

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

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

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

Sir, since this House considered the international situation and debated the question of foreign affairs, the world has gone through a number of stresses and strains, and indeed has been sometimes on the brink of war and catastrophe. Fortunately that particular episode, bad as it was, is more or less past history now. I am referring, as hon. Members will realise, to developments in Western Asia where, for about five or six weeks, the situation was very tense and on one or two occasions during those six weeks there was the actual danger of war breaking out on a big scale but recently, only a few days ago, the United Nations General Assembly passed a Resolution sponsored by the Arab representatives there, and passed it unanimously. Now, after the great tension of the previous weeks this came as a tremendous relief, and I must congratulate with respect the United Nations Assembly for this unanimous decision, and the Arab countries who sponsored that Resolution. Now, that Resolution indicated two things—I am not going into the details of it, the actual contents of the Resolution; it indicated that the Arab countries are progressively coming together; Arab nationalism is becoming welded together. In this Resolution even those Arab countries which were opposed to each other functioned in co-operation. That, I think, is a good and healthy sign and secondly, as a consequence of that, that this fact is more and more realised now by other countries which had consistently tried to ignore this fact of the importance of this tremendous upsurge of Arab nationalism. In other words we are coming or some other countries are

coming nearer to reality as it exists in Asia. Our difficulty has been that this adjustment to reality has been a very slow process, slow for all of us, but it does not make very much difference to the world. If a weak country takes an unrealistic view, it is the weak country that suffers but if a strong and mighty power takes an unrealistic view, then the world suffers; that is the difference, and unfortunately this kind of thing has been happening. All the revolutionary changes in Asia and in Africa have only been grudgingly recognised by the countries in Europe and America. I am not criticising anyone because it is always difficult to adjust oneself to a changing situation, and the fact of the matter is that the situation in the world to-day from any and every point of view is one which changes rapidly and basically. Now I cannot say what will happen in Western Asia. For the moment things have calmed down, and I believe all the countries concerned, more especially the Arab countries concerned, if I may use a colloquial expression, want to have a quiet time; nobody wants trouble there. Therefore, we may perhaps have a relatively quiet time though it must always be remembered that the major problems of that area have not been solved and they may give rise to another new upsurge and tension at any time.

Then the other subject which no doubt interests hon. Members a great deal and which comes up repeatedly in question after question is that of our relations with Pakistan. As the House, knows, I expect to meet the Prime Minister of Pakistan in about two weeks' time here in Delhi. We are supposed to discuss more particularly the frontier incidents, the border incidents that have been happening chiefly on our eastern border with Pakistan, and I hope at any rate that that problem which in reality is not at all a difficult problem would be solved.

Now, this problem of our border may be divided up into three parts. One is what might be called the international

border, about which there is no doubt. Then there is the cease fire line in Jammu and Kashmir State, which at any rate is precise; we know where it is. The third part of the border is what was decided by Mr. Radcliffe and Mr. Justice Bagge on two different occasions, and this has not been demarcated with the result that sometimes disputes arise as to the interpretation of what Mr. Radcliffe or Mr. Justice Bagge said. It is obviously a matter for friendly settlement—minor disputes about a village or about a mile here or there or whether the middle of a river is the frontier or the side of the river—and it seems to me really most deplorable that in matters of this kind there should be these border conflicts and intermittent firing all the time. However, I shall not go into this matter further. I hope that our meeting—the meeting with the Prime Minister of Pakistan—would at any rate lead to the ending of this border trouble. I am not optimistic enough to suggest that it would lead to the solution of our major problems but I have always felt that even the solution of the major problems is helped by this solving of minor problems and creating some kind of an atmosphere of *detente* and not this continuous tension. Our difficulty in regard to Pakistan has been, as I have said previously, an unfortunate legacy, partly the legacy we have and Pakistan has, the legacy of partition and what happened after partition and what has happened to some extent before. That is a thing which was inevitable and which I believe we have lived down largely on both sides, in both countries so far as the people are concerned. But a much more dangerous thing and a much more harmful thing has been the legacy in Pakistan of what they inherited from the old Muslim League, the legacy of hatred, the legacy of denying everything that we might assert just for the sake of denial, the legacy of separation of the two nations and all that. And that is the real trouble; not, if I may say so, even major questions like Kashmir or canal waters or rehabilitation and all that, big as they are because you cannot approach

