa and at the same time this, what I referred to as the African personality, grows, there can be no doubt that there will be a mighty clash between these two. Such a clash can be of advantage to neither side, because it is quite inconceivable for these growing nations of Africa, finding their soul, you might say, in some measure of freedom, to put up with the kind of treatment that the South African Union has given to coloured people. They will never put up with it, as we can never put up with it. So our only hope lies in the fact that on the South African Union side this pressure of world opinion, this recognition that the whole world is turning against them in so far as apartheid is concerned, will have some effect, and they will change their policies to

avoid this tremendous catastrophe. Deliberately in the United Nations as elsewhere we have approached this question as moderately as possible. Even this time the Resolution put forward was—I do not know if I have got it here, I do not think I have got the detailed Resolution here—a moderate one, expressing disapproval of South Africa's policy and not acting up to the last year's Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly and calling upon them again to meet the representatives of India and Pakistan. We are prepared to meet them. We shall again invite them to meet us, to discuss this matter, because in the final analysis there is no way of resolving a problem except by consultation, discussion and settlement, rather than to do it by war or to allow the problem to continue.

Now I referred to this growth of the African personality. We know, of course, about the emergence of this new State of Ghana a year ago as an independent State. Other developments have taken place since then, and the latest has been Guinea's, which formed part of the French Dominion, becoming independent. And a very interesting phase of this new development has been Ghana and Guinea agreeing to come together. It is not quite clear in what form they will come together, but whatever legal or constitutional form that might be, it does represent the outward manifestation of that deep urge in Africa for African countries to come together, especially in West Africa. And in the recent conference which I believe, is still being held in Accra, this urge has found utterance, and I am sure that this House would wish to send its goodwill to these young African nations who are finding their soul now, and who, it must always be remembered, in the past centuries, have suffered more than any people in the world—all those long years and centuries of slavery being imposed upon them, people being carried away, bound hand and foot, in a most cruel way—and have carried his burden of sorrow. So, it is a peculiar

happiness for us that they should get rid of these shackles progressively. And I should like in this matter to congratulate even the colonial powers who at last have, to some extent, helped them in this process—in regard to Guinea, the French Government, and in regard to some other areas the British Government.

And yet while I congratulate them another case comes to my mind, that of Algeria, where for the last several years there has been that most bloody conflict and all kinds of excesses have been committed. We had hoped, and I still hope, that Gen. De Gaulle's Government would deal with this Algerian question in a broad-minded and generous way, recognising the basic fact that the question cannot be settled except in the full freedom of Algeria. There can be no doubt about that. Now, Sir, in this matter, a Resolution came up only three or four days ago, or even less, before the United Nations General Assembly. That Resolution was passed in a big way but it failed to secure one odd vote in order to get a two-third majority. It was a great moral victory for the Algerians and whether they got an extra vote or not, the victory was theirs, at any rate in the United Nations and it is interesting to see how the voting went on this question. I am sorry I cannot just get hold of the paper which gives details of the voting on this Algerian question. But speaking from memory, all the great powers like the USA I believe, abstained from voting. Am I right?

SHRI V K DHAGE (Bombay) That is correct.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU That shows, of course, a vote of the USA is not merely a vote of one country. It represents the vote of a very great nation which exercises more authority in the United Nations than any other country because of its power and position. It shows therefore that the position in regard to Algeria is also taking a favourable turn to some extent. I will not go further because

there are all kinds of hurdles in the way but this, I submit, is perfectly clear that the Algerian question cannot be solved except on the basis of independence. What relationship free Algeria may have with France is a matter entirely for them to determine. They may have some kind of close relationship which two free nations have. That is a different matter. We have realized always that in considering the Algerian problem, that aspect of it which reminds us of a million or more people of French descent living there is an important one. We cannot ignore it merely but important as it is, I do submit that the fact of 10 times that number wanting independence is more important still. You cannot ignore 10 millions for the sake of 1 million specially when that country happens to be where the 10 millions and their ancestors have always lived. The only feasible solution would be to agree to this but give full protection to the big French minority there. Anyhow it is not a question for me or indeed for this House to indicate any solution except to say that we desire the freedom of those people who have so bravely fought for it during these years and that we would hope earnestly that General De Gaulle's Government which has shown in some matters, foresight and generosity as in the case of Guinea and one or two other places, will also, in this much bigger issue, show that foresight and generosity.

The biggest issue from the point of view of the world at the present moment is the issue of those islands which bring any possibility of a world conflict nearer. We have had a good deal of trouble as this House knows, in the Far East of Asia over the islands of Quemoy and Matsu and ultimately of course, in regard to Formosa. That trouble, that problem continues and as far as I can see, it is likely to continue. At present the crisis may be said to be not quite so acute in the sense that no large-scale fighting is going on, but the problem remains.

A new aspect of this cold war has now arisen in Berlin. The German

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

problem has always been a very difficult one and a very important one, and now that problem has got somehow concentrated over this issue of Berlin. I do not know and I do not wish to say anything as to how this issue will develop. I would only say that this is a dangerous issue which could lead to all kinds of complications and even conflict, in spite of the fact that I am quite sure that all the major powers concerned do not want a conflict. As a matter of fact, at the present moment there are two conferences going on in Geneva, a conference as to how to avoid or prevent surprise attacks and a conference in regard to the suspension of nuclear tests and how to discover a test if it is secretly made anywhere. These have been going on for many weeks, but the progress is slow. I gather that with regard to the second conference, that is to say, the one about nuclear tests, some kind of a draft paper is being put forward and progress has been made and agreement is being arrived at with regard to the first three articles of that paper. That is slow progress, but nevertheless it is hopeful progress. Every progress is hopeful. As to the conference about surprise attack, we have no information as to how they are getting on; but as far as we know, they are not getting on very well. Anyhow, they are still meeting and discussing.

One thing I may mention in connection with Africa. A proposal has been put forward by the South African Union for South-West Africa to be divided up, one to go fully to the South African Union and the other to remain under the U.N. Trusteeship. I am glad to say that this has not found support in the United Nations, because it would be a most dangerous and harmful thing for any area of Africa to be handed over to a country which proclaims loudly its policy of apartheid, and acts up to it, not merely proclaims it, and it would be a complete breach—and South Africa has committed it—a complete breach of the principles of the United Nations

Charter and of the Human Rights Declaration to which reference has been made by you, Sir, the other day, to put other people under the Government of the Union of South Africa, and it would be, I submit, a violation of everything that the United Nations stands for.

That is the position, Sir, with regard to these major matters in the world. It is a curious situation, because it has come to be known and to be admitted that any kind of a nuclear war will result in almost the virtual destruction of mankind. It is further admitted that any war between the great powers is bound to be a nuclear war. It cannot be a petty war. There may be a petty war between other countries, but not between the great powers.

Now, having come to those conclusions, it should follow that one should try to avoid cold war and, therefore, one should avoid all steps that lead to it. For any of the major powers to imagine that it can compel the other to submit to its will is obviously mistaken and it is recognised as such. President Eisenhower has said so; Mr. Khrushchev has said so too. If that is admitted, what is the logic of the situation? Hardly enough, having admitted all these facts, the inevitable logical result of all that is not accepted or is not acted upon and each party appears to think that it can by actual or verbal strength induce the other to submit to its will. Now, this is a dangerous policy because somehow or the other the tenuous bounds that keep them together may break. I am not here to suggest any way out of this terrible tangle but one thing I would with all respect suggest. If it is not possible—and I think it is not—for either of the major groups to convince the other of its error—I do not think that the American Government is going to convince the Soviet Government of the error of its ways and I do not think the Soviet Government is going to convince the American Government of the error of its ways—

any attempt to convince each other may be like very earnest believers and protagonists of religious theories coming together, trying to convince each other and indulging in heated argument. The result of this is to make them more bitter against each other than perhaps if they had not tried to discuss this matter with each other. It is worse here because there are the vast armies lined up on either side. Therefore, the idea of convincing each other is ruled out, on major issues, the idea of compelling each other by force is ruled out. What remains? Well, at any rate, one should avoid saying things about each other which make matters worse, condemning each other, running down each other, whatever your views may be, that is to say, the technique of cold war does not help. It makes matters worse. Whatever your views may be, it is better almost to remain silent for a while if you cannot use language which is more or less polite to each other. Perhaps, that might help a little in bringing the logic of the situation, to make it clearer to people's minds. It is not for me to advise anybody but I am merely stating in effect what our broad approach has been, and whether we agree or disagree with a country, we try to avoid the cold war approach because I am convinced that it can only do harm. That does not mean surrendering to a wrong principle or to superior force but it does mean making it slightly easier when the time comes for some kind of a partial settlement to be arrived at. The biggest thing today, therefore, is disarmament out of which all these things grow. Of disarmament, the biggest aspect is nuclear weapons and of nuclear weapons the immediate aspect is stopping nuclear tests. I know that you cannot isolate them, everything has to be taken together but one has to make a beginning and then take up the next step. If one wants the full agreement to emerge about everything, the result is that there is no agreement and, so far as nuclear tests are concerned, I think it has been, especially on all matters, fully accept-

ed by all scientists that every single nuclear test adds to the poisonous and harmful elements in the atmosphere which injure the present generation and will go on causing injury to future generations. Yet, these nuclear tests have gone on and each party calling on the other to do something and not doing it itself more or less. Well, it is not from any sense of virtue that I am saying all this, because we lack virtues in many ways, such virtues as the others possess. But in such matters one has to talk frankly, give expression to one's feelings, hoping that one's voice may perhaps affect people's thinking elsewhere.

There is one fact which I should like this House to bear in mind. We, in India at least I hope, do not claim any special virtue. We have our virtues, of course, and we have our faults. We certainly are not a military power and we have no strength in the financial sense. Why is it that India's name is respected over large areas of the world, in many countries today? Why is it that whenever India's name is mentioned, or some representative of India comes, that person or that name is associated with the cause of peace? There is no doubt about that. Our policy may err here and there, but the world acknowledges that India works for peace, and more especially the people of the world which give these big welcomes, which our President has had in countries he has visited, which other people have, which even a humble citizen of India gets, because he comes—the people say—from a land which works for peace. Now, that is a great honour for us, but also a great obligation for us to work along those lines in that temper and climate of peace, trying to develop this climate outside certainly, but inside our country also, because you cannot isolate tempers. If you have that temper abroad, you have the temper in India. If you have the temper in India, that reflects itself elsewhere, just as foreign policies and domestic policies cannot fundamentally be isolated. They act and react on each other. So, in the final analysis, it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
comes to this that we should endeavour to cultivate this temper of peace in our foreign relations and within our country also

I beg to move

MR CHAIRMAN Motion moved

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

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab)
Sir, I move

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

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

MR CHAIRMAN The motion and the amendment are before the House

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL Sir, my colleague sitting on my right, a very highly respected Member of this House said to me while the Prime Minister was speaking, that the Prime Minister has touched on practically every point that he had noted down himself in respect of this subject. And that, Sir, is true. The Prime Minister has made a very comprehensive statement which, as is usual with his statements, is charged with emotion and charged with great goodness. That is his nature

He has preached the particular doctrine of his the particular policy of his for the last many years

The House is gratefully aware that during the last week the Prime Minister has spoken and addressed conferences at least on five separate occasions on the question of foreign affairs, international affairs, and their impact on the declared policies of our country. You will notice that we are having another debate today. The reason is very simple. The problem is a current problem, the problem is a serious problem, and it is almost an

inexhaustible problem. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister, although he is the founder and the shaper of the foreign policy of India, has said quite correctly that this policy could not be any different because it is imbedded, founded, on the traditions and in the past of this country. That is perfectly correct. It could not be under any circumstances, therefore, any different. Let me say at once that while in other countries they talk about a bipartisan policy, in our country we are proud of the fact that the foreign policy of India is a national policy, a policy supported by all and sundry, by the entire nation throughout the length and breadth of this land. It was not always so, I must say, in the beginning, but as our people gradually realised the significance of this policy, they came to give their wholehearted and enthusiastic support to it. They found while giving their support to it that it had a very rare combination, the combination of high ideals of tolerance of freedom, of peace, of brotherhood. At the same time, it had too realism, realism of the workaday world, and thus it came about that the correct ends and the correct means were wedded in harmony in regard to this particular policy.

Sir, there is no room, I must say, for any boastfulness or self-righteousness in furthering this particular policy. That would be not the mark of a wise man but the mark of a fool. This policy, indeed in the presence of world-shaking events and in the presence of problems that baffle mankind has to be looked at in the proper spirit namely, in the spirit of humility which is but proper and wise. Now, the basic factors that govern the world situation which have been delineated by the Prime Minister just now in his speech are the lack of the very ingredients which go to the making up of the foreign policy of India. For instance, instead of tolerance, what do we find? We find a polarisation of certain powers into two blocs, whether it is based on fear or on self interest, and instead of peace we find the threat of war. Instead of brotherhood there

is sabre rattling that goes on all over the world, an atmosphere of conflict, and poised over the world is the threat of five megaton hydrogen bombs which can be delivered in a matter of seconds across the continents of the world. India's job in this situation, Sir, can only be the job of a peacemaker, and you have witnessed the speech made by the Prime Minister which fits into this particular attitude, that India adopts the attitude of a peacemaker, not the attitude of a partisan. Formerly in this particular attitude of ours, not aligning ourselves with any power bloc, we stood alone. Today happily we are a large family, we are a growing family. To name only a few nations who support the policy of the Prime Minister in this behalf, we have Yugoslavia, we have Indonesia, we have the United Arab Republic, we have Afghanistan, Burma and Ceylon. Now, we have got the Sudan, Ghana and many others. I do not personally understand the expression 'the uncommitted nations'. We are not an 'uncommitted nation'. We are committed right up to the hilt to the policy of peace and friendship and goodwill and freedom. No doubt, often we have been misunderstood, particularly by our neighbour, Pakistan. The Prime Minister has made the position perfectly clear as far as the attitude of India to Pakistan is concerned. "We have no desire to take on any more headaches", the Prime Minister said on one occasion which is perfectly correct. But we have been misunderstood by Pakistan, our neighbour. We want them to know that we sympathise with their difficulties. Not only do we sympathise with their difficulties, but we wish them everything that is of the best, everything that is good. In spite of all the provocations that we have suffered, we still desire as a nation to work in friendly co-operation, brotherly co-operation, with Pakistan. Why? We are the same people. It would be absurd both from the point of view of our origin, from the point of view of our geography, from the point of view of what we have been in the past, to act in any different manner. But when Gen. Ayub Khan

compares the situation in his country and discerns a similarity—with what glasses I do not know—between the misery and the instability in Pakistan and us, and says that there is a similarity in the situation between the two countries, then I must say that he is hopelessly, totally wrong. It is not good for a great leader to be so wrong. He happens to be the ninth in succession of the incumbents of that office during the last eleven years, who have been so hopelessly wrong. I am quite sure that Gen. Ayub Khan—three of his colleagues in the Government are personal friends of mine—is suffering from an infection whose origins can be found in the cold war. But it is not only that he is a victim of this infection, the people of Pakistan are victims of that infection as a result of the type of the government that they have got. It is a great pity indeed. Who suffers? It is the people who suffer. Unfortunately, in Pakistan there are no leaders left who were tested in the struggle for freedom, for the achievement of freedom. Those who remained have either been assassinated or imprisoned. I am quite sure, Sir, that the great Quaid-e-Azam would turn in his grave at the sight of the inheritors of his concept.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): They were not less bitter towards India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My learned friend is talking presumably without knowledge. Well, perhaps, he did not come into that close contact with the Quaid-e-Azam as the Prime Minister or I or those of us who worked with him. I hope this suggestion will be taken up by the Prime Minister at the proper moment when the proper conditions are apparent in Pakistan—I suggest some form of a confederation of the type that is hovering over Western and Eastern Germany today. On the last occasion when the Quaid-e-Azam spent an evening with me—it was about two years before partition—he asked me to

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

convey to Mahatma Gandhi this particular suggestion of his that he would be prepared not to divide the country if a confederation of that type could possibly be accepted. Sir, I do not want to go into this history of ...

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Who was responsible for the partition?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I do not know if my hon. friend knows that India suffered for two hundred years under British rule. Has he forgotten that? Has he forgotten who ruled us? Has he forgotten who divided us? What we want to know is, what actually did happen in Pakistan? You will recall, Sir, that when certain changes were expected in the Lebanon and Jordan, suddenly huge armies marched into these countries and troop movements took place because, obviously, those changes would have been of a type not acceptable to the Western powers. But a similar

1 P.M. change happens in Pakistan

and all that happens is that an attempt is made to describe the dictatorship that is instituted there as a process in democracy. Now obviously the incidence of the Baghdad Pact has played an important part in this, Pakistan being rather an important link in the Baghdad Pact. Perhaps a general election might have resulted in Pakistan going out of the Baghdad Pact. Every treaty takes away a certain portion of a nation's sovereignty, but the Baghdad Pact takes away not merely a certain portion of sovereignty but the entire sovereignty of a particular nation, as it has done in the case of Pakistan. But in this connection I must not allow the statement of Gen. Ayub Khan to go unnoticed. Gen. Ayub Khan said that it is not the receipt of arms from America which is really posing a threat to India but on the contrary it is the armed might of India, three times the potential of Pakistan, which is posing a threat to Pakistan. Now, I do not know in which world Gen. Ayub Khan lives. Military men, generals particularly, are not brainy men as a rule;

they are not brainy men. General Ayub Khan does not realise.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Use a little temperate language.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I am sorry, Sir, but I had the privilege of friendship for the use of this 'mild' language. But generally they do not realise that a country like India is about five times the size and population of Pakistan. God forbid that we should want to be five times as strong in arms as Pakistan. That is a very simple fact which Gen. Ayub Khan seems to have forgotten.

Now, Sir, what has happened in Pakistan may be described as the process of catalysis. Now catalysis according to the dictionary meaning of the word is: 'The decomposition of a compound and the recomposition of its elements by the presence of a foreign substance which does not itself suffer change as in fermentation.' That is what I submit has been happening in Pakistan with the presence of the foreign substance. The Prime Minister, as you know, Sir, has repeated his offer of a no-war pact with Pakistan, but now with military dictatorship ruling there, there is no possibility of Pakistan accepting any such proposition, because, obviously, they would go out of business; but as I said in reply to an interruption behind me, I hope the time will come when we may be able to sit down in peace and quiet and discuss a confederation between the two countries, each retaining its sovereignty, but at the proper moment.

Sir, I was recently at an international conference in Stockholm. This was the time when Mr. Khrushchev had made a proposal for a summit conference to the great Western powers, and in making that proposal Mr. Khrushchev had suggested the presence of the Prime Minister of India at the summit conference. Seventy odd Indian delegates got together and sent a cable to the Prime Minister at that time requesting him that if a conference of this kind was

called, not to refuse to attend the summit conference. The next day at the open Session I moved a short resolution on this subject and while moving the resolution I read out the cable that we had sent to the Prime Minister. Mr. Chairman, the audience, 3,000 odd delegates from all parts of the world, at the mention of the name of the Prime Minister rose as one man and gave a standing ovation? Why? Because they recognised that India stood for peace and for certain civilised human values of great import to the peoples of the world.

Now, Sir, far be it for me to traverse the entire ground covered by the Prime Minister in his very eloquent speech, charged with deep emotion, but it seems to me that there are two matters that are worth considering, one in Asia and the other in Europe. In Asia we have the problem of China. Take Quemoy. It is very strange indeed that Mr. Dulles made a statement early in October, I believe, and which was published everywhere, to the effect that if he could only get a dependable cease-fire in Quemoy, he would then be able to recommend to the N.A.T.O. powers to decrease the war potential in that area. Well, the Chinese people apparently took him at his word, and there was a cease-fire. But far from that period being utilised to lower the war potential in Quemoy, on the 19th of October, huge arms were delivered to Quemoy. In fact, not a Communist paper, but a Conservative paper like 'The Daily Telegraph' of London, in a leading article said that the amount of arms that had been delivered to Quemoy would enable Quemoy to withstand a state of siege and blockade for a period of six months, and the result of it was that on the 20th of October, the Chinese forces resumed the shelling of Quemoy. Now, Sir, that seems rather odd. Men who are great leaders of their countries should not take advantage of situations of this nature. They should try to decrease the tension in the world rather than do the other thing. Then, Sir, while giving a television interview to an independent

television set-up known as "The Week", Mr. Dulles said in regard to Communist China: "We recognise its existence, we deal with it, we negotiate with it, but as far as diplomatic recognition is concerned, 'no'." Surely, Sir, this is not the manner in which certain great affairs of the world upon which the entire peace of the world rests should be dealt with by any leader of any nation. I submit, Sir, that China is a country which has become one of the most important countries of Asia today. Her potential, according to the latest reports, is so enormous that one cannot ignore the demand made by India and by other countries for the seating of that real China in the United Nations and in the Security Council. That demand cannot be ignored. I am told that 70 million new acres of irrigated soil have been added during the last year. I am told that the steel production of China has gone up from 5 million tons to 10 million tons. I am told that in the matter of production of machine tools, China has gone even beyond Great Britain.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Is this progress due to the foreign aid?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend surely is not quite so ignorant as he makes himself out to be. A country like that cannot be ignored and the peace of Asia would be in a better shape if China took her rightful place in the comity of nations.

