

[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 a

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 point 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

35 RSD.-4.

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 wr"ong. 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, S'r, 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