these questions or go anywhere towards their solution when you have to come up against this solid wall of violent hatred which is nurtured and kept up in the press and speeches of their leading men. I do not know whether it is quite justified but still to indicate just how this thing is kept up I should like to read to this House a report of a speech delivered by a very prominent member of the Muslim League of Pakistan. He is not in the Cabinet, that is true, but he is a leader of one of the major parties there; in fact, the party that played such a big part in bringing about Pakistan and which has for a long time controlled the governments there and a party which may still control the governments again. This is the back-ground we have to deal with. This was a speech delivered, I believe, in the Assembly there of West Pakistan by Mian Mumtaz Daulatana, the Muslim League leader. The question before the Assembly was that the House do set up a Business Advisory Committee on the model of the Committee in the Indian Lok Sabha. It was a very businesslike proposition, a very simple proposition. Mr. Daulatana opposed this. He said that "it was a shameful attitude to refer to the Indian practice as an example to be followed in Pakistan. Pakistan was achieved by the opposition of the Muslims to the traditions of the majority of the people of India. We must stick to it and even if any good thing comes from India we should not accept it. There are people who go to India and bring back articles from India and feel proud of it. Even if my sister goes to India and brings back some Banarsi saree, I will be ashamed to call her my sister." Somewhere else he said that it was their duty to hate everything Indian. Now, it is no laughing matter when a great party is governed by this outlook and one can understand the difficulties that arise in coming to an agreement with a country, the leaders of which approach these Indo-Pakistan questions in this light. I do not mean to say that every leader does so but there is no doubt that one of the governing attitudes in Pakistan has been

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

this which a very prominent authority of the Muslim League has stated in his speech—just sheer hatred and animosity against everything India. And as I said on a previous occasion, because of this I have had often enough a feeling of frustration as to how to get over these difficulties. Hon. Members, I realise, by putting questions and supplementaries and otherwise themselves express their anger and irritation at the various things that happen. We all of us share that occasionally but the fact of the matter is that there can be only one thing that can reasonably, logically and sensibly be aimed at by us and that is some solution of these problems ultimately and friendly and co-operative relations with Pakistan, because of a variety of reasons, because we cannot do away with geography—we and they are neighbours—because we cannot do away with history, with all our past traditions and other things. We have to aim at that. That does not mean that we give up any principle that we stand for or any vital interest that we stand for. That is not the way to gain anyone's friendship—by showing weakness and surrendering on a vital point, but holding to everything vital and important, nevertheless, never going anywhere near this attitude of hatred that is exhibited in Pakistan towards India, I hope that the recent occurrences in West Asia which have had a lesson for many Western countries will also have a lesson for our neighbour country in the sense that it is not by negative policies that one can achieve anything whether in foreign affairs or in anything.

The Baghdad Pact is supposed to continue without Baghdad. I do not quite know what it is but the whole inception and conception of the Baghdad Pact was based on unreality, based on forgetting and ignoring the great forces, the great ferments in Asia today and merely thinking in terms of a certain substratum of rulers and a small group at the top and coming to agreements with them. And so suddenly you find that the very basis of the Baghdad Pact is gone; that is,

Baghdad and Iraq dropped out of it more or less and as I said, I hope that all those concerned with the Baghdad Pact will profit by that not only in the narrow terms of Western Asia but in the larger terms of looking at things as they are and not as they want them to be. It is not much good framing our policies on make-believe, and that has often been done. It is true that when strong and powerful countries make policies, even if they may be based on erroneous assumptions, they have their effect. Now, I referred to the Baghdad Pact just now. In spite of this hard blow to it, there was a meeting of the Pact countries recently in London and faith in respect of that which had ceased to be Baghdad Pact was affirmed with vigour. I can have no grievance in any person or country affirming his or its faith in anything; I am concerned with my country affirming its faith in the right thing but it seems to me extraordinary that this military approach to a problem, whether it is through the Baghdad Pact or through the SEATO, should be persisted in. I am not saying for a moment that the military approach can be given up in this world completely. I am not saying that. I am not speaking like a pacifist. But I do submit that trying to understand the world's problems in terms of military power and trying to solve them only in terms of military power has failed and is doomed to failure and a weak country in Asia will stand up, and India will stand up, and has shown that it can stand up, in the past, to military might and has not surrendered, and that lesson is learnt by others. And against this rising tide of nationalism and all those forces that had been suppressed for a century or more, it is not a wise thing or a profitable thing merely to put up military powers and military solutions. Now, one thing I may mention in connection with the Baghdad Pact, something that has not been made quite clear, but it appeared from various announcements that additional assurances have been given by those members of the Baghdad Pact about coming to each other's rescue in case something happened. It is not quite clear what that something