I must not forget however to draw your attention to the situation in Berlin. In Berlin a time-bomb has been thrown into the problem of East and West Germany by the Soviet Union, the time-limit being 6 months. There is no doubt whatsoever that something serious is afoot. What is afoot is not merely the question of Berlin and not merely the question of the unity of East Germany and West Germany. What is afoot is this as to what is likely to happen tomorrow in Paris in the meeting of the N.A.T.O. powers where the Defence Ministers and Foreign Ministers of the N.A.T.O. powers are meeting in conference. If

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

they decide upon re-arming West Germany with nuclear weapons, it is going to be a most dangerous thing; it is acknowledged to be a most dangerous thing. I am quite certain that it is possible that good may come out of all this evil. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the world may be heading towards a great disaster. We don't know. Therefore the voice of the Prime Minister of India, counselling moderation, counselling peace, is the voice which is very important today at this juncture, in world affairs. In regard to the situation in Germany, Mr. Duncan Sandys, the Secretary for Defence in Great Britain, said this the other day:

"Britain is keen on Western talks with Russia on Berlin."

He hoped that the Russians would not restrict the discussions to their own proposals. "The time has come for full discussions with the Russians about the problems of Germany and European security."

Mr. Dulles is supposed to have said in what the newspapers call 'certain leaks' regarding this particular matter that he is thinking of drastic changes in Europe. "Officials muse about such possibilities as a U.N. zone between the contesting forces in Central Europe or a gradual withdrawal of troops combined with a nuclear-free zone in Germany" and the report adds that Mr. Dulles also believes that the Russians are genuinely frightened of a nuclear re-armed Germany whom they consider capable of trying to launch a devastating surprise blow at Russia. Let us not forget that Russia lost in the last war 14 million in dead alone

This being the situation, we don't know what the end of it will be but we do know that the only policy to pursue is the policy which the Prime Minister recommended to you a little while ago. I must not forget in this connection two significant things that are happening in Europe. One is the

common market. There is a drive towards a unity in Europe, a unity of Europe, one Europe, which may possibly lead later on to a one-world. We don't know. The second is the great movement in Russia. The Seven Year Plan is designed to make Russia, apparently, one of the most prosperous countries in the world, a dream that they have dreamt for the last 40 years. All these are good signs, they are not bad signs. Let us hope that the end of it all will be the acceptance, in reality and not merely verbally, of the creed preached by the Prime Minister of India, the creed of Panch Sheel, the creed of co-existence and non-interference and non-aggression in other people's affairs. And I am glad that the Prime Minister drew the attention of this House to what is happening in Africa. We cannot forget the great surge for freedom that is going through that continent today when country after country is getting rid of colonial bonds and I hope—as the Prime Minister said—by the use of non-violence to achieve their freedom. Let this House send out to the African leaders, those who are free, those who are in prison, those who are detained, a clear call from the Leader of our nation down to the humblest one of us, a call to the effect that we are behind them in their epic struggle for freedom and that we are also eagerly awaiting the advent of the day when Africa as a whole will play its part, as Asia as a whole ought to play its part, and as Europe as a whole is beginning to play its part in the process of unity in the world. Sir, when we send this message to the African leaders, we also send this message to the peoples of the world that we are not only behind the peoples of Africa in their freedom struggle, but we are behind the peoples of the world for peace, with love and compassion and understanding in our hearts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister will reply tomorrow morning after question hour. You can sit through the lunch hour, as you have started sitting and go up to 5 o'clock. And then I hope all sides of the House will

have ample opportunities to state their views.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar) May I suggest that instead of sitting till 5 o'clock, we may avail of one hour for lunch and go up to 6 o'clock That will be better

MR CHAIRMAN. That is not possible

[**MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr Deputy Chairman, since the developments in Pakistan are uppermost in our minds, I think I should begin my speech by a reference to certain aspects of the tragic developments there. Sir, the developments in Pakistan should be viewed not as a isolated event, but they should be viewed as a new stage in the imperialist offensive against the Afro-Asian nations and that is why side by side with what is happening in Pakistan, we find equally tragic spectacles in Thailand and in Burma. Therefore it is that I say this is a stage in this development and it constitutes a new menace to the security and independence of Afro-Asian countries The happenings in Pakistan are there and we know that it is something which is the product of years of American interference, directly and indirectly not only in that country but also in other countries in this part of the world Naturally, the objective of this interference has been highly anti democratic and I think when the Prime Minister declared and called it naked dictatorship, he was explaining in a very simple way but a right way, the exact state of affairs which has come about there

It is significant to those who study the developments in Pakistan from the press to know that while the democratic movement is being ruthlessly suppressed with violence and brutality unheard of even in Pakistan, the Muslim League leaders are being well looked after I am not suggest-

ing that they should be subjected to this reign of terror and brutality. But what I am trying to point out is that this military regime is not without some kind of political bias and that bias is politically speaking or if you like, ideologically speaking, in favour of those Muslim League elements in that country. At the same time you see how the trade unions there, the workers, the students and all those who stand for peace and friendship between India and Pakistan are being whisked away into prisons and are being suppressed. That only shows the real nature of the developments taking place there and we should not be misled by outward things. with this talk of controlling prices or calling to account some profiteers here and there Everybody knows that controlling the economy of a country is not the job of a Field Marshal We have not yet known a Field Marshal who by brandishing his sword or by brandishing any other weapon could direct the economic life of his country And I do not think in Pakistan, however military-minded some of them might be, the people there believe that by their military methods, by goose-stepping or by marching or by unleashing their sword, and frowning upon the people they can bring their economy to an even keel That is not possible and they know it But naturally for demagogic purposes, to exploit some legitimate sentiments of the people who have been kept down and are frustrated, they have to take recourse to such measures But we know how these methods are getting more and more discredited and also we find from the press that Pakistan's economic life is somewhat disrupted In fact, some papers also have said that this will bring about imbalance and they have pointed out that American military assistance has resulted in imbalance in Pakistan's economy

Who is behind all this? That is the problem Everybody knows that Gen Ayub Khan is not such a mighty general that he would issue such a

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

strong threat to India knowing fully well that ours is a country of great population and with great industrial potential also, and who knows fully well that the people in his country will not like a conflict with India, much less a war with India. But behind all this is the American military aid, that I want to put quite clearly. Let me read a few extracts. This is what the U.S. Journal "New Republic" of 10th November writes about Gen. Ayub Khan:

"Four years of U.S. military aid has radically increased his armed forces."

This is a very frank admission and that is what they wrote. When these developments took place, there were certain reactions in the American press and they are worth noting. The news circulated by the United Press of America on October 10th, says:

"Recently the military takeovers in Thailand, Pakistan and Burma are viewed without disturbed feelings in the United States, State Department officials reported yesterday."

This is a serious thing, because it shows that the U.S.A. or at least some quarters in the U.S.A. were quite happy about what has been happening in Pakistan. Then another paper or periodical in an article recently writes in December, 1958, it is the *Life*. It says:

"All the new dictators are anti-Communist and resolutely patriotic, which gives the United States at least a *prima facie* reason for continuing military and economic aid."

This is from the American paper, and this is how they are talking about developments in Pakistan. As far as arms aid is concerned, we do not know how much military hardware has come to Pakistan. In his letter to the *New York Herald Tribune* of November 11, 1958, Mr. J.

J. Singh, President of the India League wrote:

"It is unofficially reported that the U.S.A. has poured more than half a billion dollars worth of military hardware into Pakistan."

These are some of the figures that we have got. And only yesterday in the papers we saw that they are buying a warship called 'Charity' from the United Kingdom for charitable purposes. That is to say, the U.S.A. will give it to Pakistan. They are not content with what they are giving to Pakistan out of their arsenals.

My trouble is that the hon. Deputy Minister relies too much on assurances given by America that this military aid is not increasing.

According to all indications, military aid is increasing and I think, Sir, it would not be wisdom, much less statesmanship to bank and rely much on what Americans tell us about military aid that is being given to Pakistan and I think the Prime Minister's statesmanship will not be lacking in this matter to appraise the real situation.

What has failed in Pakistan? The Western press is trying to make it out that democracy has failed in Pakistan. It is a lie and it is patent falsehood to suggest that democracy has failed in Pakistan. Thanks to their interference and intrigue, democracy was never given a fair trial there; it was always under manacles all the time. What has failed in Pakistan really is the policy of the Pakistani ruling clique to carry on in the normal constitutional and, if you like, parliamentary way, relying on American military assistance and economic aid and suppressing or attacking democratic rights and liberties. That is what has failed in Pakistan and one should not be misled by the Western propaganda that democracy has failed in Pakistan. In this connection, I would like to quote a few comments. I am not quoting from

any Communist source or paper because I know that if I quote something from the Communist countries or from the Communist plank, some hon. Members opposite do not feel quite happy. Therefore, I quote from the . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): It is an unfounded allegation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If the hon. Member feels happy, I am glad. The "Rangoon Daily" wrote:

"The Columnist expressed the fear that the United States will make Thailand as its stooge and use the country as a springboard of attack on Communist China."

It says also:

"Military coups in Pakistan and Thailand were engineered from outside."

This is what the Rangoon paper, by no means Communist but a liberal paper, may be a bourgeois paper, writes about the development in Pakistan. Nothing to do with Communism that way as far as these writings are concerned. This is an important point which should be taken note of. The danger of arms aid to Pakistan has increased. I am glad that the Prime Minister acknowledge this danger; not only that, Sir, but he has spoken sharply about it. I should remind him in this connection about a speech that he made in Bangalore on January 3, 1954, when the U.S.-Pakistan military pact was known. He said:

"This military aid to Pakistan by America is a step towards war. not peace, not only towards a world war but a step which will bring war right to our own frontiers.... It is an anti-Asian step".

We humbler people, meeting at a Party Congress in Madurai in 1954, said in our Resolution:

"....the warmongers are now trying to foment conflict in other areas of the world and especially in the countries of Asia, to preserve their own profits, further their war aims, and make Asians fight Asians".

We also struck this warning at the same time. Somehow or other, by a good coincidence—and generally on such matters coincidences do take place—we seem to have felt alike and spoken alike in this matter. Naturally, Sir, there is no difference over this matter; the question is, how are we going to face the situation today? Now, Sir, the danger has enormously increased today. If four years ago when this warning was struck it was so realistic, how much more realistic it should be today with a military regime installed in Pakistan, with no democratic laws, no norms but a few men, a small junta deciding on questions of war and peace provided of course some people who are supplying them arms are agreeable to this kind of thing? This is the position; the danger has increased enormously not only because of the increased military supplies but also because of the grim political changes that have come about in Pakistan. We have to be vigilant. Perhaps, vigilance is not enough; we must take necessary precautions and steps. I shall come to that later. We must see this in the context of the U.S. moves for forging bilateral military pacts with Iran, Turkey and Pakistan. I raised that point but I was told that there was no such move but the newspaper "Dawn" writing from Karachi gives us news about progress made in the bilateral military pact talks between the United States of America and Pakistan. Of course, the talks are going on behind the scenes; we can gather that from the newspaper. This is how the military bilateral pacts will naturally strengthen the military armour, aggressive and offensive character of this regime. This is adding to the danger that we are already facing. I hope proper note of these things would be

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
taken and I hope that the Prime Minister, would tell us whether this information is right or wrong. We should be very happy to be told that this information has no foundation but how can you be satisfied when "Dawn" coming from Karachi tells us day in and day out that such talks are in progress?

Now, Sir, let me come to the SEATO and the Baghdad Pact. The hon. Prime Minister thinks that the Baghdad Pact is moribund. Yes, in a way it is moribund thanks to the kicks it has received from the Iraqi revolution but then when a person becomes moribund, there are some persons who become desperate also. Here, I need not tell the Prime Minister that even in spite of the developments in Iraq, even in spite of their distress so far as the developments in Iraq are concerned, the authors and the architects of the Baghdad Pact have become hopelessly desperate. That is the point. And that is why today they are concentrating not only on bilateral military pacts but also on training of Pakistan with American arms, which the papers are writing. Much more attention should be given to Pakistan. Therefore, I should not like any hon. Member to get away with the idea that the Baghdad Pact has become so moribund that we can almost ignore it. I wish it were so. Unfortunately it is not so. On the contrary, the attention is being concentrated on Pakistan. As you know, when one has two children, if one dies, the affection is concentrated on the other. Now, it so happens that from the Baghdad Pact, Baghdad has virtually fallen out. Now, they are concentrating. It is a link in the chain of SEATO and Baghdad Pacts poised against the independence and security of the free countries and the freedom loving countries of this entire region. That is how it should be viewed. I should like to tell the House that the Baghdad and SEATO pacts, among others, are directed against the so-called un-

committed nations, directed against the United Arab Republic, the Iraqi Republic, India and Indonesia. Let there be no mistake about it. I know there are aggressive designs against the Soviet Union and China. These are all known. But now it should be more and more clear to the hon. Members that these are directed against these few countries which stand for Afro-Asian freedom, fight for Afro-Asian freedom and have some policies and some standard to offer to a world struggling for independence and peace.

In this connection, I would like to draw the Prime Minister's attention to another gentleman, Mr. Rountree, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America. They like touring. Mr. Henderson came and went and provoked, as you know, the events in the Lebanon and Jordan. And now it is revealed in the Iraqi trials. Now, there is another gentleman. Mr. Rountree. He has come on another tour and he is touring those countries, holding consultation as to how those countries could be drawn closer to the American war plans.

And from the international angle they are to be drawn more and more into the aggressive alignment. There again discussions have taken place already in Italy and it seems Italy has agreed to offer bases near the West Asian region, bases to be started by the United States of America, which will be kept clear for American rocket weapons. In this connection, the hon. Prime Minister has mentioned the case of Algeria. Then, I do not say much on this. All that I want to say here is that the United States are still supplying arms to the authorities in Algeria who are suppressing the freedom struggle there. Then, an interesting development is also taking place against the Indonesian Republic, where our President is visiting today. Recently a meeting of the rebels was held and there the United States is in the picture, under the cloak, under the slogan

'Sumatra State' or 'Estate of Sumatra'. The slogan has been given in order to bolster up the rebels, so that they carry on their activities. Now, as you know, the rebels, as has been pointed out by the Indonesian Government, have been armed and helped by the imperialist powers, especially by the United States of America. Now, another move is going on in order to help them more, so that they conduct the treasonable, anti-national and violent activities against the Republic of Indonesia

Then, Sir, Indian Ocean. I drew the Prime Minister's attention to the presence of American cruisers in the Indian Ocean at Singapore. The Prime Minister told us that they were cruising. But it seems now that they have begun to like cruising in the Indian Ocean too much, so much so that there is a proposal to keep the Fifth U.S. Fleet stationed in the Indian Ocean, so that they can hold the entire line from the Mediterranean to the Pacific, connecting the Sixth and the Seventh Fleets. I would like to know about this. Reports are there already in the press. The other day we read such reports. We do not like such cruising in our waters, in the Indian Ocean, so near to us, so menacingly, with arms in Pakistan with intrigues in Indonesia, with rocket ramps for Chiang-kai-Shek authorities. We do not like that the Indian Ocean should be treated so, should be taken possession of by them and should be placed at the disposal of the American war-mongers. Therefore, we should take note of this cruising. The Prime Minister's voice should be raised. We cannot just have our way, but we can certainly mobilise world public opinion. We can make it known to the world. We do not want to put up with menacing cruising by the American cruisers and other warships in the Indian Ocean. They have no business to be there. This is the point that I would like to make

In this connection, there are a few more points. It is sometimes felt as

if the Americans are not interested in Indian politics. They are interested only in giving aids to our country and nothing much. All very pious motives are attributed to them in some quarters. This is not so, because they have begun to take more and more interest in the internal politics of India. As you know, read the American press and you will see that a campaign is going on against the Kerala Government and a clear advocacy is made in order to get more help for the Second Five Year Plan. I do not see how the Kerala Government is linked up with the proposal for helping the Second Five Year Plan. Now, the "Washington Post" (November 2) wrote: "Will the present Kerala Government survive the session of the Union Parliament scheduled to meet in November?". Now, it seems to have survived. Anyway, this is how they look at us. When they give money, they talk about survival or otherwise of certain Governments. This is how they talk. Not only that. They have taken interest in the internal affairs of the Congress and that, Sir, causes a little more disturbance in our mind. Take, for instance, the Western Press. The "New Statesman" wrote on August 30, 1958:

"Mr. Morarji Desai who is now paying a visit to this country . . . is likely some day to be the Prime Minister of India. He is a vegetarian and even disapproves tea and coffee."

I do not know how they qualify for Prime Ministership. Then, it goes on:

"He stands on the Congress right and the Government under his control would presumably concentrate on strengthening India's present economy not on moving in socialist direction"

Then, again, the "Manchester Guardian" on August 29, this year wrote "Nehru's Heir Comes West". They discover who is who and how he

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

comes. Then, Sir, the "Time" wrote in an article of September 1:—

"In Washington next week, U.S. officials would be meeting the man whose name most often tops the list of possibilities (as successor to Mr. Nehru)".

They are talking about the successor to the Prime Ministership of India, almost the British people talking about the British heir-apparent in the royal family. This is how they talk. I do not know of any decision in the Congress party, that the successor question has been solved. I do not find mention of it in the press, but the American press has discovered . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Imagination.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My fear is that the moment you start settling successors in this manner, we have to be on guard. We have to take precaution and we should know what is what . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: That is our affair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . Why they are dabbling in Indian politics. I know that he has not decided the question. It is yet unsettled. But I do not like it to be settled in the way America likes to be settled. That is my point. Therefore, we all wish long life to the Prime Minister. We know this is a problem which will be your problem also. Now, Sir, when I say long life, I mean it and I say that he would be probably there in that position.

Now, Sir, let me come to the Berlin question. I am glad the Prime Minister referred to that question, which he missed in the other House. The Berlin question should be gone into. The Prime Minister should give the deepest thought over this matter. Now, as you know, the Soviet Union has proposed to establish the status of a demilitarized free city in West Berlin. Now, they want to bring to an

end the occupation by foreign powers of Berlin. There are complications, I know. But then the Potsdam Agreement offers no solution, because that has been completely violated by the Western powers, specially by the United States. Now, West Germany is a partner of the N.A.T.O. Nuclear weapons are there. German militarism is being revived, and all that. Missile bases are being set up. That way the solution will not come. I feel that if this plan were accepted, it will probably reduce tension in that region and will probably facilitate the process for the settlement of the Berlin question. It seems that the question of Germany itself has to be settled by the Germans themselves without any foreign power from any side coming into the picture. Therefore, it is important. We are sorry that the Western powers should have rejected in this manner the proposal for the creation of a free, demilitarised city in that region.

Now, Sir, in this connection I should like to draw the Prime Minister's attention to one matter. As we know, the two States work with two different systems, whether we like it or not. The solution will naturally lie in starting a sort of confederation of them on common issues. This proposal has come. These are things that should receive the support of all freedom-loving people. As far as the Berlin proposal is concerned, it should be supported. In fact, the Social Democrat Party in West Berlin, in the municipal elections won against Dr. Adenauer's Christian Democrat Party. I am not saying that they are following the right course. They are fed up with Dr. Adenauer's policy of militarism and of cold war and of maintaining tension and friction in that region.

Sir, I would like the Prime Minister to consider another point. I think the time has come to consider the recognition of the East German Democratic Republic also. I know that the Prime Minister does not adopt the kind of attitude that the Western

powers are adopting. But I think, his recognition, the formal recognition by India of that Republic, would perhaps help the situation and help the process of solution of the German problem. When West Germany is recognized, why should not the other Germany be recognized since they exist as a matter of reality? I think that would help.

Then, Sir, about the Algerian question. I think the Prime Minister is thinking too much of De Gaulle as a Gual. I call him De Gaulle, he calls him a Gaul. Anyway I will use that expression. We cannot count on his goodness. You have seen what has happened in the elections. Now, about the elections the "New Statesman" wrote that the French had voted into power for the first time since 1871 an anti-parliamentary assembly. As far as the Communist Party was concerned, the Communist required 3,88,000 votes on an average to be elected as against 19,000 by the De Gaullists. By getting over 20 per cent. of the total votes the Communist got less than 3 per cent. of the seats. That shows which way things are moving. I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to what has happened. I would ask him not to rely much on it. He has taken a courageous stand. That should be pursued. I think the provisional Algerian Government should be recognised. It is not unknown in international law that provisional governments are recognised. Why should you not recognize? That will morally strengthen their position, morally isolate those people who are opposed to the settlement of the question of Algerian independence in a proper way. De Gaulle is not interested in it but is interested in exacting a complete surrender from the Algerian people which, of course, after all their heroic struggle and sacrifice, would never come. Therefore, I would not count much on De Gaulle.