is. Previously it was said that the Baghdad Pact, as the SEATO, was meant to face the challenge of what is called international communism or any communist attack from the north. How far it succeeded in doing that, I do not know. My own reading of events in the past few years is that the Baghdad Pact was remarkably successful in encouraging and helping the very forces that it was trying to suppress and restrain. However, I am interested naturally to know what the present position of these assurances is, not from the point of view of communism and anti-communism, but because it has been our misfortune to have to deal with this question in another aspect; that is, Pakistan our neighbour country with whom we want to be friendly is not only a part of the Baghdad Pact and gets thereby the help and assurance and backing of some of the most powerful nations in the world and thereby Pakistan itself perhaps is prevented from adopting that friendly attitude to us or that attitude to come to terms with us which it otherwise might, but also there is the other question of the supply of large quantities of military equipment. A question was put here a little while ago about any foreign bases in Pakistan, and the Pakistan Government has denied that. Whether they are foreign bases or not, and even if we accept the Pakistan Government's denial, the fact is that the military equipment of Pakistan has grown and grown, that vast airfields have been built all over. Whether you call them foreign or domestic—you call them what you like—they are there. They are built there. And all this arming of Pakistan is matter of some concern to us. Why? Pakistan is an independent country. We have no right to interfere with what it chooses to do, but it becomes a matter of concern to us, and that arming is accompanied with this background which was exhibited in the speech of Mr. Daultana, which I have just read to this House. Because the quintessence of hatred for India plus accumulation of arms may lead to bad results; that is a matter of concern to us.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Then what are we to do?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Exactly. We shall do what we are doing and we shall not get excited like sometimes the hon. Member gets excited, because that does not help at all in considering any question. Strong speeches do not either from a military or peaceful point of view solve the problem.

Now, while in Western Asia politically and militarily the position is somewhat cooler, in Eastern Asia we have signs of fresh activity and in the last few days it appears that the islands of Quemoy and Matsu off the coast of China had been heavily bombarded from the Chinese mainland. The House will remember these islands are very near the coast of China. You can see them, I believe, from the coast and naturally the occupation of these islands by the Formosa authorities is a constant matter of friction.

So, this is the position in so far as the major events in the world are concerned. We have no particular solution to offer to those problems. When they affect us, we take some action; when they affect others, wherever possible we try to help to find a solution. For instance, in this matter, in the United Nations General Assembly we were helpful, I am glad to say, in the final solution being found in the way it was found. We have felt all along that a loud and aggressive attitude is not helpful, nor is it dignified and normally we function, therefore, quietly and rather modestly. I believe we have achieved some success from that and I believe that the world has come to recognize not only the virtue of the basic policies in regard to international affairs that we pursue—which we sometimes call the "Panchsheel", but also the manner of pursuing it. I do not mean to say that we have not made mistakes or we do not sometimes err. We do that. But we want to strive at least to think on those principles and act up to them. It is obvious that a country's authority

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

and influence is largely conditioned by that country's internal strength, domestic strength. If that domestic strength is considerable, well, it can speak with a firm voice. Otherwise, its voice is not listened to. When I said domestic strength, I was not thinking merely in terms of arms or financial strength, because we have neither. But strength means other things too. And it is because to some extent people in other countries have realised that we do possess some kind of strength, in spite of our numerous weaknesses, and some kind of integrity of policy, that some credit has come to us from other countries and our voice is sometimes listened to with a measure of respect.

Sir, I do not wish to take up the time of the House at this stage much because we have not too much time and I should like to hear hon. Members on this question and profit by what they say, and finally, if necessary, to have my say again. I beg to move this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

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

I have received notice of an amendment. Do you move it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Yes, Sir. I move:

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

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

(i) Government should take note of the stationing of warships of certain foreign powers in Singapore and in the Indian Ocean as well as similar other hostile activities designed to threaten the peace and security of India and other countries of this region; and.

(ii) Government, while seeking solution of the border problems between India and Pakistan through negotiations and defending the territorial integrity of India against every attack, should take due note of all provocations and instigations behind them'."

(This amendment also stood in the name of Dr. R. B. Gour).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Motion and the amendment are before you. I think you can sit, if you want, till half-past five or six and tomorrow morning, the Prime Minister will reply. (To the Prime Minister). Is it all right for you after question-hour?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, you can have about 5½ hours today, from now on, from 12-30 to 6-00, cutting your lunch-hour. But I do hope that you will remember the words which he has used—"Aggressive words are sometimes not very dignified"—and you will talk in very quiet dignified way on this important topic. Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thank you very much for the admonition, for the advice, that you have given. But only you forget, I believe, or perhaps it was not in your mind, that I am not a diplomat nor the Prime Minister of this country. We speak from a particular side representing the harsh feelings of the common man—the workers and the peasants. I would, therefore, be forgiven if I try to reflect that sentiment in my speech. It will be for the Prime Minister to couch them into courteous diplomatic language and above all, put them into action.