Sir, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether the question of the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry

has been taken up with the De Gaulle administration. We were told that last month the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry would take place. The matter is being delayed. That agreement was signed in 1954. That matter is being delayed, and I would like to know what is the attitude of De Gaulle on this matter and why there is this delay.

Then I should like to make certain suggestions for the Prime Minister to consider. As far as the United States military aid to Pakistan is concerned, we are of the view that we must strongly express our opinion, and this must be expressed not only at the political level but also at the diplomatic level. We think that we are within our right to declare that the Union of India considers the continuance of arms supply to Pakistan as an unfriendly act towards India. It is necessary to do so in order to isolate people who carry on such kind of activities like supply of arms. It strengthens our position in the comity of nations. It will also have a good impact on the United States itself, and it will also assure the people of Pakistan who stand for friendship and peace with India. Therefore, I think that it is necessary. Sir, it is very good that Mr. Chagla focussed attention on the United States arms aid to Pakistan, and he has done a good job of it. But I did not quite appreciate as to why he should have pressed so much for economic aid. The more we talk about economic aid from the United States, the more we weaken our case against the military aid that is coming for Pakistan. I think, Sir, we are not weak as to be so helpless that every time we speak to them, we should stretch out our hands to them for some dollars. Is that necessary? I cannot quite appreciate that. It compromises our position in so far as our stand against the U.S. arms aid to Pakistan goes. Therefore, it is also necessary to say that. Mr. Chagla said that Pakistan stands in the way of good relationship between India and the United States. I say that it is the United States which stands in the way

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
of good relationship between India and Pakistan. That is how the question should be posed. In this connection I should like to say that the matter should be raised in the U.N. more and more. We should find suitable opportunities to raise our voice against the U.S. arms supply to Pakistan.

Sir, Afro-Asian solidarity should be strengthened. It has been demonstrated before the world that Afro-Asian countries once united can generate not only a great moral but material force. It is necessary for the Prime Minister to take greater steps in bringing about the solidarity of the Afro-Asian countries. That is one point. At the same time co-operation with the socialist countries should also be strengthened. There must be co-operation in every field. Our foreign trade must correspond with our foreign policy. If we are so much tied to the Western countries in matters of trade, it becomes a kind of obstacle. That is also a very important point. It does not fall within the purview of the External Affairs Ministry. But in order to strengthen the foreign policy of our country we should also see that our trade policy is somewhat changed in other directions.

Sir, in matters of military weapons, I am not a militarist, neither is the Prime Minister. But good arms are being given, very modern weapons are being sent to Pakistan. British weapons are not much good compared to the American weapons. We are dependent only on British weapons. It is for the Prime Minister to consider this question, whether we should put up with an inferiority in arms as compared to Pakistan. I am not suggesting that there should be an arms race, but then, if necessary, we have to import arms from other countries also in order to maintain ourselves in readiness to meet any kind of aggression that may be provoked by the U.S.A. or other countries. Our Defence industries and heavy industries should be strengthened. What is more, in the Army we must incul-

cate in them a spirit of democracy, a love of democratic institutions, and we must tell them the sacred cause for which we stand. In the Army you find very often American and similar other literature being circulated. You should put an end to that. The spirit of democracy should be transmitted and inculcated in the Army.

In this connection I regret to draw the Prime Minister's attention to a circular which has been issued by the Home Ministry, in which Cabinet Ministers and Deputy Ministers have been asked not to associate themselves with any kind of society like the All India People's Council, Indo-Soviet Cultural Society, India-China friendship Association, All India Progressive Writers Association, All India Association for Democratic Lawyers, etc. I do not know why. There must be some common forums. These are organisations where all can mix together in spite of their political differences. Why should there be such a circular? Incidentally in the list the Committee for Cultural Freedom is not mentioned, Indo-American Society is not mentioned, and Free enterprise is not mentioned. I am saying that such circulars should not be issued and no names should not be mentioned. You must follow one principle. As far as we are concerned, we think, Sir, if there is a common organisation where Congressmen, Communists, P.S.P. people and others can work for the advancement of the cause of peace, for Afro-Asian solidarity and for friendship with China and other countries, why should there be embarrassment if Ministers join it? Who is embarrassed? I do not think the Prime Minister should be embarrassed because somebody is joining a body which is called 'The Friendship Society with China'. I am not embarrassed. In these matters, we want to work together. In our political parties, we cannot work together. Separate parties of all kinds exist. There should be a common forum for this. Therefore, I say this is not good. This demoralises the people.

Finally, I would appeal that it is necessary to rouse the country against the danger and in that task, the Congress, the Communists, the Praja-Socialists—every party—should put their heads together. I think that it should be a good day if the Prime Minister would take the lead in this connection in order to bring about a national mobilisation behind the foreign policy. We make this appeal. Why can't we unite? Are we not united in the matter of food and various other common issues? Then, why can't we unite against the menace of the United States' arms supply to Pakistan? Why can't we unite for the solidarity between Asian and African nations? Why can't we unite for advancing the cause of Panch Sheel or for working for world peace? In this matter, unfortunately, the Congress is passive as an organisation. They have simply adopted the line "Leave unto Caesar what is Caesar's". Leave unto the Prime Minister everything Prime Minister's. The Prime Minister should disfavour such a thing. That should not be the approach of Congressmen—it is not also our approach—towards issues which are common. In foreign policy, we have to create mass sanction, mobilising the people, making them conscious, giving them some good mission to fight for, instilling into them the spirit of activity and mass action. Therefore, this is another aspect of the task.

Sir, I have covered many aspects of the foreign policy and in conclusion, I have suggested certain measures. We want our foreign policy today to be strengthened not only carrying it forward at the State level, but also we want our policy to be backed by the country, by massive, broad, united, national mass support which is necessary not merely in the interests of the people of India, the people of Asia and Africa, but indeed of the whole world. That approach should be at all levels so that we may prove worthy of the great traditions and

ideals for which we have fought and for which we are living today.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is almost impossible not to be very deeply touched by the deep and transparent humanism that characterised the hon. Prime Minister's address on our foreign policy. It has been said on the floor of the House not only by the Mover of the amendment but has been agreed to also by the Leader of the Opposition group that our foreign policy is not merely bipartisan, but also national—a policy which has found acceptance not only by the multitude of our own people, but also all over the world. There had been initial difficulties in the understanding of our position, but a steady pursuit of that policy has now convinced the world that we are, if not anything else, at least honest and sincere about it. One may not agree with it, but one may not question the honesty and sincerity that characterise our policy. We may not agree with it here and there in minor details, but so far as the basic principle is concerned whether it is in regard to Cyprus or Algeria, whether it is in respect of our African policy or the Arab policy, we have pursued our main, basic, fundamental principle of non-alignment with either party in the contemporary cold war, with our fundamental policy of peace, of understanding, of co-existence and of democracy. It is now easy to recognise that so far as Asia is concerned, this country alone today in the context of contemporary history is the bastion of parliamentary democracy. It is here alone that we are trying our best to give the best possible interpretation of it not only in our day-to-day affairs, but also in larger international affairs, of what political democracy in its best interpretation, in its widest meaning means, and it is now being recognised that we are heading—may be slowly, maybe with slightly faltering steps—towards social and economic democracy as well. Elsewhere in Asia—right and left—democracy is being smothered or being

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.]
liquidated, or still elsewhere democracy means something else.

As I said, our general position in respect all the plague spots in the world has been made absolutely clear. I would, therefore, content myself by referring to certain things nearer home. All the bigger problems had been explained in more or less detail by the Prime Minister himself and there has not been any very great difference between what he said and what the Leader of the Opposition did except in slight difference in emphasis. Perhaps, the latter laid certain emphasis on certain things that suited his ideology. There is a common struggle. There is no doubt about it. But even behind this common struggle, this question of emphasis is important. Not that we on this side of the House do not understand the meaning of the emphasis laid on certain aspects of the policy.

Certain points in this discussion perhaps have so far escaped attention. I would like to make mention of a few of these. First of all, I would refer to one of our small problems—not a very big problem, but a problem that deeply touches our honour and dignity. It is also a human problem. I am referring to the problem of Goa. We must not forget that in Goa there are prisoners behind the bars, who had been put behind the bars for the struggle of freedom in which they took part. It has leaked through that the treatment meted out to these prisoners has been below civilised standards of even political vindictiveness. We would like to be informed a little more about this treatment how these prisoners are faring
2 P.M. and if there is any prospect of their being released soon.

Then on our own people and the people of Goa, whom we also consider to be our own people, there have been restrictions on travel between India and Goa—very many tight restrictions are being experienced by both sides. We would like some more information on this point too and

if any attempt is being made to ease the situation.

What disturbs us—let me be very clear about it—what disturbs us is not the attitude of Portugal—that is perfectly understandable; we know the system of Government that obtains there—but what disturbs us most are the countries that claim to be our friends when they stand by Portugal, when they express themselves in favour of Portugal. Now everybody knows what the system of Government in Portugal is, but when it is said that Portugal in this respect is pursuing a policy that accords very well with their policy and their expressed policy is one of parliamentary democracy, is one of international peace and goodwill and they claim Portugal as one of those States that belong to their own category, well, that is the one thing that disturbs us a great deal.

Last time when I spoke before the House on our foreign policy, I spoke about the necessity of raising our foreign publicity in respect of Goa to a higher level. When I said to a 'higher level', I meant what was being done in other areas of the world in similar circumstances, and I gave the example of Cyprus, to what the Greeks have been doing in respect of Cyprus. Have we been able to do it? Have we been able so far to make the world acquainted with the Goa case, India's case for Goa? The historical background, the legal position, the contemporary situation, even in our own country very few people know; I am not speaking of the emotional attitude, but so far as information is concerned, so far as background knowledge is concerned, even our own people are often very ignorant.

Reference has been made to Pondicherry. Now that the elections in France are over, now that France is going back to a stable Government—howsoever we may dislike it or like it is a different matter altogether—I do feel that the case of the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry should be taken up without further delay. I

believe it is already before the eyes and minds of the Ministry of External Affairs, but if we do not make any mention of Pondicherry in our Houses of Legislature in connection with our foreign affairs debate, people are likely to interpret it as a thing which is going by default. I would therefore like to underline it, to emphasise it a little bit so that we are not misunderstood.

I would also like to make mention of another point. In the other House in connection with the foreign affairs debate, some criticism was made of our position in the Commonwealth. The vehemence of opposition to our Commonwealth relation has slowed down. Perhaps better understanding is being reached, but at the same time a new danger is making itself felt. Here in this very city the other day, the highest representative of the British Government in this country made a very significant statement. He said that he could not understand why military dictatorship and parliamentary democracy could not co-exist inside of the Commonwealth. Now, apart from emotional relations, apart from historically conditioned facts, apart from our sentimental ties, from the point of view of Commonwealth relations alone, looked at from the political point of view, the one binding force amongst nations within the Commonwealth was the binding thread of parliamentary democracy. It was given expression to by the leaders of British politics, not only by those of the ruling party but also of the Opposition that the greatest common link amongst the nations in the Commonwealth was the link of parliamentary democracy. Now, if it is argued that that common link has no meaning, that military dictatorship and parliamentary democracy can now co-exist inside of the Commonwealth, then we must take notice of the fact that the very fundamental character of the Commonwealth is undergoing a significant change. And we have got to consider whether this change in the character of the Commonwealth will

not affect our place in the Commonwealth.

It has already been said with sufficient emphasis, with deep humanity and with a great deal of regret, that our relations with Pakistan have, for some time, been at a very low ebb. I would not like, therefore, to refer to it at all. But with regard to the Nehru-Noon Agreement—I have nothing to say against that Agreement—we would like to know a little from the hon. Prime Minister as to how the various arrangements mentioned in the Agreement are going to be implemented. Can transfer of enclaves be effected by merely an enactment in Parliament? Will it not be necessary to amend the Constitution? This is something which is engaging the attention of the Members of this House and also of the leaders of public opinion outside.

Personally, Sir, I do not consider Kashmir to come under the purview of our foreign affairs, because with us the State of Jammu and Kashmir is a part and parcel of India. But in this connection, Sir, I would like to make some reference to this Kashmir problem. The world knows today that our *bona fides* in respect of Kashmir have been proved. It was argued last time, and it is now also being argued in the press; Can the two basic problems which are said to be the two bones of contention between Pakistan and India, be solved either on the basis of *status quo* or on the diplomatic level? We on this side of the House feel that if there was any such possibility, now is not the time, for we cannot possibly speak on this basis at all, so long as there is a military dictatorship in that country. It is profoundly to be regretted that certain justifiable criticisms have been made about the character of the administration in Kashmir. We should have felt happy if we could say that the administration over there was very clean. But unfortunately this cannot be said. (*Time bell rings*). We recognise that the area of civil liberties in that part of the country has got to

[Dr Nihar Ranjan Ray]

be extended The Democratic National conference cannot function there, a party like the PSP cannot function. We do not also see why the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and of the Election Commission cannot be extended there. The situation is not as it should be, and unless we can get extended the area of civil liberties there, unless we can bring them within the general pattern of political and civil democracy that obtains in India itself, unless we can obtain that very pattern in Kashmir and Jammu—I am not speaking from the point of view of politics alone—our case, from the point of view of humanism that we stand for, will get weaker and weaker. (Time bell rings) Sir, these are a few of the points that I wanted to make. Thank you, Sir

شری بی. محمد خاں - (حموں)

ایڈکٹڈ کشمیر : حذاب قذقی جرمین صاحب - ان ہی دوں یا کچھ تھورے دن پیچھے پاکستان میں جو تبدیلیاں ہوئی ہیں اور ان تبدیلیوں کے نتیجے میں جو گورنمنٹ وہاں قائم ہوئی ہے اور جس کو کہ حقیقی معنوں میں ملٹی ڈکٹیٹرشپ کہنا چاہیئے اس گورنمنٹ کے ذمہ دار آدمیوں نے کچھ ایسی (سیپیج) دی ہیں جن سے انڈیا اور پاکستان کے تعلقات پر بہت برا اثر پڑا ہے اور پڑ سکتا ہے - کشمیر کے متعلق وہ اپنی اس پہلی والی گورنمنٹ کے نقش قدم پر چلے ہیں - جس طرح سے وہ وہاں کی اکائیک کشمکش سے بھٹنے کے لئے کشمیر کا سوال میں لے آئے نہ اسی طرح وہی طریقہ انہوں نے بھی اختیار کیا ہے بلکہ پہلی گورنمنٹ سے بھی زیادہ اختیار کیا ہے - ابھی تو ہمارا اس گورنمنٹ کے ساتھ کوئی خاص سوال پیدا نہیں ہوا ہے لیکن انہوں نے پہلے سے ہی

کشمیر اور کینال وائر کے معاملے کے بارے میں کہنا شروع کر دیا ہے تاکہ لوگوں کی نظریں ان بدگمانیوں اور بے ضابطگیوں کی طرف سے ہٹیں رہیں جو ملٹری ڈکٹیٹرشپ کے عرصہ میں پاکستان میں ہو رہی ہیں - ہم جموں اور کشمیر کے لوگ ایک ٹوہ کی دیوار کی طرح اپنے لیڈر بخشی غلام محمد کے ساتھ ان کے پیچھے کھڑے ہیں - جس طرح کا تھیٹ پاکستان نے دیا ہے اس کے بعد اگر کوئی بھی علمی قدم اس نے اٹھایا تو ہم اس کو بتا دیں گے کہ انڈیا اور کشمیر کے لوگ خون کا آخری فطرہ بھی بہا دینے میں کوئی گریز نہیں کریں گے -

پاکستان کو جو ملٹری امداد باہر سے مل رہی ہے وہ ایک انتہائی افسوسناک بات ہے - اور ملٹری ڈکٹیٹرشپ قائم ہونے کی وجہ سے اس امداد میں اور بھی کافی اضافہ ہو گیا ہے - جو ملک اس کو اتنی زیادہ ملٹری امداد دے رہے ہیں وہ انکی نیک نیتی پر مبنی نہیں ہے اور نہ ہی انڈیا کی دوسری پر مبنی ہو سکتا ہے -

میرے سے پہلے جو اسپیکر صاحب بول چکے ہیں انہوں نے کشمیر کے ایڈمنسٹریشن پر کہ جس کا یہاں اس قبیحیت سے کوئی تعلق نہیں تھا بلا وجہ کچھ نکتہ چینی کی ہے - میں ان کو اور اس ہاؤس کو یہ بتا دینا

چاہتا ہوں کہ بخشی غلام محمد کی لیڈر شپ کے بارے میں اور ان کے ایڈمنسٹریشن کے بارے میں دوسرے ہاوس میں جو دبیت ہوئی تھی اور ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے اس پر جن خیالات کا اظہار فرمایا ہے اس کے مقابلے میں میں اس کریٹیکسزم کی بالکل کوئی وقعت نہیں سمجھتا۔ کشمیر میں بخشی غلام محمد کا ایڈمنسٹریشن اور ان کی لیڈر شپ کیا اس لئے اچھی نہیں کہ ان ہی کے وقت میں کشمیر کے الحاق کا انڈیا کے ساتھ فیصلہ اسمبلی میں ہوا - میں تو آپ لوگوں کو یہ بتانا دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ ان کی لیڈر شپ میں ایجوکیشن، ہیلتھ، کمیونیکیشن، کمیونٹی پروجیکٹ اور انڈسٹریز سب ہی میں بہت اچھی طرح سے ترقی ہو رہی ہے - اس وقت ملک کے اس حصہ میں جتنی اچھی ترقی ہوئی ہے اور جتنی اچھے ڈھنگ پر وہاں حکومت چل رہی ہے اس کے بارے میں کسی کو کوئی شک نہیں ہو سکتا ہے - میں وہاں کا رہنے والا ہوں اور میں نے شیخ صاحب کا بھی ایڈمنسٹریشن دیکھا ہے - لہذا میں یہ پورے یقین سے کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ اس وقت کشمیر میں بخشی صاحب کی لیڈر شپ میں بہت اچھی طرح اور ترقی کے ساتھ وہاں کا ایڈمنسٹریشن چل رہا ہے -

اب میں زیادہ وقت ہاوس کا نہیں لوں گا - گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی جو موجودہ فارن پالیسی ہے اور جس فارن پالیسی پر وہ چل رہی ہے وہ صلح کن فارن پالیسی، ایک چھٹی کی فارن پالیسی، ایک دوسرے کی مدد کرنے کی فارن پالیسی، ایک دوسرے کے معاملات میں دخل نہ دینے کی فارن پالیسی اور ایک دوسرے سے جھگڑا نہ کرنے کی فارن پالیسی ہے اور میں اس کی دل سے نائید کرتا ہوں -

†[آپریر موہممد خان (جیمز) اینڈ کاشرمیر) : جناب ڈیپٹی چیئرمین ساہب !
 انہی دینو یا کھو تھو ڈین پوڈھ پاکستان مے جو تب دیلیا ہئی ہے اور ان تب دیلیوں مے جو گورنمنٹ وٹاں کام ہئی ہے اور جسکو کہ تھکیکی ماڈنوں مں ملٹی ڈیکٹریٹریپ کھنا چاہیے اس گورنمنٹ مے جیممہدار آدمیوں نے کھو اےمو سپیچ دی ہے، جنمے انڈیا اور پاکستان مے تاللقاٹ پر بھوت بڑا افسر پڈا ہے اور پڈ سکتا ہے ۔ کاشمیر مے موتلقک وھ اپنی پہلی والی گورنمنٹ مے نکش-کدم پر چلے ہے ۔ جس ترھ مے وھ وٹا کی اکانامیک کشمکش مے بچنے مے لیے کاشمیر کا سوال بچ مے لے آتے تھ، اسی ترھ وھی تریکا انھونے بھی اترتیار کیا ہے بلک پہلی گورنمنٹ مے بھی جیادا اترتیار کیا ہے ۔ اتری تو ہمارا اس نئی گورنمنٹ مے ساٹ کوئی کام سوال پیدا نہی ہوا ہے، لکین انھونے پہلے مے ہی کاشمیر اور کینال واٹر مے ماملے مے بارے مے کھنا شرو کر دیا ہے تاکہ لوگوں کی نجرے ان بد-گمانیوں اور بجا بترگیوں کی ترھ مے ہٹی رھن، جو ملٹی ڈیکٹریٹریپ مے اترے

[पीर मोहम्मद खान]

में पाकिस्तान में हो रही है। हम जम्मू और काश्मीर के लोग एक लोहे की दीवार की तरह अपने लीडर बख्शी गुलाम मोहम्मद के साथ उनके पीछे खड़े हैं। जिस तरह का थ्रेट पाकिस्तान ने दिया है उसके बाद अगर कोई भी अमली कदम उसने उठाया तो हम उसको बता देंगे कि इंडिया और काश्मीर के लोग खून का आखिरी कतरा बहा देने में कोई गुरेज नहीं करेंगे।

पाकिस्तान को जो मिलिट्री इम्पाद बाहर से मिल रही है, वह एक इन्तहाई अफसोसनाक बात है; और मिलिट्री डिक्टेटरशिप कायम होने की वजह से इस इम्पाद में और भी काफी इजाफा हो गया है। जो मुल्क इसको इतनी ज्यादा मिलिट्री इम्पाद दे रहे हैं, वह उनकी नेक नीयती पर मुबनी नहीं है और न ही इंडिया की दोस्ती पर मुबनी हो सकता है।

मेरे से पहले जो स्पीकर साहब बोल चुके हैं, उन्होंने काश्मीर के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन पर, जिसका कि यहां इस डिबेट से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था, बिला वजह कुछ नुक्ताचीनी की है। मैं उनको और इस हाउस को यह बता देना चाहता हूँ कि बख्शी गुलाम मोहम्मद की लीडरशिप के बारे में और उनके एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के बारे में दूसरे हाउस में जो डिबेट हुई थी और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस पर जिन ख्यालात का इजहार फर्माया है, उसके मुकाबले में मैं इस क्रिटिसिज्म की बिल्कुल कोई वक्त नहीं समझना। काश्मीर में बख्शी गुलाम मोहम्मद का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन और उनकी लीडरशिप क्या इसलिये अच्छी नहीं कि उन्हीं के वक्त में काश्मीर के इलहाक का इंडिया के साथ फैसला असेम्बली में हुआ? मैं तो आप लोगों को यह बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि इनकी लीडरशिप में एजुकेशन, हेल्थ, कम्युनिकेशन, कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स और इंडस्ट्रीज सभी में बहुत अच्छी तरह से तरक्की हो रही है। इस वक्त मुल्क के इस हिस्से में

जितनी अच्छी तरक्की हुई है और जितने अच्छे ढंग पर वहां हुकूमत चल रही है, उसके बारे में किसी को कोई शक नहीं हो सकता है। मैं वहां का रहने वाला हूँ और मैंने शेख साहब का भी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन देखा है, लिहाजा मैं यह पूरे यकीन से कह सकता हूँ कि इस वक्त काश्मीर में बख्शी साहब की लीडरशिप में बहुत अच्छी तरह और तरक्की के साथ वहां का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चल रहा है।

अब मैं ज्यादा वक्त हाउस का नहीं लूंगा। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की जो मौजूदा फारिन पालिसी है और जिग फारिन पालिसी पर वह चल रही है, वह सुलहकुन फारिन पालिसी, यकजहती की फारिन पालिसी, एक दूसरे की मदद करने की फारिन पालिसी, एक दूसरे के मामलात में दखल न देने की फारिन पालिसी और एक दूसरे से झगड़ा न करने की फारिन पालिसी है और मैं उसकी दिल से ताईद करता हूँ।]

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, among the nations that recently emerged independent, India and the tiny bit of an island, Ceylon, alone maintain democracy. Indonesia has accepted controlled democracy. Our immediate neighbours like Burma and Pakistan and Middle East friends like Iraq and Sudan have gone under military dictatorships. We have no right to criticise them. Perhaps the people got the Government they deserved. Perhaps these countries had a long tradition of violence and intolerance or they had a hard crust of feudalism. The surface soil in these countries was either non-existent or too thin to receive and support the young plant of democracy. Mr. Deputy Chairman, weak and vacillating democracies, like debilitated men, attract disease germs and succumb to them. In these countries perhaps there was no urge from the people for democracy. They

only wanted national independence and nothing more than that. Perhaps they were feeling like the old patriots who revolted against the foreigners in the Sepoy Mutiny in India. They did not think in terms of personal freedom or democratic institutions. They dreamt of restoring Bahadur Shah to the full glory of the grand Moghul Emperors.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the sole content of the wave of the liberation movement that swept the Afro-Asian nations was only nationalism and not democracy but many who fought for national emancipation had their own profound admiration for democratic institutions. They were romantically attached to democracy and they imposed democracy on a people who wanted nothing but a King unto themselves who could unite the nation and make them stand up to any foreign Government. In the modern concept, a dictator has taken the place of a King. People who are not trained in the ways of democracy do not want to be worried with questions or to be harassed by the demand to exercise their thoughts or urged to come to conclusions. They want to be commanded and ordered about by a strong man. It is this that might have contributed to the springing of dictatorship in our neighbouring countries. I am afraid they are a potential danger to our infant democracy also. It is idle to think that we are safe and sound though the plague of dictatorship is raging in the houses that surround us. I am not prepared to think that we are so healthy that we need not worry at all but at the same time we shall not be scared nor can we run away from our houses. We have to inoculate the people against the pestilence. The words of our hon. Prime Minister that military dictatorship cannot solve the problem of the people has a great sobering effect on those who lightly talk of Ayub Khans, whether it be in condemnation or in adoration. Now the very fact that military dictatorships cannot solve the problems of the people makes the

present situation in Pakistan a menace to us. The dictator has to keep his people busy and the best way to do so is to make them engaged over or rather to make them excited over Kashmir and keep the canal waters always troubled. Mr. Deputy Chairman, this man, who so unceremoniously pushed away President Iskander Mirza, seems to be as crude as the old Bacha Saheb of Afghanistan. As you remember, this Bacha Saheb was an ordinary soldier who led a revolt and became a King for three days in Afghanistan and finding the lavatory of the Afghan Ruler so fine and smooth and shiny, paved with marbles, it is said that he decided to sleep there. He could not imagine that to be a lavatory. Now a mad man is at our fence and we have to take the necessary precautions. Should not our friends in the Commonwealth club do something to keep this man away from mischief? I am one who wants to make as many concessions to Pakistan as possible, consistent with the integrity of our State and the security of our borders. Prosperous and contented neighbours on our frontiers are the best defence that we can think of. I wish my assessment of General Ayub Khan is wrong and he turns out to be a sane man who does not want to gamble with the lives of the people of Pakistan.

Then if the United Nations is nibbling at Kashmir, China and U.S.S.R. seem to do the same thing on the Assam side also, of course only on maps at present. I am not surprised that the thunderous voice of our friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, on the opposite side, did not reverberate in this House about the trespasses committed on the maps of India. Perhaps the Assam 'aspect' of the question may be 'Moksha' or deliverance to him. I have no doubt that the minds of the so-called custodians of world peace and order as well as that of our 'Bhai-Bhais' are not functioning as they ought to be. Thought, word and action are the three stages of fulfilment and we have to take

[Shrimati K Bharathi]

note of these maps as an indication of their thoughts. We think that South Africa is wicked and uncivilized because of her colour policy and racial discrimination. That little community of Afrikaners who have trespassed into the 'African homeland' and planted themselves on the soil, are packing the magazines with black gun powder, which will blow off the tiny colony of whites, at any moment. I am one who feels that anybody has a right to go and settle down in any part of the world. Certainly the whites too have that right but they have no right to push the people off their lands and to pack them in ghettos. To the present discomfort of the natives and the ultimate ruin of the whites, they do pursue this policy. They push Asians also into ghettos. I wish the increasing pressure of world opinion and the awareness of the development of the African personality will yield better results.

Mr Deputy Chairman, I can understand a race-mad Afrikaner adopting this barbarous and uncivilized policy in Africa. But the attitude of Ceylon to men of Indian origin is disquieting. As a matter of fact are not the Ceylonese men of Indian origin? Why Sir, some of us in the West coast of India are considered to be people of Ceylonese origin. If we are to uproot people from their homes and moorings, and send them adrift either as "stateless people" or "aliens", it is a very dangerous and explosive situation. A man belongs to the land where he is born and bred, and where he wants to die. If a man is brought to a place and has been there and wishes to be there, he too must be considered as a citizen of that State. Apart from a human approach, if we import narrow considerations or questions, racial or national, I think the human race itself is heading to a disaster. Sir, I am more pained at this squeezing out and orphaning attitude of Ceylon than at the crudi-

ties and cruelties of South Africa. Our feeling towards Ceylon is and has always been that of an elder brother to a dear younger one, whom we like and love to see prosperous and glorious and independent Ceylonese who are really Indians who had settled there a few centuries earlier than the present group described as "Indian settlers" must accept the latter as Ceylonese. I am sure Sir, Ceylonese "patriotism" will not make them cast away Buddhism which originated in India why then conduct this archaeological investigation to mark out a certain sections that are there as "Indians" and then uproot them? Sir, if this process is not stopped, some madcap may demand the uprooting of certain people of the South who, mythology says, are of Ceylonese extraction. Then I may also be squeezed out, though that may sound fantastic nonsense.

Sir, I support the policy of the Government. Thank you.

SHRI P C BHANJ DEO (Orissa)

Mr Deputy Chairman, it was with great interest and admiration that I listened to the able and enlightening speech of the Prime Minister on the motion before the House. The policy that India has been following in this direction under his leadership cannot but be approved, in my opinion, by all the right-thinking citizens in this country, and as such, regarding the broad items of policy revealed by the Prime Minister on the floor of this House, I am in full agreement and I fully endorse the opinions that he has expressed in this House. I am aware, Sir, of the great work that our External Affairs Ministry and its head **have been able to do within the last few years of our independence**, in spite of tremendous odds. I am aware, how we were weak nation, which had lost practically everything during the years of its enslavement and when

independence came to us through the sacrifices and efforts of the nation as a whole under able leadership, we were found to be quite an empty vessel

In that condition, it is undoubtedly true that the helm of affairs had to be directed with the greatest caution. It is my opinion that what India has achieved under able leadership within the last few years is an achievement to be proud of by every nationalistically-minded citizen and so, Sir, it is with this background that I intend to make whatever comments I have to make on this matter

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P N SAPRU) in the Chair]

It is not that I under-value the achievements of the External Affairs Ministry but that in my opinion, the House is entitled to much information, much interesting information from that quarter which will help us to mould our own ideas and give our support as much as possible to the good cause which the Ministry is trying its best no doubt to further under very difficult circumstances. With this view, Sir, I wish to first draw the attention of the House to the fact that on repeated occasions the assurance from the mouth of the highest person in this Republic that has come to us in the shape of repeated emphasis is that while we shall never think of encroaching on the territories of others, we shall not tolerate encroachment by others on our own territory. It has been my duty all along and my pre-occupation in this House to keep the Government and the Members of the Rajya Sabha alert to the principles of this assurance. Today it is troubling us to think as to how far we have succeeded in observing this tenet in the strict interests of this country and its people. India has always throughout the ages been opposed to conquests as well as to aggression. It is not our intention nor is it in the Indian Constitution

that is, make-up. The Prime Minister has echoed all our sentiments quite rightly today by saying that India is always after peace and always will be after peace. She derives inspiration from that sentiment which is respected today throughout the world. At the same time, Sir, we who are votaries of peace, live as it were in a jungle consisting of citizens who are far from peaceful, how are we then to orientate our thoughts, our policies and our actions so that the principle enunciated by us originally—that while we shall commit no aggression on the territories of others, we shall not permit others to commit aggression on our own territory—may be followed and how best are we going to serve those tenets is a point on which I shall be glad if the Government can illustrate to us clearly and in concrete terms, since the achievement of independence, there is aggression in Goa. In Goa, which we have repeatedly declared to be Indian, we believe it to be Indian, there is immense suffering and immense sacrifice has taken place quite in vain, quite futilely. The situation remains quite unchanged, we are unable to do anything about it and all that we can say is, "Oh, what is to be done in a case like that?" We have either to think of going to war straightaway or bear everything smilingly as best as we can."

SHRI N M LINGAM (Madras). What is the hon Member's suggestion about Goa?

SHRI P C BHANJ DEO. Why should I suggest anything? That is up to the Government.

SHRI N M LINGAM. The hon Member is part of the Government.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA. Part of the Legislature.

SHRI P C BHANJ DEO. I want light from the Government regarding

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo.]

these problems. If we had the policy in our hands to mould, we would not hesitate to tell the House what that policy should be and how we intend to keep our prestige intact but as we are not in that coveted or uncoveted position, as you may call it; hence it is up to those who are in that position to explain to us how that problem should be faced, in keeping with the principles enunciated in this House by themselves.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): The hon. Member can place his suggestions before the House.

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI (Bombay): Why can't the hon. Member place before the nation the solution for solving this problem in Goa if he thinks that he has any solution?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I say this, Sir? The Goa Liberation Committee started a movement to liberate Goa. That was a suggestion which could have been considered but that was banned.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Then, Sir, there is Kashmir. There is naked aggression there as everyone knows and I need not emphasise that point too much here but today I was very glad to hear from the lips of the Prime Minister himself a positive statement on this matter that if further aggression is committed on the territory of Kashmir, it will be considered by the Government as an act of war on the whole of the Indian Republic. That is the right attitude to take and it should have been taken long ago.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Oh, but it was taken long ago.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: But it was not declared in this way.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: It was declared.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: It was positively declared.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I draw your attention to the fact that the Foreign Affairs debate is going on but neither the Foreign Minister nor the Deputy Foreign Minister nor even any Minister is present in the House?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Rajagopalan is here.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh): And he is taking notes.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Very beautifully taking notes.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: It would have been graceful if some Cabinet Minister had been present here. It is for you, Sir, to protect the dignity of this House. That is what we are saying.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I quite appreciate that point of view. I think that courtesy requires that a Minister should be here during the debate.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Then, Sir, there has been encroachment by Pakistan on the borders of this Republic which has been openly acknowledged by everyone to amount to aggression; under such circumstances, it is my request to the Prime Minister to throw more light on this matter as to the concrete steps which are being taken by our Republic in order to counteract this aggression in consonance with the policy declared by the President in his speeches at the openings of Parliament repeatedly every year. It is, as I have made it

clear, Sir, not in a spirit of criticism that I make these utterances but in all deference and with all approval to the trend of our foreign policy which has been so ably placed before the House by the hon. Prime Minister today.

The other point that I am at a loss to understand is regarding our linking up with the British Empire or the British Commonwealth. It is no longer the British Commonwealth but it is the Commonwealth as it is fashionably called. I cannot see, under the present circumstances, the logic behind this act on the part of the Government because of recent events which are a contradiction to the very principles and policies we are wedded to uphold and see translated into action in our lives in this Republic. As is quite patent, Britain in our very face has patted Pakistan on the back over the *coup* which has taken place there. I, for one, cannot reconcile the idea of a Commonwealth based on the rule of law and parliamentary democracy with approval of the type of Government that has come about in Pakistan today. Other problems are also patent to everyone; they glare at us in the face. There is South Africa where colour bar is rampant; our own countrymen are persecuted. The great leader of this country, the father of this nation, started his independence movement with the blows and insults aimed at him by the people of that land. I, for one, cannot understand why we, who are wedded to the ideals of equality of all classes, creeds and colours, should be in an organisation that harbours a Government like the South African Government wedded to the principles of *apartheid*, hate of nations and hate of coloured people. So, Sir, on this too, I would like some light from the Government. I would like to know what the justification is for our being so much in love with the British Empire or, perhaps, the British Commonwealth or rather the Commonwealth. Why should we be willing to compromise our basic principles in order to

remain in league with an organisation, which has no ideals in actual practice today in common with us. I also fail to see why at all the various Commonwealth Conferences like the Prime Ministers' Conference, etc., etc., have their venues always in London. Now, if the Commonwealth is not a reflection of the old British Empire, I do not see why its centre should lie in England only. The Government, especially the Prime Minister, in my opinion, should bring to bear the force of his personality to influence thoughts in such a way that the various conferences, various meetings of the Commonwealth—if it is really a Commonwealth without any bias—are held in the various capitals of the Commonwealth, so that the various Prime Ministers and the various items that they discuss, can come into direct contact with the people of the Commonwealth everywhere. To that end, I would like to know also from the Prime Minister as to how the sovereignty of our President stands in comparison with the sovereignty of Queen Elizabeth as the Head of the Commonwealth. That is a sore point with me, Sir, because I am proud of this Republic. I would like to guard with my lifeblood the prestige and the sovereignty of the President of this Republic. Hence as a matter of information I would like to know this legal point as to how far our sovereignty, the sovereignty of our President as the head of an independent State . . .

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): The President is not sovereign.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sovereignty, he said.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: I did not say that. The sovereignty of the people lies in the President. How is this compatible with our being a member of the British Commonwealth or rather the Commonwealth? If I am satisfied on that matter, I have nothing very much to say.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: You do not intend to be satisfied. It has been repeated so many times and replied to so many times in the House.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: And then why do you stick on to it?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: But the debate has been repeated so many times on the floor of this House. Why is the Member so anxious to say that it should not be repeated again? Mr. Bisht has no answer to that.

Sir, the very powers which have subscribed to the principles of 'Panchsheel' seem today to be flouting those very principles in actual implementation. It is quite plain today that the People's Republic of China, which was one of the first signatories to this salutary principle of live and let live, is showing certain admitted tracts of Indian territory to be within the control of China. The principle of the respect for sovereignty and the upkeep of the territorial integrity of our neighbours lies at the basis of this principle of 'Panchsheel'. If this has been flouted in this way by the Chinese Republic and other members who have subscribed to those principles, I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister, what we are doing in order to safeguard the principles which we are pledged to defend and which, I believe along with the Prime Minister, are for the good of India and for the benefit of India's greatness in the future.