Only a few weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, we were almost on the brink of a war. Nobody knew what would happen. Everything seemed to be so uncertain and menacing. Fortunately, that immediate danger has been averted, not merely because the aggressor

powers—Britain and the United States of America—have known how to behave and not to misbehave, but also because the combined moral and material power of the peace-loving States and people went into action and prevented aggressive actions on the part of the United States of America and Britain. Mr. Chairman, these are the two lines of international development. On the one hand, we have these imperialist powers launching aggression, in violation of the United Nations Charter and defying all canons of civilised behaviour, against two small countries, with the object of suppressing their nationalism. On the other hand, we have the spectacle of the socialist countries and uncommitted nations like India, Indonesia, Burma and others and the peoples of the world crying a halt to this aggression. And it is a matter of the greatest satisfaction that we have succeeded—the people of the world have succeeded—in stalling that aggressive design. It is not that we are out of danger yet, but the United Nations Resolution at a special session has been a tremendous achievement for the progressive forces. It has been an achievement in the sense that it has stalled the plans of the aggressors; it has been an achievement in the sense that even the plans that President Eisenhower spelled out in his speech before the Assembly would not be easy to implement for him today, in view of this Resolution of the United Nations and it only shows what moral bankruptcy the imperialist powers have reached. With their high hands tainted with crime, they had to submit to the will of the people in accepting the United Nations Resolution. All glory to those people who have fought magnificently in this crucial struggle in defence of peace and freedom!

But, Mr. Chairman, I think that a word of caution is needed because the United Nations Resolution does not lay down for the immediate withdrawal of the forces from Jordan and the Lebanon. Of course, it accepts it in principle, and promises that thing. But at the same time, it appears that these

aggressive powers are on the lookout for pleas and justifications in order to remain there as long as possible. Why then, even after the election of the new President in the Lebanon, the United States should not pull out its forces from that country? I cannot understand it, because it is well known that the President-elect has himself expressed that these forces have got to get out of the Lebanon. Well, as far as Jordan is concerned, the forces are there somehow or other to prop up a tottering regime. Here is the *New York Times* which says:

“In Jordan, King Hussein clung to his shaky throne thanks chiefly to British Army support.”

Well, this is what one of the accomplices of those people in that colossal crime has to say about Britain regarding that landing in Jordan. They are clinging there and they would like to cling to their booty as long as possible because they never change their policy. Therefore, it would be necessary today to work not only at the Government level but also otherwise, so that we can secure the immediate expulsion of the aggressive forces. I am glad that the Prime Minister has categorically declared against this aggression. Once the forces are vacated, I would like to know what steps will be taken in order to ensure that the United Nations Resolution is not bypassed, but implemented adequately and effectively.

As far as Arab nationalism is concerned, I agree with the Prime Minister—and everybody will agree with him—that it is an irresponsible force in the world today. Nothing on earth can defeat that force. Attempts were made at the time of the Suez crisis. Then there was a conspiracy against Syria by Turkey and the United States in collusion, last year. Here again was an adventure against Iraq. All these attempts have failed. Therefore, Sir, I consider this to be a great event in the life of our people and of every people striving to make this world worth living. Sir, we are particularly

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

grateful to those patriots and soldiers who have carried through this glorious revolution in Iraq which has brought down the shameful regime of Nuri, which has taken Baghdad out of the Baghdad Pact, which has now brought Iraq on the side of peace and freedom. It is a great event. We are particularly gratified because the Baghdad Pact, let it not be forgotten, was directed against us. It provided a link between the Karachi authorities and the N.A.T.O. Powers. As you know, Sir, plans were there to build roads between Karachi and Baghdad. I would like, in this connection, to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he knows anything about the report that some Baghdad documents had fallen into the hands of the revolutionaries. These give a list of names and particulars of those agents of American imperialism in the various countries, agents of Baghdad Powers. If it is so, we should be interested in knowing some names, at least as to who those people in India are. I do not think, Sir, India has been completely immune from that contamination. On the contrary, I have a fear that there are some such people and it is necessary for us to find them out.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Then again, here is the West Asian problem. I need not go into the problem of colonialism. That is why the imperialists resort to the course of plunder and war. They want to invade Iraq and ultimately the United Arab Republic with a view to crushing Arab nationalism there, so that they could cling to their oil empires. As you know, Sir, 60 per cent. of the oil resources are in the hands of the imperialist powers and they have got yet to be liberated from them. Then, Sir, it is also one of their plans to utilise that area as a base for attacks against other countries, for terrorising other countries and intimidating them. This is yet another plan of theirs. Then, of course, with this is bound up the question of economic recession in the U.S.A. Now I need

not go into this question very much, because it has been clearly pointed out that the enlarged U.S. expenditure is seen not only in terms of defence, but it is also a way of rescuing its economy from what otherwise may become a crisis as bad as that of the thirties. That is how they view this matter.

Then, Sir, a leading American columnist, Dorothy Thompson, wrote an article in the paper in which it has been stated as follows:

"Actually, only the U.S. has any economic interest in its cold war continuation. War and preparation for war (called Peace and Deterrent) has become the greatest single American business."

Sir, I want to stress this fact to the House that as American recession gathers momentum, there will be greater likelihood of adventures on the part of the United States in order to get out of the mess into which their military economy has landed them today. Therefore, Sir, we must always be on the alert and we must always be vigilant. We must always be ready to meet aggression by the moral and material forces of peace and freedom.

In this context, Sir, I should like the Prime Minister to take certain concrete measures both in the United Nations Assembly as well as outside. In the United Nations Assembly some of the Afro-Asian powers, as we know, are on the side of peace, and there are ten socialist countries. They generally constitute almost the majority. I think, Sir, that better understanding, co-operation and co-ordination should be developed among them in order to see that the United Nations becomes more effective and is not developed into an instrument for covering up American aggression. Outside also we have to consider some proposals. We have to develop greater co-ordination and co-operation among the different peace-loving nations. Panchsheel has to be defended and it has to be defended against any calumny. It seems that

there are some hon. Members somewhere who think that Panchsheel was born in sin. I do not have any exact idea about their sense of virtues or sin, but it seems to me that according to them nothing which is not born in the State Department of the United States of America is virtuous. Now, Sir, I leave them alone because theirs is a solitary voice, and such voices cause more amusement than anything else.

Then, Sir, let me come to another aspect of the problem. There is this question of U.S. warships in Singapore. I would have very much liked to mention the name, but I think we have to be courteous, and according to our rules we cannot mention these names in our resolutions. But here you will find, Sir, that in the last few days eight warships have appeared on the Indian Ocean and some of them have landed their troops also in Singapore—I think about 2,000 troops. Here is what is stated in *The Washington Post*. Let the hon. Members note it. It says:

“Serious consideration is being given within the Navy Department to the creation of an Indian Ocean Fleet to provide a mobile stabilising force able to act quickly in another Lebanon-type situation.”

And the *Post* despatch added:

“Such a force could go a long way towards filling the power vacuum that now exists in the Indian Ocean and be able to come to the aid of any American allies or friends who might want assistance against direct or indirect aggression.”

Sir, this is almost a reproduction of that notorious Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine and almost the same plan which brought the world to the brink of war in the West-Asian crisis. Therefore, Sir, are we to sit with folded hands or must we take some serious note of such developments? I hope, Sir, that a few million dollars that have come here should not blind us to the grim reality that is facing us. The whole

thing clearly directed against India, Indonesia and other freedom-loving countries. They want to develop Singapore against these freedom-loving countries. As far as Indonesia is concerned, it is well-known how the United States are backing the rebellious activities and supplying material to the rebels. Singapore and other imperialist possessions are going to be used as a base for attacking the Republic of Indonesia. We know what is going to happen. Then Sir, as far as India is concerned, here is this blackmailing and intimidation. These things are unequivocally pronounced, and therefore we must take note of them. Sir, I do not see any reason why, when the SEATO forces are so directly linked, we should stick to that infamous agreement which allows Gurkha soldiers to be exported across our frontiers. I say, scrap that agreement at once, throw it in the dust-bin, it has no place anywhere here; it is no good saying that that agreement has got to be honoured. Great Britain has violated, as far as India is concerned, every international principle and every moral consideration that governs the Commonwealth relations. It has humiliated and insulted India at every step, and still we have got this unfortunate spectacle of our Prime Minister standing by that agreement. I know that he does not feel happy about it. Therefore I would like him to be happy by abrogating that agreement and by denouncing it publicly. There shall be no passage to any potential soldiers across India who go to the join the SEATO and participate in their aggressive designs. That is my suggestion here, Sir.

Then, Sir, about other things I would like to say that our Prime Minister sometimes takes very faltering steps. I am not happy about the manner in which Prime Minister spoke of the American intervention in Indonesia. I thought he would speak much more sharply and strongly. And I do not think that the response to President Soekarno's appeal in that grim hour was adequate. Therefore, I should like the Government to take some firm stand, because if it is Indonesia today,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

tomorrow it is going to be India. Appeasement does not solve our real problems or our connivance does not make them behave well. On the contrary, they get some encouragement to repeat those things. Therefore, Sir, some amount of thinking is very necessary about this matter in order to take a firmer stand against aggression in this region.