These are a few observations that I make in all humility and not in a spirit of criticism, to the Prime Minister for whom, as I have said already, I have the greatest admiration and for whose policy I also cherish great hope and great faith regarding the future greatness of our country. It is not in any spirit of criticism of that policy that I make these utterances, but in order to find out and get further clear information on these various matters, so that we

ourselves can form our views clearly and further enthusiastically support and help to implement that policy, so that India can actually achieve the status, to which she is destined and to which our Prime Minister is leading her, in the near future.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज (मुम्बई) :

उप-भाष्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे भारत की विदेश नीति के संबंध में इस प्रस्ताव पर बोलने का जो मौका दिया है, उसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। आज़ादी के बाद हमारे देश की अंतर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न पर कहने का जो मौका मिलता है, उसका हम शान्ति तथा दुनिया की प्रगति के कामों के लिए ही उपयोग कर रहे हैं और पिछले आठ साल में जो हमारी विदेश नीति रही है वही अभी भी है, हम उसमें थोड़े भी इधर-उधर नहीं हटे। हमारी विदेश नीति एक अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण बात बन चुकी है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की जो नीति है, वह शान्ति की नीति है और इस समय दुनिया में युद्ध की वजह से जो घबराहट फैल रही है, उसमें शांति पैदा करने वाली नीति है। इसीलिये हमने एक साल के अन्दर इस सभासभ में चार बार इस प्रश्न के ऊपर विचार विनिमय किया। आज भी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने तथा अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने जो कुछ कहा है, उसमें मैं कुछ बातें नई कहूँ अथवा कोई भी कहे, ऐसा नहीं है। बातें वही हैं। हमारी विदेश नीति पुरानी ही है, परन्तु परिस्थिति में कुछ बदलाव हो गया है। पुरानी बातें नये ढंग से कहनी पड़ती हैं। आज भारत अनेक राष्ट्रों की सैनिक सरकारों के मुकाबले में खड़ा है। आज डेमोक्रेसी के मूल्य पर पुनः विचार करना ज़रूरी हो गया है। ब्रह्म देश, थाईलैंड, पूर्व एशिया, इंडोनेशिया तथा पाकिस्तान इन देशों में एक क्रांति हुई है। एशिया के बहुत से देशों ने

अभी-अभी आजादी प्राप्त की है, लेकिन वहां लोकशाही शासन संस्था हर न सकी । भारत के लिए यह बड़े खेद की बात है । उसमें भी ज्यादा पाकिस्तान के बारे में है, क्योंकि ७ अक्टूबर के पहले से ही हमारे गिने तथा संबंध उस देश से ठीक नहीं थे । मौनिक सरकार के बाद तो वह और भी खराब हो गये हैं । हमारी सीमा और सरहद आक्रमणों से व्यथित हो रही है । इसके लिए हमें डिफेंस पर ज्यादा खर्चा करना पड़ता है । इसी तरह के और भी दूसरे प्रश्न हैं । इसलिए मैं कहूंगा कि पंचशील की प्रगति तथा नीति अधिक उत्साह से स्वीकृत हो जानी चाहिए, क्योंकि कोई भी राष्ट्र हो, हम उस के साथ अपने मंत्रियों का पालन पंचशील के सिद्धांतों पर करते हैं । मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से विनती करूंगा कि वे जितना हो सकता है, अधिक राष्ट्रों के साथ पंचशील पैक्ट करें और उसकी शुरुआत अमेरिका में करें ; क्योंकि पाकिस्तान को जो शस्त्रास्त्रों की मदद हो रही है, उससे वह सरकार भारत को तकलीफें दे रही है । यदि अमेरिका दिल में भारत की भलाई सोचता है, यदि अमेरिका का भारत और पाकिस्तान के काश्मीर के झगड़े में बैस्टेड इंटेरेस्ट नहीं है, तो वह भारत से पंचशील पैक्ट करें और हमारे मन में जो शक का निर्माण हो रहा है, उसको हटा दे । यह है मदद की बात ।

3 P.M.

दूसरी पाकिस्तान की बात यह है कि जो पिछले डिबेट में कहा गया था कि भारत पाकिस्तान में एक मित्रता का डेलीगेशन भेजे, वह अमल में लाया जाय । पालियामेंट के सदस्यों का एक डेलीगेशन पाकिस्तान की जनता को बता दे कि हमारी उनके प्रति कोई भी बुरी इच्छा नहीं है । हम उनके मित्र हैं और उनमें मित्रता की अपेक्षा कर रहे हैं ।

तीसरी बात यह है कि दोनों देशों के डिफेंस मिनिस्टर इकट्ठे मिल कर, दोनों देशों का प्रतिरक्षा पर होने वाला खर्चा कम कैसे हो जाय, इस बात पर विचार करें । पंडित जी १७ तारीख को विनोबा जी से मिलने जा रहे हैं । मेरी आशा है कि वे उनमें इस बात पर विचार करेंगे ।

भारत ने पुराने जमाने में और अभी भी दुनिया को प्रकाश दिखाया है और मैं यकीन करता हूं कि मौनिक सरकारों को भी भारत पुनश्च लोकशाही मार्ग बतायेगा । यह एक कायमी वस्तु नहीं है । जब मौनिक सरकारें लोकशाही पद्धति के अनुसार चुनाव कराएंगी, तब यह पता मिल जायेगा कि लोग शांति में, मित्रता में और भले ढंग से स्वयं शासित बनने की कोशिश करते हैं । हम भारत के लोग शांतिवादी हैं । हमको गौतम बुद्ध और महात्मा गांधी ने जो रास्ता बताया है वही सही है । अभी मैं थाईलैंड की एक जागतिक बौद्ध कांफ्रेंस में गया था । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी बुद्ध देव का पंचशील का आदर्श अपने आगे रख कर राष्ट्रीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं का सामना कर रहे हैं । पंचशील मनुष्य, समाज और राष्ट्र की शांति और सुख का एकमात्र पथप्रदर्शक है । यह मनुष्य जाति की अत्याचार और संकटों से बचाने वाला है । यह हमें सहयोग, शांति और सहवास का मदेश देता है । जब मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह मदेश थाईलैंड की बौद्ध कांफ्रेंस में बताया, तो वहां लोगों को बहुत सतोष हुआ । तो उम्मी आधारे में हम पीडित देशों को प्रकाश देंगे । इसलिए मौनिक सरकारों से हमको डरने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । पाकिस्तान में जनरल अयूब खा कितनी भी गर्जना करें, लेकिन वह गर्जना लोकशाही की गर्जना नहीं है, वह डिक्टेटर-

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

शिप की गर्जना है। हमारे पास शक्ति है, लेकिन हम प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नेहरू जी के नेतृत्व में पंचशील के आधार पर काम करना चाहते हैं, इसीलिए हम पाकिस्तान के लोगों को ऐसी धमकियाँ देना नहीं चाहते हैं। हम उनके साथ प्रेम से रहना चाहते हैं। पाकिस्तान एक छोटा देश है और वहाँ मिलिटरी राज्य है। वह हमारे देश की विदेश नीति के खिलाफ काम करता है। यह बहुत खराब और खतरनाक चीज है और इसका जवाब आज नहीं तो कल उसको मिलेगा। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को दुनिया की स्पोर्ट्स और दुनिया की सहायता प्राप्त है। यह हमारे देश का सौभाग्य है कि हमें ऐसा नेता मिला है, जो सब जगह शांति फैलाना चाहता है। जो अन्य देश युद्ध करना चाहते हैं, हमारी पालिसी के खिलाफ जो कुछ विदेशी लोग प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, उनको आज नहीं तो कल शांति से हम जवाब देंगे, इतनी मुझे उम्मीद है।

इसके साथ-साथ जब तक हम आपस के भेद और भय नष्ट करके इकट्ठे हो कर सरकार के हाथ नहीं मजबूत करने तक हमारा भविष्य खतरे में है। इसलिए मैं इस विदेश नीति की प्रशंसा करता हूँ और पंचशील को इस सारी नीति का पहिया मानता हूँ। पाकिस्तान के मैनिक राज्य की पुनरावृत्ति भारत में होना असंभव है, फिर भी हमको जागरूक रहना चाहिये। इसलिए देश में लोगों को जो कुछ प्रश्नों पर अमनोष हो रहा है, उसको नष्ट करना चाहिये और उसके बारे में एक निश्चित स्वरूप का दृष्टिकोण रखना चाहिये। हमारे मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस देश में जो छोटे छोटे सवाल हैं, जैसे काश्मीर का प्रश्न है, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के निर्माण का प्रश्न है, मैसूर और बम्बई की सीमा का प्रश्न

है, गोआ का प्रश्न है, अनाज का प्रश्न है, उनको जल्दी से जल्दी मिटाने के लिए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कोशिश करेंगे। जो हमको तकलीफ है, जो हमको दुख है, उसके बारे में निश्चित दृष्टिकोण रखना चाहिए, वह सब हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर के दृष्टिकोण में है, लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हमारी तकलीफों को जल्दी से जल्दी दूर किया जाय।

अन्त में जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पंचशील की पालिसी है, उसका समर्थन करके मैं अपना भाषण खत्म करता हूँ।

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the Prime Minister in conveying my respectful good wishes to the President on tour. But, Sir, I would like to bring to your notice rather a disturbing news that has appeared in today's Press. I find, Sir, that the Government of India has done a great wrong in advising the President to address a closed session of all Indonesian Army Commanders at Bandung. The report goes on to say that the venue of the conference was changed from Djakarta to Bandung in order to enable Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who is touring the country, to deliver his warning to these Army Commanders. Sir, I do not think it is right for our Head of State to interfere and meddle with the internal affairs of any other country. I could concede, Sir, the Prime Minister associating himself with such conferences . . .

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I say a few words? I know nothing about this matter, I do not know what has appeared in the Press. Government certainly has not advised the President to do this, and I am reluctant to believe that the President is going to do this.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: It is very correct that the hon. Prime

Minister has clarified the position. But my information is based on today's paper "Hindustan times." This is what has appeared at page 6.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): What appears in the papers is not always correct.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Well, Sir, we are supposed to know only from the Press and from nowhere else. I can pass it on to the Prime Minister who can satisfy himself about what has appeared in the Press, and I am glad that he has not advised the President to do so. But this is what the report says that he has addressed such a conference of military personnel.

Sir, it is very correct that the Prime Minister has drawn our attention to the emergence . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Sir, may I interrupt? According to the report that he has given me, the warning was given by Dr. Soekarno.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: You please read the whole report. I cannot waste the time of the House by reading it. You can read it and see.

Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the holding of the All African People's Conference at Accra, which is of great significance. Sir, this Conference marks the beginning of an epoch. As I feel, this has laid the seeds of a Pan-African Commonwealth of free and independent States of Africa.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

We rejoice that the African people have met in this Conference, have deliberated and have chalked out a programme for ridding Africa of foreign domination. It has been reported that in this Conference, there was a debate on the efficacy of the non-violent methods and movements to achieve the political independence of a country. The discussions as re-

ported are reminiscent of our own discussions in this country on the utility and effectiveness of non-violent struggle to achieve our own independence. But it is stated that the Conference demonstrated a lack of understanding of Satyagraha and even amongst some African leaders who have used it as a kind of civil disobedience, non-violence here has frequently been equated with inaction and non-resistance. Sir, we all know that Satyagraha is just the opposite of it. Satyagraha is a weapon wielded by the strong and not by the weak. We have had some experience about this. Now, I feel that Africa would do well to enlarge this concept of non-violent struggle as a means of achieving political independence.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: We should have sent a team of experts from here.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir, I was rather amazed that the Prime Minister spoke rather differently about this Conference—about this African People's Conference.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I said a lot in praise of it. I am sorry my words have not been understood.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir, I appreciate that the Prime Minister is full of praise for this Conference and his sympathies are with the African people. I appreciate that. But he has stated also in the other House that India is not very vitally concerned with it. I think India is vitally concerned with the happiness of the African people.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is a pure African Conference to which India has not been invited and therefore, India cannot push itself in. No country has been invited except African countries.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I agree that India has not

[SHRI Rajendra Pratap Sinha] been invited But was it not possible to send some of our observers there?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU It is neither possible nor desirable We do not push in ourselves where we are not wanted No country has sent them

AN HON MEMBER It is a People's Conference

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA I know.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU We have got our representatives in Accra to report to us We have got our Mission in Accra

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA I am sure the Prime Minister must have kept himself informed of the Conference But as far as my information goes, there were some observers from other countries to this Conference This is what at least the Press reports say.

Sir, the whole difficulty is this that in India, we get always second-hand news We have not got our independent news agencies through which we could get more objective news about other countries The Prime Minister is, of course, in a better position because he is getting news directly from our own Missions abroad But will it not be in the fitness of things that the Prime Minister shares at least with Members of Parliament all these objective news and information that he receives? We get all kinds of reports and intelligence from every Ministry barring the Ministry of External Affairs We get all this news from foreign commentators or news agencies whose vision is coloured We do not get objective news, which places us rather in a difficult situation to have a correct appraisal of the happenings in the world

I am very happy that India has played its part in helping the Algerians to achieve their independence

And I am happy also to note the way in which the Prime Minister spoke today about the Algerian question But I fail to understand, in view of our sympathies for the Algerians and their cause to achieve independence, why the Government of India has not recognised the Provisional Government of Algeria Sir, I am told that since 1956, the Algerian Army of Liberation has been holding two-thirds of the territory of Algeria and controlling it I am also told that the Provisional Government has approached the Government of India for recognition It is a known fact that many sovereign States in the World have recognised the Algerian Government I think the Government of India will help the cause of the Algerians to regain power and to eradicate the entire influence of France from Algeria if this Provisional Government is recognised

Sir I would like to congratulate the United Nations on the decision that they have taken to hold a special Assembly of the United Nations in February, 1959, to consider the African question and I am looking forward that many countries in Africa will gain independence as a result of the deliberations of the 13th Session of the United Nations.

Sir, I would like to ask the Prime Minister what progress has been made about the implementation of the resolutions of the Bandung Conference I feel that the Government of India should develop an Afro-Asian mentality And it is important that the Afro-Asian group of nations should co-operate together in the economic field There is much that could be achieved by such a co-operation for mutual benefit, and to raise the standard of living of the people in this area Sir, we could evolve some pattern of co-operation like the Colombo Plan Then, Sir, we should also investigate the possibility of creating a common market for this Afro-Asian region Sir, we know that there are certain other trading arran-

gements like the one I am proposing, in the Commonwealth trading area, in the continent of the two Americas, in the U.S.S.R. and eastern Europe and now, the prospects for a common European market are being explored. I wish that some such market for this region were investigated into. I am glad, Sir, that a beginning has been made at the trade and commercial level by holding an Afro-Asian economic conference at Cairo. Sir, an extension of this at the Government level, in my opinion, may result in good.

Sir, now coming nearer home, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the border disputes on the borders of East Pakistan with those of West Bengal and Assam areas. Sir, the Prime Minister himself has referred to this question this morning and has also referred to the speeches and other utterances of the President of Pakistan in this connection. Sir, the President of Pakistan regards these border disputes as pinpricks, which will not serve any purpose and he goes on to say, Sir, there are certain limits to such incidents and 'we' shall see that they do not go beyond these limits.

Sir, I feel that these border disputes are being kept up with a set purpose, to divert public opinion of Pakistan to these external events. Sir, now that the ordinary checks and balances of a parliamentary Government functioning in Pakistan are removed and everything now depends upon the mood of one man, it is dangerous to adopt a complacent attitude towards these incidents—there may be a flare-up at any moment . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Of which India is not afraid.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Quite right; India may not be afraid but what I feel, because of this imminent danger, on the other side of the border, is that the Indian army should be kept in a state of alert-

ness so that there is no surprise attack on India anywhere.

Sir, referring to the border disputes I would like to point out that my esteemed friend, Mr. Bose, who comes from these border areas put a question to the Government some time ago—before the Nehru-Noon Agreement—regarding the position of Tokergram, and Government replied that Tokergram was part of Indian territory and there was no dispute about it. He put another question after conclusion of this Nehru-Noon Agreement, and he was told that this area of Tokergram was a disputed territory.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): This was clarified later on in a statement.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Well, I would like the Deputy Minister to correct whatever statement . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The statement was corrected and placed on the Table of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has already been corrected. This is what she has been saying. It was corrected and placed on the Table.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Whatever it be, the point remains that the border disputes should be sternly dealt with. It is the responsibility of any Government to protect its nationals whether outside the border or inside the border from aggression from abroad. That is the primary and preliminary duty of any Government, and when aggression is rampant against our nationals on the border areas, Government cannot adopt a complacent attitude and an attitude of helplessness. Sir, I would like that this approach of helplessness of the Government of India should come to an end as early as possible and full protection must be given to all our nationals living on the borders. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P N SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, I should like to say that the broad lines of our foreign policy have the support of the entire country. It is a policy which, as the Prime Minister said the other day in a memorable address to the Convocation of the Delhi University, both our traditions as a peace-loving country and our enlightened self interest dictate

We have no history of animosity or controversy with either of the two great giants and it is common sense that it is in our interest and for that matter of the world, to be friendly with both these powers. We have to traverse centuries in years. We have to make up for lost time. Our people are hungry, ill-fed, badly clothed, badly housed. They need food, shelter and employment. We want a sane world, and that is why we are insistent on peace. We were ourselves at one time the victims of a colonial power. Our sympathy naturally goes out to the poor and the oppressed in all lands. We are in favour of an enlargement of freedom everywhere. It is heartening to find therefore that the UN Resolution on Algeria though defeated, was defeated only by one vote, it failed to secure a two-thirds majority by only one vote. The voting shows that France's policy is not supported by a majority of the United Nations. General De Gaulle's task, hard as it was when he came to power, has been made more difficult by the rightist victory in France. The way he deals with the Algerian problem will be a test of his greatness as the leader of the French people. I do hope he will have the wisdom and the strength to deal with that problem in the right way. That right way is the recognition of Algerian personality, that right way is the recognition of the right of the Algerian people to determine their destiny. The fact that there is a French minority in Algeria cannot be adduced for denying the Algerian people the right

of self-determination. This Algerian war has been a horrible affair. France is a great nation. She made great sacrifices for human freedom at one time of history. She has shown vision in her attitude towards Guinea. I hope that wisdom will dawn upon Gen De Gaulle and he will have the strength and the courage to do the right thing by the Algerian people.

Mr Deputy Chairman, we have watched with great concern certain recent developments on the South Asian frontier. We have had Thailand, Iran, Pakistan, Iraq and also Burma in a way going the military way. Now, Sir, in Iraq, the revolution had some ideological background. The military leaders there were able to get rid of a bad regime. We are not very much interested in the other countries, but we have some interest in what happens in Pakistan, because it is our immediate neighbour. And I do not accept the view that this military coup in Pakistan was due to the failure of democracy in that country. In fact, democracy had never had any chance in that country. During her independence period of 11 or 12 years there had been no general election at all. And only when the election day was coming near, President Mirza discovered that there was nepotism, corruption, blackmarketing and profiteering. The election was to be held in April, and only a few months before that, it was decided that Pakistan should have a military revolution. Of course it is for Pakistan to determine any Constitution that it likes for itself. We have no desire to interfere with its right to do so. But I think some legitimate inference can be drawn from the way this revolution has taken place. President Mirza and President Ayub Khan, who has now replaced President Mirza, were afraid of facing the Pakistani people at a general election. Maulana Bhasani and Mr Syed were described as very dangerous men by President Mirza and President Ayub Khan because they felt that possibly the

people of Pakistan or of certain parts in Pakistan were behind them. Well, it is a strange commentary on the character of the Commonwealth that we have today a military State as one of the members of the Commonwealth. The dictatorship in Pakistan is not a party dictatorship. It is worse than the dictatorship of Mussolini and Hitler. Mussolini and Hitler came into power by other methods and they had at least some organised parties behind them. Gen. Ayub Khan has no organised political party behind him, and yet it is strange that some papers describe this military *coup* in Pakistan as a *coup* which holds out a new hope for Pakistan. I read an article, the other day, by Prof. Rushbrook Williams. It was something like 'Fresh Start in Pakistan'. It was really a nauseating article. And what is that hope? The hope that this revolution holds out is the hope of suppressing liberties of trade unions, of all political parties, of free speech and of free association. Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are having these border raids. I suppose they represent a symptom. They are symptomatic of certain trends in the political life of Pakistan. We have no ill-will against the people of Pakistan. We want the people of Pakistan to be a progressive people. We do not want to impose our own ideology upon Pakistan. But I think we have a certain duty towards the people of Pakistan, or for that matter, of other countries which have dictatorships. And I think our Ministry of Information and Broadcasting should play, in this matter, a positive role. Our All India Radio should, from time to time, correct the impression which the Pakistan Radio creates about our country in that country. It should speak to them frankly about the way in which we look at their affairs, and it should talk to them in a friendly way about their problems and about our problems.

Passing on, Mr. Deputy Chairman, from Pakistan, I would like to say one or two words about Kashmir. I

have never had any doubts about the righteousness of our stand in regard to Kashmir. But I must say that I have some real concern for civil liberties, and I think the people of Kashmir are as much entitled to civil liberties as we in other parts of the country are. Now, Sir, I do not say that the people of Kashmir are not enjoying civil liberties. That is not my point at all. But we must at least see that justice has not only been done, but it must also appear to have been done. Therefore, Sir, I would say that some gentle persuasion is needed on our part to make the Kashmir Government realise the importance of accepting the jurisdiction of our Election Commission and the full jurisdiction of our Supreme Court in regard to Kashmir matters. I think that in accepting the jurisdiction of our Election Commission and full jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the people of Kashmir will not be in any way, limiting their autonomy.

I would like, before I conclude, to say one word about the European free market and GATT and the recent GATT conference. Between foreign policy and economic policy there is an intimate connection. We don't want a shrinkage of our export markets. The underdeveloped countries of the world may find themselves exploited by this European free market community and it will be a problem for us to maintain our exports at the proper ratio. I therefore hope that in future when we discuss these questions of foreign policy, some attention will be paid to certain trends in international trade. I don't see why we should be completely dependent upon one bloc or the other for our ordinary requirements. We have the whole world to make our purchases from and it is not necessary for us to integrate our defence with one bloc or the other. I don't think that we are doing that but we should be careful in this matter. Our policy should be such as to make it clear that we are not in any manner tied to one bloc or the other. As long as the Prime

[Shri P. N. Sapru]

Minister is there, we may be certain that this principle will be borne in mind. It is not the Prime Minister but it is certain trends in the country which makes one a little worried. Thank you.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, a great deal has happened in the world since foreign affairs was last discussed in this House. In several countries military rule has been established and at least in three of them democracy has had to give way to military dictatorship. The countries that I am referring to are Pakistan, Burma, Sudan and Iraq. It is in the first three that dictatorship was substituted for democratic Governments. In Iraq itself although the Government was in form democratic, hardly any vestige of democracy existed there and the revolution in Iraq should be held therefore to have been anti-monarchical and anti-feudal. It was anti-monarchical because it was supposed that the Palace was the source of the power enjoyed by Nuri Said and that it was the centre of those intrigues that were carried on from time to time among the various parties. We are concerned more with Pakistan and Burma than with any other country. The remarks that General Ayub Khan made with regard to India the other day have been referred to by the Prime Minister and by some other speakers. I should like to refer only to one remark of his which I think deserves a reply. He accused India of trying to carry on an organised and centrally-controlled campaign against Pakistan. He asserted that it was trying to be made out that the present regime in Pakistan was a naked dictatorship and had therefore lost all rights to be a member of the Commonwealth and so on. It is quite true that the present rulers of Pakistan have said more than once that their rule would only be temporary and that it was their intention, as soon as a new constitution had been framed, to restore democracy. This might

have been said in all good faith but we have to consider this situation in the other countries where military dictatorship has been established and there is a common pattern of policy that has been followed in all these countries. The coups were everywhere almost bloodless and the man in the street seemed to be unaffected. Again in all these countries it was said that the change had been made in the former Government in order to stop corruption which was widespread in public life, and a proclamation was issued, outlining the policy and programme of the new Government.

Lastly, everywhere with the exception of Burma, political parties were dissolved and the constitution abrogated. We accept the argument of Pakistan. We must accept the arguments of all the other countries and believe that democracy would be restored in all of them very soon. But the situation is such that even those who are the dictators of these countries can hardly find it possible after what they have done to restore the old form of Government. In Egypt too it was said that parliamentary rule would be restored after a new constitution had been framed. Elections were held and parliamentary rule was restored in form but I don't think that we can call the Government of Egypt a democratic Government. If the same kind of thing happens in Pakistan and in other countries we cannot possibly regard the Governments as really democratic. Again General Ayub Khan, the new President of Pakistan, may suspect the motives of India but India has never tried so far to push her out of the Commonwealth. An opinion was expressed with regard to the character of the Commonwealth by Mr. Gaitskell in an article on the New Commonwealth in the "Socialist Commentary" of March 1958 which deserves to be read carefully by General Ayub Khan. Discussing the position of the Commonwealth and the reasons why the various countries

that were in the Commonwealth continued to work together, he said:

"In general one can hardly doubt the attachment in all Commonwealth countries to the practice of parliamentary democracy. This is not to say that there will just be one single pattern. It is for the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa to evolve their own forms of democracy. But if in any Commonwealth country there were to emerge a ruthless dictatorship, a police State based on terror or a monolithic single party, it is hard to see how this could be reconciled with genuine membership in the Commonwealth."

It is clear, Sir, from the opinions that have been expressed in England and elsewhere, with regard to the change in the form of government in Pakistan, that Pakistan will continue, for the present at least to be a member of the Commonwealth. But if military dictatorship continues there for any length of time, hardly anyone can doubt that a problem will be posed for the Commonwealth.

Just one word more, Sir, about Pakistan before I refer to Burma. It is reported that Gen. Ayub Khan told pressmen the other day that it was not for him to tell the people of India what form of government they should have and that they were intelligent enough to understand where their interests lay. Well, there are many things in India that have to be corrected, many things that give rise to anxiety. But there are, I think, two differences between India and Pakistan which Gen. Ayub Khan seems to have lost sight of. While in Pakistan political parties were hardly in touch with the masses, most of the parties in India, practically every party here which enjoys any esteem among the people is directly in touch with the masses and is trying to increase its contact with the common man so that it might be able to voice the needs and aspirations of the people and thus be

identified with them. Again, while in Pakistan there was hardly an economic policy worth the name, a policy whose object was to raise the standard of life of the people, in India serious efforts are being made to make the life of the common man easier by developing the economic resources of the country, and by providing him with all those opportunities that preserve one's self-respect and dignity, and as long as we continue to tread this path, whatever other dangers may beset us, I think it can hardly be said that we run the risk of having to follow in the footsteps of Pakistan.

Now, I should like to say a word about Burma, because that is just as near a neighbour of ours as Pakistan. The Prime Minister, I believe, said to pressmen soon after the transfer of power by U Nu of Burma to Gen. U Win, the Commander-in-Chief of the Burmese Army, that the transfer of power from civil to military hands was a voluntary one. In form it was so. But when we consider the fact that the transfer was made in order that the internal peace might be secure, and that free and fair elections might be held, it seems that the civil authority was compelled to abdicate by the circumstances, being unable to maintain law and order which is the primary duty of any government and had transferred power into military hands. It is true again that the Commander-in-Chief in Burma whom every political party in Burma or rather the two principal political parties in Burma and the masses in general have great faith in, has said repeatedly that he does not want to keep power long in his hands and that he means to hold elections within six months. But who can prophesy? Can even Gen. U Win prophesy at the present time that peace and order will be fully restored in Burma, say, by the end of March, 1959? Again, Sir, it is a significant fact that while U Nu when transferring power to Gen. U Win said that his task would be to hold free and fair elections, to secure internal peace, Gen. U Win in

[Shri H N Kunzru]

his pronouncements has always referred first to the establishment of internal security and mentioned the necessity for holding free and fair elections only after that. Moreover, Sir, I understand it is recognised in Burma by all political parties that the future of democracy there is bound up with the success or failure of Gen U Win. It seems to me, therefore, that the internal circumstances in Burma were such as to compel its civil rulers to come to the conclusion that it would be better for them and for the country that military rule should be established than that democratic government as it was known till the time of transfer should be continued. They may well have hoped that the transfer would prove to be only temporary. But in the present circumstances, hardly anyone can say how things will shape themselves and when free democratic parliamentary government would function again in Burma. We wish Burma well. We want parliamentary government to be restored there and we hope that Gen U Win will be fully successful. But we have to be vigilant and we should realise that what is happening in a neighbouring country may not, in the end, prove to be in our interest, that we cannot really separate ourselves from our neighbours, however efficient and honest our Government might be.

4 P.M.

Now, Sir, I should like to refer for a moment to those wider considerations on which the peace of the world depends. The Prime Minister has referred to the two conferences that are being held at Geneva for the temporary cessation of nuclear tests and the prevention of surprise attacks. We are glad to learn that agreement has been reached on three articles in the Conference concerned with the suspension of nuclear tests. The object of these conferences was to relieve tension and to remove the fear of war from the minds of men but at the very time when at least one

conference was at work and there was some hope that its work might be crowned with success, the Berlin question was raised. Now, if the object at least was, to prevent tension from growing, how is it that the Berlin question was raised at this very time? Four powers are concerned in its future. I can well understand the deep interest of Russia in the permanent settlement of the position of Berlin. West Berlin is inside Communist territory and again, its economic and political systems are in sharp contrast with the systems prevailing in the Communist controlled sector of Berlin. The contrast is so great that during the last few years, two million Germans have left East Berlin for West Berlin that is, the sectors controlled by the democratic powers and even now the drift westwards continues. Every week, I understand, about 4,000 people migrate from East to West Berlin.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA There would be nothing left there.

SHRI H N KUNZRU It has taken place; that means, a little over two million people have left East Berlin up to now. What is more serious, Sir, is that I understand that it is the skilled workers of all kinds and professional men who are leaving East Berlin. Now, such a position cannot but cause anxiety to Russia, but we have to settle it in such a way that the peace of the world may not be disturbed. Just as the question of nuclear warfare and disarmament can be settled only when the countries most concerned with these questions feel assured that any agreement would not alter the present balance of power, it must also be realised that hardly any change can be made in the status of Berlin unless the alteration is brought about in such a way as not to disturb the present equilibrium or the balance of power if one prefers to call it. I should, therefore, like to know, if Government has any information about it, as to what the causes are that have impelled the Russian Government to raise the Berlin question at this time when it should be

the desire of all of us to see that the conferences concerned with disarmament and the suspension of nuclear tests should achieve full success.

Sir, if you will allow me, I will just refer to one more question before I sit down and that is this. The only suitable solution in regard to Germany seems to be either unification of both the Germanys or at least a federation or confederation so that they might continue to work together. We cannot achieve stability in Germany and thus establish peace in Europe at least on a secure basis unless the German question is satisfactorily settled.

Now, the last question to which I want to refer is the question of Africa. We have had three conferences in Africa. A conference was held some months ago in Accra which was attended by the representatives of the Governments of the Free African States. The present conference is being attended, if I may say so, by the non-official representatives of the whole of Africa; the representatives of all political parties and trade unions have been invited. There was another conference, Sir, which either preceded or followed the first Accra conference which concerned the States of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco and questions relating to the formation of the federation of these three States, popularly known as the Maghreb, were discussed at this conference. The Algerian representatives were really the representatives of the National Liberation Front and although the federation had been in the air for some time, I think it was for the first time that an agreement was arrived at at this conference by the representatives of these three countries with regard to the desirability of establishing a federation as soon as Algeria became free. Now Sir, the most important fact about the recent developments in Africa is that in the first Accra conference it was shown that no political barriers divided the Negro Africa from Muslim Africa. It was generally thought that there

was a great deal of difference between Mediterranean Africa and Africa south of the Sahara but the first African conference had made it absolutely clear that instead of there being any political barriers between the North and the South, their interests were common in many respects and that in certain respects there was more agreement between certain Negro States and certain Arab States than between the Arab States themselves or between the Negro States themselves. I hope, Sir, that now that Ghana has assumed the leadership of the Negro people, when Nigeria becomes free, as it will in 1960, the position of the Negro States will become even stronger though there may be rivalry for leadership between Ghana and Nigeria. If the two countries work together for the common advantage of the African continent, I have no doubt that they will be able to exert a great deal of pressure on the colonial powers to do justice to the African people. If a federation is achieved—it is desirable in theory but it may not be so well practicable—the pressure on East Africa, Central and South Africa and even on French West Africa will be such that the colonial powers will hardly be able to resist it. I cannot speak with any confidence about what will happen in South Africa, but as regards the British Government one can say that it should take note of the feeling that is developing all over Africa and try to develop East Africa in such a way as to create contentment in the African community there. Again, it is its responsibility to see that the Central African Federation which has been established by it and which has given place to a great deal of power in the hands of the Europeans is not allowed to gain such an accession of power as to be able to treat its African population in the same way as South Africa does at the present time. What is happening today in Africa shows that Africa is the coming continent. And if the present day events are to be a warning to the imperialist powers, they ought to conduct the affairs of their colonies in Africa in such a way from

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]
now onwards that it may be in their own interest and in the interests of the whole continent that the people of Africa may gain freedom in such a way as to develop, as to be a source of benefit to their own people and to the whole world.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the last great war created many problems, some of them insoluble and some of them soluble. And one of the soluble problems was, to my mind, that the Asiatic countries won their independence. Out of evil cometh good. The war resulted in great havoc, a great deal of calamity and distress to the world, but Asia and the Asiatic countries became free. The problems of Asia itself have begun since then, after the achievement of freedom. We have been talking in the House of a relapse to military rule, of a retreat, going back from democracy. I consider this not a correct reading of the situation. There has been no retreat from democracy, because there was no democracy. There has been no democracy. In most of these States, there were feudal rules which obstructed any change, any advance. These have been replaced and for the good. In other States there was the situation of law and order and the State breaking up. Possibly that was the situation in Pakistan; possibly that was also the situation in Burma. They had to hold together and to hold together they had to bring in military rule. There has been no retreat, to my mind, of democracy there. But there is a great demand for economic development. There is an urge for rapid economic development. To my mind, if countries like Egypt, Iraq and Syria, resorted to military rule, it had the support of the people, because the people believe that only by such rule can there be rapid economic development. Here is a great warning to India.

I have heard of references to Kashmir, that in Kashmir also perhaps

there is a retreat of democracy. I believe that Kashmir may be having democracy a shade lighter, weaker than we have; and I do not think that our shade is very strong or deep either. But I do believe that Kashmir has made rapid economic development as very few States in India have made. I would go even so far as to say that Kashmir has a kind of economic democracy—and I use the words 'economic democracy' deliberately—which we have not achieved in India. I mean that in the villages they have panchayats. They have co-operative societies; they have schools, well integrated in such a way that, I think, no other State has got them in India. It is economic democracy of a kind of which at least I am proud. It is possible that it may make hereafter an advance to a democracy which may be a shade deeper than our own democracy. After all, do not forget it, the other day there was the Dogra Maharaja, followed by another Maharaja, Raja Abdullah, and now by Bakshi. It is, I think, good enough and we should be satisfied with the change and improvement . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:
There is economic democracy but there is no political democracy there.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I am saying that from economic democracy may arise political democracy. In some of these countries . . .

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Malkani, your time is limited. Please go on.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: No interruptions; and I am not very controversial either. Here comes, to my mind, the challenge to India. If in India our economic development is not fast enough, if the pace is slow—today the pace is slow—we would have the parallel of military rule, or if not military rule, bureaucratic rule. And I personally think the danger in India would be bureaucratic rule, not the

military rule, and the danger is there. It is not that Pakistan is a peril to us. Our economic development is a peril to us, if it is not fast enough.

But the real peril to democracy is not in India, it is not in Asia. It is in Europe. It is in Europe that democracy is on the retreat. There is a hasty retreat. It is in France that democracy is in debacle. It is in a morass. And France was the leader of enlightenment, of democracy. It taught us all about democracy and today France almost is fascist, is almost imperialist, and France is not only a problem for us, but problem for Europe and problem for the world for the matter of that. It is France that has retreated from democracy. May I say, in all humility, that it is also America? I remember how America's reputation was at its peak in 1945 when we were fighting for our own independence. The Americans who were in India used to be very friendly, very nice to us, very good to us, very helpful to us. They wanted everybody to be free. To all colonial people America was at that time a great defender, a great protector, holding aloft the torch of democracy. And what is happening to America? Where is America now after the lapse of about ten years? It may be very strong so far as its army is concerned, its navy is concerned. Its army and navy and so-called bombs are always on show everywhere. Today in Quemoy, tomorrow in the Indian Ocean, the third day in the Mediterranean, the fourth day somewhere else. It is parading all over the world. Its military force is obvious, but nothing else. Where is its moral prestige, and where is the free world? One would think that its maxim was peace with all princes and war against all people. I could give you a number of instances roundabout east and west where all the princes, all the feudal rulers look up to America and all the democracies have to sit quiet. As a matter of fact, America helps those people more who shout about communism. The more a country can say, 'I am afraid of communism', the more help it gives to that country. To my

mind, America must revise its own policy, must get outside the cold war mould. It is a congealed cold war mould. Russia has retraced its steps. It does not make a show of force, but builds it up quietly and firmly. And today perhaps its force is not inferior to that of America. Russia has retraced its steps since the death of Stalin. Today it believes in the rouble, diplomacy. Today it believes in economic and other political activities. It does not believe in military force alone. It is only America which believes in that.

Sir, there is another thing to which I wish to draw your attention. Just as there has been the resurgence of Asia for Asiatic countries, there is the great awakening in Africa. I personally feel that this is the greatest event of the century or perhaps of the half century or the last half of the 20th century, the awakening of Africa. Even the greatest countries of the world have got to take note of this great awakening.

Sir, we have all been talking just now of the People's Conference there, of the Conference of States also there, but the tone of the Conference is firm and strong and confident and as that tone is carried to us, and there is a throb in our heart that something great is happening in Africa. Just as in Asia, Sir, Nasser became a kind of a symbol, so here we have got Nkrumah becoming a great symbol for the freedom of Africa. Just as there was a slogan in Asia "Advance Asia", so there is a slogan there in Africa "Free Africa". They have created a fund for freedom. They have created an organisation for freedom. They have a Freedom Day, just as we have got an Independence Day. I think they celebrate it on the 15th of April every year. They have a regular secretariat, as we used to have a congress secretariat in those good old days. Just as in 1947 we had an Asian Conference called by our Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, followed later on by the official Bandung Conference in 1955, today on the same lines I feel that Nkrumah has called a similar African Conference. (Time

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

bell rings.) . . . Sir, I want at least fifteen minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please close at 4.25.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I have hardly spoken for eight minutes. I want only fifteen minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got to give a chance to fifteen more speakers. Please close at 4.25.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, how can I do it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I cannot help it.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Just as you please, Sir. It is not my fault. I gave my name six days back. I thought I would be called much earlier.

Sir, I was saying that just as a conference was called in Asia by our Prime Minister, followed later on by the Bandung Conference on an official basis, similarly we find in Africa a movement for a People's Conference called by Nkrumah. I am sure it will be followed soon after by an official conference of the representatives of the States in Africa.

Sir, the question now is, what can we do? What is the part that we are expected to play? To my mind we too can play our part in the freedom struggle of Africa. There are two issues which have been raised in Africa, and both issues are a challenge to us. There is an issue whether the Africans should fight for their human rights as human beings or whether they should fight literally against racialism. Shall they stand as human beings and say "we must receive equal treatment from the world", or shall they fight racialism as it is so rampant there in Africa? There is another challenge, and that is whether they win in human rights or whether they abolish racialism, shall they fight it by violent means or

shall they fight it by non-violent means? It appears to me today that the movement is at a stage where they wish to fight for human rights in which all of us can join, all of us can help and give support. It is quite likely that we may not help them or even if we help, they may feel that the help is not enough, and they may fight racialism in a very bitter manner and hatreds may be released as they have never before been released on the face of the globe. It is possible that the challenge may be to the world, but the challenge to India also stands. Is India able to take up that challenge? Is India able to give a trial, give help, give guidance, send some friends from India there to see that Africa also leads the struggle in the same way in which we led the struggle of non-violence and achieve its great independence by methods and measures which we adopted in India? To my mind it is a great challenge, and for India it is a great opportunity. It is up to us to rise to that great opportunity.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I share the feelings of the Prime Minister and agree with him with regard to the references he made about the Africans and their struggle for independence. But I do sincerely hope that the Africans' struggle for their independence will not be like the struggle of our country, will not be for the kind of independence which we are enjoying today. I wish the Africans all success and prosperity and I hope they will come of their own and will, in all glory, carry on a campaign for their economic betterment, in the best interests of themselves.

Now, Sir, coming nearer home, we are talking about the aggression of Pakistan, and various speeches and pronouncements are made by the authorities of our Government, excluding our Prime Minister, that the border incidents are a prelude to something more. But the Prime Minister will not say so. He has used words like "petty pinpricks", "little aggression", "some cause for anxiety",

and so on and so forth, regarding the incidents on the eastern border and other areas. And what do these words convey to the people and the nation? I can only imagine that these are warnings given to the Indian nation that we must be prepared for a war. There is every likelihood of Pakistan crossing into our territory and declaring a war. How are we to meet that challenge is a problem which baffles the present statesmen. But the difficulty with regard to ourselves is that we are suffering under a hallucination, a feeling that the Pakistanis will not invade our country. If that were so, these prickles need not have come. There is a possibility of living in amity and peace. But that possibility is not there. Why? The C is there—C into C into C that is, Cashmere, Canal Waters and Corridor to East Pakistan. When these things are taken into account you will understand the trouble underlying the fight of Pakistan. But that is not the trouble here. The trouble in this country is that India, that is Bharat, got divided between the Americans and the British. The Americans took charge of Pakistan and started equipping the Pakistan Army with the most modern weapons, and the British occupied India, nominally controlled by the Congress party, is still having the old junks left out and cast away out of the previous war with the military for our defence. How is it possible to defend this country in the face of such a threat? You may have an army numerically three times that of theirs, but that number will not count. If something has to be done, we have got to have weapons. You may be Gandhiji's followers, you may be peaceful and non-violent. Your weapons are used for offensive purposes when Indians start agitating for something. But against the Pakistanis these weapons will not help. They are equipped with the most modern weapons and whenever border incidents are taking place either in Bengal or in Assam or in East Punjab when they once come into our territory and squat there your army is unable to chuck them out. I want to know why? The reason is, our boys

are not cowardly, though Mr Morarji Desai made a reference about our being weak. We are not weak. We are very strong. We have got enough capacity to resist aggression. But without weapons what can we do?

I am reminded of an old story that, when the Moghul hordes invaded Maharashtra, the poor Bajirao II, who was then the Minister there, said "Look, the Muslim hordes have come. The Muslims have invaded our country. What shall we do?" When he was asked by the commander of the military forces about the course of action Bajirao said "pede se maro what does that matter?" He has understood only milk and plenty as flowing in the country. Bajirao said that "Peda" means a stuff made out of milk and sugar.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN What is your authority?

SHRI H D RAJAH My authority is history. Our Dr Barlingay is here, and he will corroborate me. Therefore, those who have studied history will understand the implications of a statement of that nature. The result was the Muslim hordes got into Maharashtra and occupied it for 150 years. In the same way, my difficulty and my problem will be.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN You should be more serious, Mr Rajah.

SHRI H D RAJAH It is all historical facts which cannot be controverted by anybody.

In the same way, my problem is to defend my country. If this country is to grow up economically and politically, I should be strong. How can I be strong? That is the problem that agitates me. You may be a weak nation, you may be having power; you may have three times the army which the Pakistanis are having. But one man is enough to destroy ten people if those ten people are not properly armed. Therefore, my advice to the Government will be, see a little bit of reason. Do not waste

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

away two hundred crores to the British people. They have been looting this country for two hundred years. Now you have been buying junks from them. Instead of that, utilise part of that money in equipping our army. Wherever you get the most modern weapons of warfare, buy them and have the borders—both eastern and western—well protected. That is enough for me. You need not equip your army all over India. When once you protect the borders—both east and west—the internal security is a matter for ourselves and we shall take care of it ourselves. I do not want these hordes to come and talk about a corridor or talk about coming into this country and settling their disputes by force of arms.