Then, Sir, I would just like to mention something about the Geneva Agreement. It is clear that this agreement is sought to be violated and undermined by the U.S. authorities. South Viet-Nam is being developed as a separate State. Elections have been frustrated. They were to be held two years ago. Now, we find that South Viet-Nam is being equipped for aggressive actions. And let it be known, Sir, that South Viet-Nam stands with the United States of America and aggressive actions have been indulged in by South Viet-Nam under American instigation against Cambodia. Again, Sir, we know that the International Commission under our chairmanship has permitted the replacement of French armaments by the South Viet-Nam authorities, which means in other words the introduction of heavy armaments of U.S.A. into that region. I am inclined to think that this is very wrong and this goes against the letter and spirit of the Geneva Agreement and indeed it seeks to undermine its very juridical foundation. My regret is that the Government of India supported that resolution which was brought in by Canada. There are three parties there—Canada, Poland and India. I thought that India would be able to see through the game that was being played and take proper steps in the matter. Therefore, I would like the Government to take note of all these things. Then, Sir, Formosa has been equipped with nuclear weapons as other countries are being equipped, and let us not forget, Sir, that this is all being done with the sole object of advancing their aggressive design in the South-East region of Asia. Now, Sir, I do not know why the Laotian

Commission should be wound up. I cannot understand why the Indian Government should take the view that these functions of such Commissions should be suspended. These three Commissions form an integrated whole and I suggest that no Commission should be wound up till the entire problem has been satisfactorily solved. I should like to know from the Prime Minister what progress has been made in the implementation of the Geneva Agreements on Indo-China, whether they relate to Viet-Nam, Cambodia, Laos. I would like to know from the Prime Minister a little more about these things. It seems that the Americans are interested in winding up these Commissions in order that there is no longer any vigilance exercised against their aggressive activities so that they can get on with their offensive and aggressive activities.

About the Algerian problem I don't like to say very much because we know what problems the Algerians are facing. Today after De Gaulle's assumption of office, the military action against the Algerians has been intensified and there is no sign of abatement. On the contrary; what De Gaulle's draft Constitution promises to these overseas possessions, far from giving them independence, is integration within the French Empire. I would perhaps like to say a word about France. Now, France we are interested in, not because we are particularly interested in some people's internal affairs, but it is clear that De Gaulle is aiming at expansion of the Empire, with a view to paving the way for the emergence of Fascism in that country. De Gaulle is a personal dictator and he wants to establish his personal dictatorship. If Fascism triumphs in France, it is not merely the French people who would suffer but the peace and freedom of the world would be in great jeopardy and the forces of aggression and war in Europe will be strengthened. Therefore, we are vitally concerned. We had known in the years before, how the

advent of Hitler in Germany brought the Second World War. We have known how the Fascists, when they come to power, indulge in war-like activities and go in for war. Now I think we should take these danger signals from France. It is clear De Gaulle is biding his time and the moment he gets his Constitution passed by the referendum of October, 5—I hope it will not be possible for him to get this done—he will proceed to establish in France an unfettered and unbridled Fascist regime because his make-up is clearly that of Hitler's.

Then with regard to Cyprus, the Government stand is unfortunate. The India Government should come out sharply against the Cyprus policy of the British which has been rejected by all Cypriot patriots. The British believe in 'divide and rule' and they want that the Cypriot Greeks and Turks to be divided so that they can hang on to their empire. I think the Government of India should come out sharply against it and reflect their policy in support of the freedom of Cyprus in the U.N. Assembly. I don't know why the Government of India is avoiding a correct, bold and forthright stand in the U.N. Assembly whenever the Cyprus question is brought in there.

Let me come to the border incidents. This has been troubling us over the past few weeks—there is no doubt about it—and they present a serious menace. Incessant firings have taken place from across the border and there have been intermittent raids on our soil, the *modus operandi* of all that happened over the past few weeks will show that they are premeditated and planned. They are not casual chance actions carried out by certain wild military personnel or officials. They are planned; they are acting on certain orders. It is quite clear. Therefore we must go a little deeper into them and I would not like to be satisfied, like the hon. Deputy

Minister for External Affairs, with a statement from the Pakistan authorities. First of all, these actions seem to be politically motivated in the sense that they want to divert the attention of the people of Pakistan from certain local internal problems. Whenever they are in trouble, the Karachi authorities go in for diversion. They want to create hysteria, some kind of political hysteria, in the country in order to cover their sins and divert public attention and sidetrack the issues. It seems that the coming general elections have also got something to do with them. They are frightened of their own people and they want to mislead them and rouse their passions and want them to blindly follow them politically. Therefore, it is intended against the democratic forces in Pakistan. I say this because when I criticise the Pakistan Government, I have in mind always the people of Pakistan who cherish freedom, who love peace and who would like to be friends with the Indian people.

Another important thing is U.S. inspiration and instigation of these things should be understood. There is a tendency on the part of the Government not to see this. Mr. Morarji Desai may go to U.S. as many times as he likes, Mr. Krishnamachari may have failed in some of his missions, but I don't see why we should not face the facts that but for the U.S. instigation and support, but for the piling up of armaments—destroyers, cruisers, aircrafts and all that—which are being sent in abundant quantities to Pakistan by U.S.A., the Pakistan authorities would have found it extremely hazardous and certainly profitless to engage in such an adventure against any neighbouring country like India. It is quite clear. We must see this. It is not surprising that these raids are taking place or these firings are taking place on our border. The *New York Times* of August 19 wrote in its editorial as follows and

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

those who are fond of Western democracies may please note it.

"Prime Minister Nehru used troops to seize the Princely States of Hyderabad, Junagadh and Kashmir. The world will judge their present words in the light of their deeds."

This is what the dollar patrons have to say about you. Everybody knows that such editorials in the *New York Times* are written after being tipped by the State Department. Now such propaganda has been launched against India. The Prime Minister is being called an aggressor and yet we find some people praising the U.S. democracy and what not. This is a very important factor. There may be many things that stand in the way but the most important thing that we must take note of and what stands in the way of Indo-Pakistan friendly relation is this constant American provocation, this constant American instigation and the piling up of armaments in Pakistan by the U.S. Withdraw U.S. from this picture. Tomorrow there will be friendly relations between our two countries. Therefore in our anger, let us not forget the enemy that is behind these actions. We must see this factor, this American intervention in Pakistan politics, and the part it has played. I would like hon. Members' attention to be drawn to it. I would only hope that we would not be lulled—as it seems some would like us to be—in favour of the U.S. just because of some dollars we have received. It is necessary for the Government to tell the country as to what is happening on the other side of the border and who are responsible for this great military build-up. Serious allegations and statements have been made by the Soviet Union about nuclear weapons. I am not satisfied with the answer that has been given. Even in their reply to that statement, the Pakistan Government has admitted a powerful

military build-up in that country and Shrimati Menon need not be so emphatic in her answer on the basis of a denial by the Pakistan Government. Therefore, when the Prime Minister meets the Prime Minister of Pakistan, these things should be kept in view. The right course is of course negotiations, peaceful settlement. We cannot quarrel. War or war-like action will offer no solution whatsoever. We have to settle our problems peacefully, no matter how long we have to wait, no matter what efforts are to be made. We must try by peaceful efforts all the time because that is the only way to the solution of the outstanding problems between our two countries. Therefore, while undoubtedly defending the frontier, while protesting against such attacks, every avenue of solution of the problem peacefully must be sought and here the Prime Minister is quite right when he emphasises that. We know that it is in the interests of American instigators in Pakistan and of imperialist powers to retain the tension between our two countries, that path we shall never take, no matter what the provocation is. Even if Pakistan hands handle the guns, we know that these guns are American-made and behind these guns stand American imperialists whose dastardly plan is against our country brethren. We can never forget that. Therefore, in directing our efforts, I think we should always keep that factor in view. I hope the talks will be successful. I hope efforts will be made in that direction for bringing about a solution of the problem peacefully. Here I would like only to offer one criticism. I think the Government of India was a little complacent in the beginning. Security measures were not adequate. They must realise that Singapore, Indo-China, Indonesia, Pakistani firing—all these form part of the 1 p.m. American Cold War against India. They are by no means isolated actions. You must try everywhere and wherever the enemy raises his hand we must strike down that hand and for that we must be prepared.

Let me now come to the problem of disarmament. That is an important problem. Nothing could be done in the Disarmament Sub-Committee and in that Commission that they had, because the American would not allow anything to be done. The summit talks were opposed and everyone knows how the Americans are still against the summit talks. They do not want to sit across the table. Here I only like to point out the magnitude of the situation. According to important sources like the *New York Times* and similar other papers, one hundred thousand million dollars are spent every year on weapons and armies in the world today, that is to say, ten thousand crores of dollars are spent every year according to them. And some 18 to 20 million men are under arms. And the NATO countries alone have got 5.5 million men under arms. This is the position today. A great armada is there and the arms race is going on. And then there are the nuclear tests. The Soviet Union has suspended the nuclear tests unilaterally. One would have thought that the response would come, but then the United States of America and Britain are continuing these tests even at this hour. We are told that on the 31st October they will suspend the tests, but there again, in the same breath some conditions are laid down. I do not know what will happen. What is important for us to ensure is that these weapons are prohibited, that these weapons are completely destroyed and to that end we must work. I think that for solving the problem of disarmament and similar other major problems of the world situation, the importance of the summit conference remains and we should work for a summit conference. India had been invited by Khrushchev to the proposed summit conference. But some people here feel upset and perturbed. They called it patronising. When other countries call us those people feel upset. I do not know what kind of melancholia such gentlemen suffer from, because we think that this is an acknowledgment of our strength. When we are invited, it is an acknow-

ledgment of the role we are playing in the world and it is a matter of profound pride and honour to be regarded a great power in the world and to be invited to the summit conference. But some people are upset. I do not know how to talk of them. It is for our friends there to talk of them. I say, it is not patronising. India is a great country and India's part has been acknowledged and they want India's co-operation and friendship in solving the great problems that humanity is facing today.