There is some meaning in the talk of Diwan Chaman Lall. He said that there must be a confederation of Pakistan and India. Well, it is a thought that he has given out. But I may ask Diwan Chaman Lall, before that can fructify, what about a federation of ourselves? We must think about decentralising power ourselves and bring about a federation and then talk about a confederation. What has to be done in this country is the main point that we have to take into account. Before you talk of a confederation, you must talk of a federation with Indians, with complete autonomy and responsibility to every State coming together and with a joint defence for our purposes. That is the way in which you must progress and do your work.

The declarations of Gen. Ayub Khan were more or less a menacing thing. Now, Prime Minister Nehru categorically says, what is the form of government there? We are not worried. As to what they should do; it is their affair. And see this statement in contrast with what Gen. Ayub Khan has declared yesterday or rather a few days back. What does he say? He says, "The conditions in India are similar to Pakistan and I expect a military dictatorship to come

in India sooner or later." How is he competent to talk about us? He must have had the tongue in his cheek, and he must keep quiet. So far, there has been no protest from this Government and what is the fundamental mistake this Government has done with regard to Pakistan? Sir, when Gen. Iskander Mirza suspended the Constitution—he did not suspend it; he abrogated it—that means he kicked the ladder through which he came up. When there is no Constitution in Pakistan, was it proper for this Government to still continue to have diplomatic relations with Pakistan, the moment that concept of a democratic government was given up, when even the pretence of it was given up? It was something like batches of warriors going from the North-West Frontier with swords and occupying the constituted Government in Afghanistan. A military junta which Gen. Iskander Mirza, just to sustain—not even sustain . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not use such words. You should not use such words.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: What words? 'Military junta' I said. Sir, let me now make it clear that the word 'junta' is parliamentary. If you give a ruling, I will bow; otherwise, I will not. 'Military junta.' 'J-u-n-t-a.' When they usurped the functions of the Government and when the Constitution was abrogated, it was—proper and right for our Government to have severed diplomatic connections with Pakistan. But how was it possible? Where is the Commonwealth, a great fascination for our country to get itself attached to? And what is it? The history of the Commonwealth is the history of imperialism, exploitation, loot, plunder and trade monopoly. They are not concerned about the existence of other nations as free and independent nations. They were concerned only with a matter by which this kind of dictatorship came into existence. Do

you mean to say that without the active support of the Americans and the Britishers there, this military dictatorship would have come into existence? It is not possible. Therefore, the basic problem for us is the problem of the Commonwealth. If you want to be really following a decent, independent policy, you must get out of this wretched Commonwealth. There is nothing in common there and you still have a vestige of that because you were obliged to them for putting you into power. That concept must go forthwith..

Then, Sir, let us take Ceylon. We are not worried how West Germany misconducts itself or some other people misconduct themselves. In Ceylon, our own nationals are beaten to death. Revolutions take place only in the interests of the local citizens. The Indians there are the legacy of the British indentured labour system. The tea plantations of Ceylon are full of Indians today because the Britishers booked them on an indentured labour basis and their progeny and followers are today in Ceylon. They number about fifteen lakhs, disenfranchised, disinherited, owned by nobody and suffering the worst humiliation there and the perpetual struggle between the local population and these Indians takes place. You are complacent about that. I charge the Government of India with being complacent, not taking charge of a decent percentage of our population who has gone and settled there and whose progeny is suffering. Not only are they suffering. The latest riots killed about 1200 Indians in that country and what steps you took, I do not know. It is your paramount duty as Government to protect the Indian citizens wherever they are. If you cannot do that and call it a 'dynamic neutralism', I must say that you are unfit to govern. I cannot say anything more than that.

Now, I come to Goa. The Prime Minister has forgotten about Goa. He was very active, eloquent about the Government of India's policy. About a hundred of our patriots in the most non-violent way went there and faced

the bullets and died there. There was a hasty retreat of our struggle because you could not do that by force. You are Panchsheel men and Goa, you declare, is part of India and Salazar ignores you just as we ignore a mosquito. Then what happens? Salazar is supreme; Goa is forgotten and it is not part of our Indian territory today and you start opening avenues. Look at the stupid way in which our Government is behaving in regard to the passage to be given to these people and the Hague Court. . .

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): Is it parliamentary? Is the word 'stupid' parliamentary?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I am not able to say anything now with regard to this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If it is unparliamentary, I will expunge it. You should not use such words.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It is quite parliamentary. I would like you to read the proceedings of the House of Commons which are your guide and May's Parliamentary Practice declaring which word is parliamentary and which is unparliamentary. Please go through May's Parliamentary Practice. I know something of these things and I will not use a word without responsibility. Take it from me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is better you do not use such words.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Why 'better'? I agree, but then you can't say it is unparliamentary.

In the heat of our talk, we forget these things.

Now, that is the position with regard to Goa. We started to fight for freedom. We have ended with a complacent outlook—the *status quo*—with regard to Goa. Well, it is not Goa. The point is the British have got a treaty. . . . (*Time bell rings*). Then, I need not speak at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I am obliged for the small mercy.

Now, there is one story which must be known to this House and that is *apartheid*. What about *apartheid* in this country? Have you ever noticed the British people enjoying the sole privilege of not allowing within one mile of the circumference of their building any one single Indian? Have you seen or read in this country that these people enjoy the privilege of having a swimming club in Bombay and allowing there not a single person born in India? You are talking of *apartheid* in South Africa. Are you not a citizen? Have you got any sovereignty in this country? Can we allow any foreigner in this country to establish himself in such a privilege? Sir, I am reminded of the China which was under Chiang-Kai-shek and I shall just read these two sentences from Sardar Panikkar's book:

"On the bund itself was situated the Shanghai Club, which was reputed to have the longest bar in the world, where at lunch time stream in the great ones of British business. The country clubs, English, French and Italian, with extensive grounds and luxurious apartments in the commercial heart of China, proclaim the importance of the different European communities."

They were enjoying extra-territorial privileges including their right to put up boards, 'Chinese and dogs not permitted'.

Today you are in a similar situation in this country and before you talk of foreign affairs and survey the world, you survey your internal hearts and find out whether you have nationality, whether you are nationals and you have self-respect, to yourself.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome this

opportunity to participate in this debate. It gives us a chance to review the world situation but more than that, it gives us the chance to express our opinion about the current topics—I shall confine myself only to two or three.

First about the Commonwealth. I am sure we all recall that both in literature concerning the composition and the character of the Commonwealth and also in many of the speeches which are made at the conferences of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, two things have always been stressed, namely, the spiritual unity of the free people—formerly it was allegiance to the Crown, but that has not been made requisite; that is no longer necessary—but the 'parliamentary institutions' is stressed over and over again. It may take one form in one country; it may take another in the other, but I cannot get reconciled to the idea that within the Commonwealth you can have dictatorship whose policies are very repugnant to the whole system of parliamentary democracy which rests upon the rule of law, tolerance, freedom and all the rest that goes with it. Now we may not ask any member at this stage to get out of the Commonwealth; we may not even consider that we should no longer associate with it, but I do submit, Sir, that sooner or later the very basis of this association within the Commonwealth of nations will have to be re-examined and re-examined very carefully. This is just a very passing observation.

Now, Sir, turning to Africa, a great deal has been said about the emergence of free independent African countries, about the significance of the various conferences that have been held in Africa, but I would like to draw the attention of this House to two or three of the very sinister and pernicious tendencies in some section of the western press to undermine these new forces. Originally they tried to discredit Nasser in the eyes of the Arab people because he symbolized Arab unity. They did not

succeed. I notice in the press reports today that references have been made to the Accra Conference as counteracting forces against the Afro-Asian conference that was held last year in Cairo. I say it is a deliberately mischievous move because, if you read the resolutions of the Cairo Conference, you will find that they are absolutely identical with the resolutions that have recently been passed both by the official Accra conference and the unofficial. Certainly it was made abundantly clear by the speakers that these People's Conference does not have any organic or constitutional link with the Afro-Asian Solidarity Association. That is perfectly true, but they do have a link which I prefer to call a 'common spiritual link'; they all stand for the abolition of imperialism, for the abrogation of racial discrimination, for the freedom of all countries. I therefore suggest, Sir, that we should be on our guard against such attempts. Unfortunately,—I will not say 'deliberately', perhaps unwittingly—certain section of our press and more deplorably, some of our own officials, have even fallen into the habit of looking upon these Afro-Asian Conferences as being dominated by the communists. I speak with some personal knowledge because I have had active association with them—I am not passing any judgment about the merits or demerits of communism—and I can say that never in any of these conferences you find more than five or six per cent. of the delegates who are communists, and I think it is paying undue compliment to the communists to say that five per cent. have ever been able to dominate the rest 95 per cent. We should guard ourselves against these tendencies.

One word about Algeria, Sir. I have no doubt that our Ministry of External Affairs and our Prime Minister are fully aware of the problem. They are fully aware of the fact that the African people, and the Algerian people particularly, do expect recognition from this Government. I do not suggest that whenever any national Government emerges on

another soil, our Government should rush and immediately recognise it, but I do want to convey to this House the feeling of most of the African people—of the few that I met—that they always expect much more from India than from any other country. I am not suggesting that the Algerian National Government should be recognised immediately—and I am sure our Prime Minister is fully aware of the feelings of those people,—but I do want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that so much is expected of us, and if we don't come up to their expectation, the disappointment is naturally and inevitably proportionate. Some of us who go out and participate in these conferences find to our embarrassment that we are usually pushed into places of responsibility and prominence, merely because we come from India; not for any other meritorious personal accomplishments, but because you come from India they think that you might be in a position to give wiser counsel. This is a very great responsibility and I therefore feel that once the pros and cons have been carefully examined, our Government will not hesitate for a moment to accord recognition to the newly formed Government.

One word about the Berlin issue Sir. The Prime Minister has said on many occasions that it is a very complicated issue. There is no doubt about it. But there are people, Sir, who feel that the idea of reunification of Germany under free elections is no longer possible or feasible. Even a man like Walter Lippman, a very eminent and highly respected columnist in America, who certainly does not have much love for the Russian policy, in his recent article has said that the time has come when we are going to be compelled to be more realistic; we may have to recognise the existence of two Germanys, East and West.

I am not suggesting any solution, Sir; nobody knows the solution, but having recently been in Germany in both the parts, I came away with the feeling that some of the high officials,

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

some of the journalists and professors felt that our Government perhaps did not fully understand and appreciate the patent political reality of the existence of two Germanys. I am not saying whether our Government does or not, but there is the general feeling there. One of them went so far as to say that our Government may have to think that the two Koreas can no longer be united under one free democratically elected Government, that is the case with Viet-Nam and that the case of Germany is the same. I am bringing this point merely to suggest that there is a growing feeling both in America and in some circles in Europe, particularly in Germany, that unless we recognise the existence of two Germanys, no immediate and no enduring solution of the German situation is possible.

I thank you.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश) उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा नाम आखिर में आया, तो भी आपने याद कर लिया इसके लिए धन्यवाद है। आज प्रातःकाल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो भाषण दिया था और अपनी जो नीति बतलाई उसका मैं पूर्ण समर्थन करता हूँ। एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स की मिनिस्ट्री का कर्तव्य जैसा कि होता है कि हर जगह अपने नागरिकों का बाहर के देशों में रक्षा करना, अपने ट्रेड की उन्नति करना या कोई अन्य कल्चरल संबंध स्थापित करना या स्टूडेंट्स वगैरा का आपस में विनिमय करना, तो ये सब कार्य हमारी मिनिस्ट्री करती रहती है और अपने देश की प्रगति और उन्नति के लिए दूसरे देशों में जो कुछ करना आवश्यक होता है वह करती है। इस बारे में हमारे इम्बेसीज, हमारे राजदूतावास दूसरे देशों में हैं और दूसरे डिप्लोमेटिक अधिकारी लोग हैं जो इन कार्यों को देख रहे हैं। मेरा खयाल है कि जैसा कि

हम अपने अन्य महकमों में कुछ किफायत-शारी वगैरा का ध्यान रखने हैं वैसे ही हमारी इस मिनिस्ट्री में भी खुद प्रधान मंत्री जी अपने उन अधिकारियों पर काफी नियंत्रण और किफायत रखने का ध्यान रखते ही होंगे और यह एक दृष्टिकोण भी बहुत जरूरी है जो कि हमारे सामने रहना चाहिये। बहरहाल, हमारी इस मिनिस्ट्री का यह सम्पूर्ण मंगल आज बहुत अच्छे ढंग से काम कर रहा है और उसकी नीतियों के विषय में स देश में पूर्ण मतभेद है और इसका मुख्य कारण यह भी है कि स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी जो कि हमारे देश की नीतियों के बहुत कुछ उत्पादक हैं और उनके प्रारम्भ करने वाले हैं। वे ही उसका संचालन कर रहे हैं।

अभी विरोधी पार्टी के नेता श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने कहा था कि हमको ईस्ट जर्मनी, अल्जीरिया वगैरा की गवर्नमेंटों को मान लेना चाहिये, उनको मान्यता प्रदान करनी चाहिये, मेरा खयाल है कि इस मामले में सावधानी की जरूरत है और जिस ढंग से प्रधान मंत्री जी शिथिल और सावधानी बरत रहे हैं वह मुनासिब ही है क्योंकि जैसा अल्जीरिया में, एकदम उस गवर्नमेंट को जो कि अपने देश में नहीं रह रही है बल्कि बाहर के देशों में फकशन कर रही है। इसी तरह से अन्य नई गवर्नमेंटों को इतनी जल्दी मान्यता नहीं दी जा सकती है। एक बात अवश्य है कि हमारे देश में वैदेशिक नीति के संबंध में सर्वमान्यता है। उसको ज्यादा व्यापक बनाने और राष्ट्रीय आधार पर प्रोत्साहन देने की आवश्यकता है। जैसे कि हम फूड या अनाज के संबंध में तथा दूसरे मामलों में सब पार्टियों का सहयोग लेते हैं, मेरे खयाल से यह बहुत जरूरी है कि भारत

की जो सामान्यता राष्ट्रीय वैदेशिक नीति है जिसके बारे में कोई पार्टी मतभेद नहीं रखती है उसको ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन देना और उसका ज्यादा प्रोपगैंडा और प्रचार होना चाहिये। मेरे खयाल में इस विषय में कोई विशेष योजना बनाई जाय जिससे हमारी जो सर्वमान्य नीतियाँ हैं उनमें किसी तरह की गलतफहमी न हो। उनके बारे में हम जितना अच्छी तरह से प्रचार करेंगे उतना देश के लिए हितकारी होगा।

अफ्रीका के विषय में आज नेहरू जी ने जो सद्भावनाएं प्रकट की वे बिल्कुल मुनासिब हैं। यह एक नया महादेश है, एक नया महाखंड है जो कि अब बढ़ रहा है और आगे आ रहा है। मेरे खयाल से यह एक बड़ी भारी शक्ति होगी। इसमें खतरा यही है कि यहा पर कुछ ऐसी गवर्नमेंट है जो जातीवाद की नीति पर काली जातियों के खिलाफ अपना रवैया रखती है। अगर सफेद जातियों ने इन सफेद गवर्नमेंटों का साथ दिया और जितनी काली जातिया हैं नीग्रोज हैं, उन्होंने अपना संगठन किया और उनमें अगर कहीं कोई वाइलेंस या हिंसा आई तो एक महायुद्ध होने की संभावना है। तो इस विषय में भी हमारे मंत्री जी ने दूसरे राष्ट्रों को जो सलाह दी है—वे अपनी नीतियों को इस तरह से बरतें जो उठते हुए अफ्रीका की इन जातियों के विरुद्ध न पड़ें तो ठीक होगा। इस विषय में यू० एन० ओ० में, जो रिजोल्यूशन पास हुआ है वह बहुत मुनासिब है। यू० एन० ओ० के रिजोल्यूशन में कहा गया है कि साउथ अफ्रीका की सरकार ने जो नीति अख्तियार की हुई है उसके खिलाफ वह रिजोल्यूशन है, उसे अपनी पालिसी को दुरुस्त करने को कहा गया है।

पाकिस्तान के बारे में हमको सावधान रहने की आवश्यकता है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उनके प्रति बहुत अच्छी सद्भावना व्यक्त की है और साथ ही यह भी आगाह कर दिया है कि हम किसी भी हमले को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे चाहे वह हमला काश्मीर की भूमि पर हो या भारत के किसी हिस्से पर। मेरे खयाल में इस विषय में हमारी सरकार सावधानी बरत ही रही है और यह ठीक भी है। हमले की कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है, सम्भावना नहीं है किन्तु हमको पूरा होशियार रहने की जरूरत है। इस हाउस में अधिकांश सदस्यों ने गवर्नमेंट से यह प्रार्थना की है और सलाह दी है कि हमको होशियार रहने की आवश्यकता है। पाकिस्तान किसी वक्त हमला कर दे क्योंकि वहा पर एक डिक्टेटरशिप है। डिक्टेटरशिप की प्रवृत्ति यह होती है कि अपने राज्य में जब कि वह अपनी समस्याओं को हल नहीं कर पाता है तो कोई न कोई अपनी शक्तियों को बाहर इस्तेमाल करने का जरिया निकाल लेता है। मेरा अपना खयाल है कि हमको इस संबंध में बहुत सावधान रहने की जरूरत है और इस विषय में जो कुछ किया जा सकता है उसको किया जाना चाहिये। इसके अतिरिक्त इस संबंध में और कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता है और न आवश्यकता ही है। पाकिस्तान को अमेरिका जो मदद दे रहा है हम भारतवर्ष के लोग यही अनुभव करते हैं कि जब वे हिन्दुस्तान को भी मदद देते हैं तो पाकिस्तान को फौजी मदद देकर वे दोनों को आपस में लड़ाने का काम करते हैं। ऐसी एक भावना पैदा होती है। इसलिए अमेरिका की गवर्नमेंट को हमें यही कहना चाहिये कि यदि वह सचमुच हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की भलाई चाहता है तो उसको इस तरह की दो तरफा नीति अख्तियार नहीं करनी चाहिये

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

कि पाकिस्तान को सैनिक सहायता दी जाय और उसको सैनिक ढंग से तैयार किया जाय। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान का बजट भी बढ़ता जा रहा है। इस तरह की मदद से हिन्दुस्तान के दिल में शंका पैदा होती है। इसलिए अमेरिका हिन्दुस्तान को जो इमदाद दे रहा है वह एक तरह से बेकार हो जाता है। यू० एस० ए० की गवर्नमेंट से इस बारे में अपील करनी चाहिये कि वे इस तरह की नीति अख्तियार न करें ताकि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में कोई विरोध पैदा हो।

बर्लिन के विषय में हमारे अन्य मित्रों ने सदन में काफी रोशनी डाली है और विशेषकर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने काफी कहा है। यह एक ऐसा सवाल है जो कोल्ड वार को भड़का रहा है। यद्यपि दुनिया के दूसरे हिस्सों में जैसे ताइवान क्यूमौय, जोर्डन है और लेबनान में कुछ शान्ति हुई थी लेकिन श्री ख़ुश्चेव ने यह एक नया बर्लिन का शूफा खोल दिया है। जबकि जेनेवा में दुनिया की शान्ति के लिए कांफ़ेंस हो रही है उसी वक्त श्री ख़ुश्चेव ने बर्लिन का सवाल उठा दिया। अगर वे बर्लिन के सवाल को कुछ समय बाद उठाते तो शायद उसका दूसरा असर होता। शायद वे यह सोचते हैं कि इससे दुनिया में शान्ति के पक्ष को बल मिलेगा। मगर इसका असर यह होता है कि शान्ति के बजाय अशांति बढ़ती है। अगर वे सचमुच शान्ति के इच्छुक हैं तो उन्हें ऐसे समय बर्लिन के सवाल को नहीं उठाना चाहिये था।

(Time bell rings.)

अभी तो कुछ टाइम है। मैं एक दो बातें और कह दूँ। आपने मुझे आखिर में बोलने का वक्त दिया है।

श्री उपसभापति : पूरा कीजिये।

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : तो मैं इतना कह कर इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

5 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I think we can continue a little more. There are some more speakers. I hope the Prime Minister also would be agreeable to prolonging this debate a little. He can reply tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the House does not insist on the Prime Minister being here, I am prepared to extend by half-an-hour.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : आपने तो मुझे अपना भाषण समाप्त करने के लिए कहा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will sit till 5-30. Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Pakistan and the military dictatorship that has sprung up with all the attendant risks naturally absorbs our attention. World issues like that of Berlin are of concern to us. So it is right and proper that emphasis should have been laid on those issues by the speakers here and from this side of the House, those issues have been dealt with by the Leader of our group.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair]

But to my mind a most pleasant and heartening feature of this debate has been that for the first time Africa and African affairs have figured so much in our debate. The Prime Minister referred to the emergence of the African personality and he laid stress on the significance of this development. After all it is a positive aspect of our foreign policy that freedom must be increased and enlarged in that part of the world which is largely colonial even today. Now I have no time to refer to the Accra Con-

ference, the proceedings of this conference, though that conference by itself is a big event because delegates from about 29 countries representing the whole of Africa participated there I have no time to refer to the discussions there and I have not the time even to refer to the big heroic struggles going on through that continent in almost all territories—in Madagascar, in Uganda, in Tanganyika in Somaliland, in Nigeria and even in the Portuguese territories of Mozambique and the Cameroons—but in the limited time I just want to refer to two or three points which have in a way, created certain misgivings in the minds of these people. After all the Bandung spirit has sprouted and it is up to us to nurse it. Some of these territories especially the Cameroons and Somaliland are Trust territories and our representative is sitting there on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. Specially in regard to some of these problems, I shall specially refer to the French and British Cameroons, the problem is not only one of independence, it is one of unification and on those points, there is a feeling of disappointment among the people that our representative on the Trusteeship Council is not taking a really positive attitude. What is happening there? We have our experience in Goa. Goa is an integral part of Portugal and under that cover they say that it is their internal affair and the other major powers also accept that position. The position in Africa in regard to dependent territories is—not only in regard to Portuguese possessions but in regard to French Cameroons—that they are declared to be integral parts of the Trust. If it is a trusteeship territory, if the UN is responsible for seeing that they are granted self-government and all that, all these issues are raised and naturally, the representatives of the African people look to India for more positive help, for more positive guidance. I am not sure what exactly has happened in the Trusteeship Council but those are issues in which the people of India also are vitally interested because

after all, in that continent, which it has suited many to call 'dark', all these forces of freedom are rising up

Another point is in regard to the attitude of Indian settlers there. Of course, they are of Indian descent. They are not our nationals. We have no direct control over them and they can have their own attitude in regard to these problems but there is a feeling in regard to people of Indian descent, especially in East Africa and other places that their attitude towards these surging moves, these democratic movements, towards this fight against colonial rule is not quite a happy thing. I am not suggesting that we can do anything direct to have any change of attitude in them but a positive statement from the Prime Minister of India to our people as to how they should identify themselves with those people, the real masters of the country, the native population, will go a long way.

I have no time but I will just refer to Korea. The hon Prime Minister in his opening speech stated that to be associated with peace has been the great privilege of India and along with this privilege it has cast an obligation also. Conscious of that obligation, when there was struggle there, our Government and the Prime Minister took a positive role and it produced results. Now after 5 years, what do we find? I find that from one part of Korea the Chinese volunteers have withdrawn but the other portion continues to be developed as a war base. After all for the time being it may not be giving trouble but after 5 years or after the armistice, the thing is there. Our Government can take a little more positive attitude in regard to this and some initiative for the unification of these people. After all it was there in the agreement arrived at earlier there. Even in regard to the stalemate in Viet-Nam, millions of people there look to India to break this stalemate. I would like to know what positive approach India brings to bear on these issues. For the time being Korea and Viet-Nam

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.]
seem to be forgotten. We can ignore them only at our peril.

One more point in regard to Pondicherry. Reference has been made to *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry to India. Now the position has been aggravated in this way that even the Assembly has been dissolved there. My own information is that under certain forgotten laws, even liberties are crushed. We read in the papers that Special Envoy of De Gaulle visited India and had occasion to meet the Prime Minister. This question of *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry has been hanging fire for so long. It would be good if the Prime Minister could tell us exactly what the position is and if any progress has been made in regard to the transfer of Pondicherry to us, specially now that the internal position there is causing a lot of concern to the people there. I don't want to refer to other points. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Shah Mohamad Umair. Five minutes.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar): Sir, I don't know how to thank you for giving me at least this opportunity of five minutes at the eleventh hour.

The foreign policy of our country is being discussed for the last 10 years and we are proud to say that the policy which we are discussing today we have had the privilege of discussing, the same policy, without any alteration or change in that policy, for the last 10 years consistently. The great pride and the great beauty of the foreign policy can be explained in a simple way. Other countries who also have got their foreign policies had to make certain alterations and changes under certain direct and indirect pressures, sometimes today, sometimes tomorrow or the day after. But the firm strength and beauty of our foreign policy is that it has remained the same for the last ten years and no direct or indirect pressure could bring any change in it.

This foreign policy of ours has got its various aspects. Its many-sided aspects can be briefly described as friendly relations with all the countries in the international field. Its basic background is world peace and friendly relations with all, with Pakistan also, and co-existence with other nations. This has been the background of our foreign policy for the last ten years and this is the policy that we have been following under the great personality and leadership of our Prime Minister.

Many things have been said about it, but since I have only five minutes, it will not be possible for me to speak out all that is in my mind on this subject. But I will tell the House that the military dictatorship in Pakistan has been spoken of in so many words here. I do not understand why this military dictatorship in Pakistan is being referred to so often, for after all, it is not a new thing. Dictatorship of almost some sort has been in Pakistan for the last ten years. May be it was a civil dictatorship and it is now a military dictatorship. There has never been democracy. There has never been any elections there. There has never been any democratic spirit in the Constitution of that country. So why should we speak with some surprise and amazement and say that democracy has disappeared from there? where was democracy there? Democracy did not exist in Pakistan.

At the same time, this dictatorship, this military dictatorship is not something new which is there today. The foundation stone of this military dictatorship, let me tell you, was laid some four years back under the U.S.-Pakistan military alliance. The U.S.-Pakistan military alliance was the real background and that was the planned and organized background for the present military dictatorship that is there today before us, and it was laid some four years back, which was interpreted in terms of military alliance between Pakistan and the U.S.A. Therefore it is something which was contemplated

four years back by many, and it has come into force today in 1958. Sir, let me tell you that I agree with Shri Bhupesh Gupta that we should find out the real clue, the real spirit that is behind all this mischief, all these developments that are taking place in Pakistan and elsewhere. The clue lies somewhere else. It is not in the Pakistani people. They are not in a position, they do not have the capacity to enforce such a tremendous military rule or this military dictatorship overnight. That was not possible. This has been imported from somewhere else. So we must be very cautious, for many other things may come out after this development. They should be checked. We should not be complacent about these things, thinking that we are very strong. What has happened in Pakistan overnight must be watched by many other countries. We should see what were the agencies, the forces and the circumstances which made Pakistan a country with a military dictatorship today. These circumstances, whether they be at a long distance or at a short distance, they are there, and circumstances may create situations and may put us in difficulty. Why should they again and again show their red eyes to India in the name of Kashmir or anything else? It is not the simple words that are uttered, but these words have got tremendous significance and we have to look deep into that significance and see that with what strength behind him Gen. Ayub Khan utters such strong words and shows such angry red eyes to India. These have got some significance which we must find out. I agree with Shri Bhupesh Gupta that we should not forget that we are placed in such circumstances that though we are thinking of friendship and alliances on the one hand with European powers, on the other hand we are daily experiencing lots of difficulties in various ways. Assurances will not help us in the circumstances in which Pakistan is now placed. Pakistan in its madness, in its fury and in its anger or under the dictatorship may be prompted by other foreign powers to do something some

95 RSD.—7.

day for which we may not be fully prepared.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I do not want to interfere, but will the hon. Member please now bring his remarks to a close? His time is up.

SHRI MOHAMAD UMAIR: Sir, I reached this point only just now. Anyway I am closing my remarks just now. I must tell the House that we must be fully prepared and we must be fully armed and we should be very cautious. We should not be complacently thinking that Pakistan will show some gentleness. Much goodness has been shown to Pakistan. What more gentle attitude and generous attitude could have been shown to Pakistan than what has been already shown by the Prime Minister of India, by giving them all sorts of assurances by showing them all sorts of courtesies, by showing them all sorts of friendly relations, in spite of the difficulties which we have been experiencing? And how has Pakistan responded? Pakistan has responded in the same spirit in which the first makers of Pakistan did. And those makers of Pakistan are still there. There may also be some in India even now. So the attitude and the spirit of Pakistan is the same as it was ten years back when Pakistan was formed. So I say we must be on our guard. We must be seriously on our guard.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Please bring your remarks to a close.

(Time bell rings.)

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: These incidents on the border are the warnings. Let us take them seriously. We speak of Kashmir. In Kashmir also we have to be watchful. Civil liberties should be seriously watched and safeguarded. We should bring it under the jurisdiction of our Supreme Court, and the jurisdiction of the Election Commission should be extended to Kashmir, especially because Pakistan has such military designs.

[Shah Mohamad Umair.]

Our foreign policy is praised because it has not changed. It is the foreign policy which we have followed for the past ten years and this has not been done by many other countries. Let me conclude with the slogan of "Indo-Pak reunion" wherein lies the final solution.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव हमारे आदरणीय नेता पं० जवाहरलाल जी ने रखा है कि वर्तमान अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति तथा तत्सम्बन्धी भारत सरकार की नीति पर विचार किया जाय यह बहुत ही उपयुक्त है। प्रस्तावक महोदय ने जिस दृष्टि से वह प्रस्ताव रखा उस दृष्टि से तो वह परिपूर्ण है, इसमें शुबहा नहीं लेकिन हाउस की दृष्टि में उसमें कुछ न्यूनता थी, कमी थी और उस न्यूनता को हमारे मि. चमनलाल जी ने पूरा कर दिया। जिस तरह से अब हमारे सामने प्रस्ताव है वह बहुत ही सुन्दर रूप में और बहुत ही अच्छे तरीके पर है। मैं इस प्रस्ताव का हार्दिक स्वागत और समर्थन करता हूँ।

मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यह प्रस्ताव हमारे मौजूदा हालात और समयानुसार जो नीति होती है, उस पर ही आधारित हो यह बात नहीं है बल्कि यह विदेश नीति का प्रस्ताव हमारी प्राचीन, संस्कृति, प्राचीन पद्धति हमारे मूल सिद्धान्त, सबके समर्थन पर आधारित है, और हम जिन प्राचीन सिद्धान्तों के मानने वाले हैं उनके बिलकुल अनुरूप है। अभी हमारे मित्र मिर्जा साहब ने, जो इस समय चले गये हैं, यह प्रश्न किया था—जब कि पार्टेशन का जिक्र आया—कि इसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जो सवाल उन्होंने किया, अगर वे थोड़ा सा विचार करते तो उन्हें अच्छी तरह माजूम हो जाता कि वह जो मुसलिम लीगी

जहिनयत हमारे भारतवासियों के दिल में पैदा हुई थी उसका ही नतीजा था। तना ही नहीं उनकी घृणा और नफरत पैदा करने की वह नीति भारत तक ही सीमित नहीं रही, वह उस नीति को अपने साथ पाकिस्तान में भी ले गये जो स्वभाविक ही था और उसका खमियाजा उनको खुद को भुगताना पड़ा। उन्होंने खुद देखा कि वहाँ किस कार भिन्न भिन्न कई पार्टियाँ उत्पन्न हो गई वह बेतरह बड़ी और उनका अस्तित्व बहुत थोड़े दिनों में ही विलीन हो गया, साथ ही ससे यह हुआ कि आज हम देखते हैं कि वहाँ मिलिटरी शासन है। मेरा निवेदन है कि इन सब बातों से हमें थोड़ा सबक लेने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे भारतवर्ष के लोग तो हमेशा से इस सिद्धान्त में विश्वास करते हैं कि "वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्"—सारा ससार हमारा कुटुम्ब है, इसमें विश्वास करते रहे हैं और करते हैं। हमारा विश्वास इसमें है कि "कृष्णतो विश्वमार्यम्" अर्थात् हमें सारे संसार को श्रेष्ठ बनाना है। यदि हम अपने प्राचीन इतिहास को देखे तो ऐसा नहीं है कि हम इन बातों को, या पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों को, आज ही कहते हों। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने खुद ही पंचशील के जिन सिद्धान्तों को अपनाया है और दूसरे देशों से मनवाने का यत्न किया है और मनवा रहे हैं। वे ऐसे सिद्धान्त हैं कि जो सारी दुनिया की भलाई के लिये हैं। वे इस सिद्धान्त को मानने वाले हैं कि जीओ और जीने दो। यह हमारे प्राचीन सिद्धान्त हैं। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि हमारे पाकिस्तानी भाई, जितना ही हम उनकी तरफ मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाये उनकी तरफ से हमेशा इस प्रकार की बात कही जाती है जो बिलकुल असत्य होती है और ने दरअसल आज दुनिया को धोखा देने की कोशिश करते हैं। वे दरअसल स्वयं अपने को तथा अपने पाकिस्तानी

भाइयों को ही धोखा दे रहे हैं जब वह यह कह रहे हैं कि हमको भारतवर्ष से खतरा है या भारतवर्ष से हमारी कोई दुश्मनी है। ऐसा वे महज अपनी व्यक्तिगत मनोकामना पूरी करने के लिए और अपना शासन चलाने की दृष्टि से कहते हैं और इस प्रकार की बातें लोगों के मन में भरा करते हैं जो नितान्त असत्य हैं। मेरा यह निवेदन है....

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू): कृपया समाप्त कीजिए, अब खत्म कीजिए।

श्री राम सहाय : एक दो, मिनट में समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू): अभी श्री याजी को भी बोचना है।

श्री राम सहाय : इस प्रकार का जो मिलिटरी शासन वहां चला है उससे बहुत कुछ सबक सभी को सीखने की आवश्यकता है।

काश्मीर के बारे में पाकिस्तान हर वक्त चर्चा किया करता है। जिन हमारे इन पाकिस्तानी भाइयों से अपना घर नहीं संभल रहा है, जिन्होंने स्वयं ने अपने साथियों पर, अपने देश के नेताओं पर खास कर अप्रत्याचार के आरोप, खुद्गर्जी के आरोप लगाए हैं, वे किस मुंह से काश्मीर की बात करते हैं यह समझ में नहीं आता। इसलिए यह निवेदन है कि स प्रकार के जितने भी प्रचार या प्रोगेंडा की बातें वे करें लेकिन वे भी दुनिया की आंखों में धूल नहीं झाँक सकेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ, हमारे पाकिस्तानी भाई भी अपने लोगों की इस किस्म की बातों को ध्यान में रख कर सचेत होंगे। हो सकता है एक समय ऐसा भी आये जब उनकी इससे और बुरी हालत हो। इसलिये आवश्यक है कि वे चेतन की कोशिश करें।

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): I will request you to give me time tomorrow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are 5 minutes. Start today and you can continue tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): No, other speeches. You can not continue tomorrow. We will adjourn at 5-30. You have to make up your mind whether to speak or not.

श्री राम सहाय : मैं अपनी स्पीच खत्म नहीं करना चाहता था और श्री याजी को बोलने का अवसर देने के लिए बैठ गया था।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, अभी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों पर बहस के सिलसिले में हमारे साथी दीवान चमनलाल जी ने मूल प्रस्ताव पर हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को स्वीकार करने के सम्बन्ध में जो संशोधन किया है मैं उसकी तारीफ करता हूँ।

अभी हमारी जो शांतिमय और प्रगति-शील वैदेशिक नीति है, प्रायः हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी पार्टियां हैं, और जितने लोग हैं वे इसको स्वीकार करते हैं और साथ ही साथ दुनिया के लोग भी। यद्यपि हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ ऐसी भी पार्टियां हैं जो अपने को समाजवादी पार्टी कहती हैं, वे रूस और चीन को भी बराबर गाली देती हैं और हंगरी के मामले को लेकर बड़ी बड़ी बातें उठाती हैं, लेकिन बड़े-बड़े नेता यहां तक कि जयप्रकाश नारायण जी की टाइटल के लोग जो समझते थे कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को दुनिया नहीं मानती है जब वे बाहर के देशों की यात्रा कर आए, तो उन्होंने भी कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान की वैदेशिक नीति को सारी दुनिया मानती है और इसके वे कायल हैं। आज सिर्फ इंग्लैंड और अमेरिका को छोड़िये, संसार

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

के और जो २६ बड़े-बड़े देश हैं, जिनकी करीब पौने तीन अरब की आबादी में दो अरब लोग हैं जो कि दुनिया की जन-संख्या के दो तिहाई हैं, वे हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को मानते हैं। लेकिन इस हाउस में वैदेशिक नीति पर बोलते बोलते श्री एच० डी० राजा ने हमारी जो सैनिक शक्ति है उसको छोटा दिखाने की कोशिश की जोकि मुल्क की बहबूदगी के खयाल से अच्छी बात नहीं है। वे कामनवेल्थ के बारे में भी बहुत सी नापसंद बातें बोल गए हैं। हमारे कुछ और साथी भी बोलत हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान को कामनवेल्थ में नहीं रहना चाहिए। मैं भी पहले इस ख्याल का था लेकिन जब कामरेड चाउ एन लाइ हिन्दुस्तान में आए, उन्होंने यहां इस प्रकार का बयान दिया कि राष्ट्रमंडल, 'कामनवेल्थ' में बैठकर जब नेहरू जी और देशों की अपनी वैदेशिक नीति की तरफ लाते हैं तब उसको कामनवेल्थ में रहना चाहिए, जब उन्होंने भी सिफारिश की तो मेरा ख्याल बदल गया। जब इतने महापुरुष लोग कामनवेल्थ में रहने की बात करते हैं तब एच० डी० राजा न जाने क्या समझते हैं कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। अभी परसों की बात है जब पुराने क्रांतिकारियों की कांफरेन्स हुई थी तब उसमें बोलते हुए राजा महेन्द्रप्रताप सिंह ने कहा था कि जब तक हिन्दुस्तान कामनवेल्थ में है तब तक हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई समाप्त नहीं है, हम अभी तक गुलाम हैं और इसलिए हमें आजादी की लड़ाई को जारी रखना है। ऐसे ऐसे सनकी लोग हैं जो इस तरह की पागलपन की बातें अभी भी करते हैं। तो यदि हम कामनवेल्थ में रहते हैं तो भी हमारी नीतियों पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ता है, चाहे वह गोआ का मामला हो, चाहे क्यूमीय, मत्सू या वेस्ट ईरियन का मामला हो। आज गोआ के मामले में इस हाउस में बहस के वक्त यह भी कहा गया कि क्यों नहीं वहां सैनिक शक्ति का प्रयोग किया गया।

जिस प्रश्न के सम्बन्ध में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी बार-बार सफाई दे चुके हैं, उस पर भी इस तरह की बातें चलती हैं, यह समझ में नहीं आता।

अभी हमारे साथी राजा जी ने अमेरिका की जो नीति है उसका जिक्र किया। अमेरिका की नीति शुरू से ही यह है कि गिलगिट से लेकर कराची तक एक लाइन पाकिस्तान को दे दी जाय

(Time bell rings.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): It is half past five now.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इसीलिए मैं बोल नहीं रहा था। पांच मिनट में वैदेशिक नीति पर क्या बोल सकता हूँ ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Five minutes.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : समाजवाद में समता का भाव होना चाहिए। किसी को एक घंटा बोलने के लिये दिया, किसी को आध घंटा। मैंने कभी फारन अफेयर्स पर नहीं बोला इसीलिए मैंने कह दिया था कि तीन मिनट में क्या बोल पाऊंगा।

तो हमारी यह जो वैदेशिक नीति है, यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि हमारे कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता जो हमारी गृह नीति पर कभी-कभी चिल्लाया करते हैं वे भी उस नीति को कबूल कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने जो बातें कही हैं, उनमें से कुछेक बहुत अच्छी कही हैं। शुरू में ही मैंने कहा था कि जब हमारे कामरेड चाउ एन लाइ, बुलगानिन तथा साम्यवादी व समाजवादी पार्टियों के कितने ही ठेकेदार (कस्टोडियन) हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की, पंचशील की प्रशंसा करते हैं तो कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता न करें तो

उनके लिये शोभनीय बात नहीं है। पाकिस्तान को यदि अमेरिका सैनिक सहायता दे रहा है तो अपनी गर्ज में दे रहा है क्योंकि उसे रूस पर और चीन पर कूदना है और गिलगिट से लेकर कराचा तक एक लाइन बनानी है, यह उनकी माजिश है। अयूब खां ने जो यह इशारा किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान में एक मिलिटरी डिक्टेटरशिप हो, तो इस तरह की बातें यहां नहीं होने वाली हैं और यह महज अयूब खां की शराबत भरी बात है। लेकिन “बंदर के हाथ में नाग्यल”—अगर जनरल अयूब का हथियार मिलता है तो—बंदर एक रोज क्या करेगा, इस बात के

लिए हमें सावधान होकर तैयार रहना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं साथी दिवान चमनलाल के संशोधन की तारीफ करता हूं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The Prime Minister will reply tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Tuesday, December 16, 1958.

The House then adjourned at thirty-one minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 16th December 1958.