Sir, I would like to suggest some steps, as far as I can understand the world situation, and in many matters, my understanding differs somewhat from that of the Government, although we agree in so far as we take a common stand against aggression. But it is essential to understand who are the aggressors and who are working in self-defence and in defence of peace and freedom. There is a tendency sometimes to equate the two and I think that equation is bad, because we must not all the time go on irritating our friends and we must prevent any misrepresentation of our friends before the eyes of the world. It is quite clear that the socialist countries are on the side of peace and are defending freedom. Take for instance the joint communique issued by Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev. What does it say? It is a clear-cut, firm and strong stand against all aggression. The imperialists have been told in the plainest possible language that if they dare to launch an aggression against the people of the free countries, then they have to meet a mighty challenge coming from that quarter. We should be happy for it. It is not cold war. It is self-defence. It is defence of civilisation, it is defence of freedom, and it has given us sustenance, it has given us courage. We must develop co-operation with all peace-loving countries. We must stand together in our efforts for the preservation of peace, with all peace-loving peoples in all the places. The

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] initiative should be taken to call an Afro-Asian conference of powers, because since the Bandung Conference many things have happened. What is most important is that we should set up the necessary arrangement so that we can meet any challenge, so that we can bring into operation concerted and united action of all like-minded peace-loving nations. Unfortunately, there is no such arrangement. The United Nations alone is not suitable for that. For one thing, the U.N. is influenced by the Western Powers. Secondly, China is not in the U.N. China should be there and as everybody knows, her place is there. But only the U.S.A. has prevented it. As long as China is not there, I take it that it will be all the more necessary to develop certain activities outside the United Nations to meet aggression or challenge.

Then we should take action against the stationing of naval units in the Indian Ocean. I do not know how action will be taken, but let the voice of India be raised. Let her anger express itself against this dastardly and hostile action against India. It is possible to do so. Let the Prime Minister explore the possibilities of taking it up in the U.N. or otherwise through the diplomatic channels. One thing we must make clear to the United States of America. We consider that the advent of the naval units in the Indian Ocean is an act intimately directed against us and we are not going to put up with such acts. We should fully support the Indonesian freedom struggle and it should be given full assistance. Every assistance and help should be given to that country.

Sir, vigilance is essential in these matters. The Prime Minister referred to the real strength of the people. We agree and we are conscious that we do not have the material and military power or the financial power. But we have got the moral force of 380 millions of people and should generate that force and bring this force into action. It was most disgusting when I found

the All India Radio black-out all broadcasts about the activities of the people, the workers, the peasants, Congressmen and others, against the aggression in West-Asia. Sir, we want that the people should be apprised of the situation. The Prime Minister should tell the people, the Congress party and other parties, to join and rouse the people. That is how you enlighten the people, how you keep the people in the state of constant political and moral mobilisation that we want. Unfortunately, there are people in the administration and in Government service who love America more than they love peace, who hate the Communists more than they love peace and freedom. These are the people who are not interested in peace. I gave one example of a Secretary who wrote an article against friendly countries and who went to the length of slandering one of the parties publicly, in violation of all rules. Such things are happening.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to some of them. In Calcutta, there was a Congress procession when Shri Govind Ballabh Pant went there, and in that procession Kuomintang Chinese were brought in, well-known Kuomintang Chinese who shout about Chiang Kai Shek. They were also in that procession. I think the Congress is not yet in such a bad state that they have to seek assistance from the flotsams and jetsams of the Kuomintang regime. But this is what happened. The Prime Minister's attention must have been drawn to this matter. We know that in Calcutta these things were done. I do not say that the Kuomintang people are joining the Congress. The Prime Minister would not allow them. But the Prime Minister, perhaps, is not vigilant and some of his followers in Calcutta, having been isolated, seek support in the Kuomintang Chinese to join in the procession. This is another thing worthy of note.

Sir, I think the moral power of India has got to be fully developed. We

are a patriotic people. We have got fine traditions and party lines disappear the moment it comes to a question of peace and independence.

We have cast away party barriers and lines to mingle in a common big united concourse of Indian humanity to withstand any challenge to our freedom and oppose any challenge that comes from imperialist quarters. We are prepared for it. I know that the Congress people also feel that way. Sir, I think it will be more useful for the Congress to devote a little more time to such action. The Prime Minister thinks that we, Communists, sometimes do right things. I can tell you that we are always doing the right in such matters; only the Prime Minister sometimes recognises that we are right. That is the trouble. That exactly is the trouble. He does not recognise in time. He is always late in such matters.

Sir, I have explained the situation. I tell you that the world situation is still somewhat explosive. We are not out of danger; danger continues all the more so since American and British troops are there. I think we must take note of it. I think that we should not feel as if the war danger has completely receded. Nothing of the kind. Something had been done to halt aggression but, some other aggressive actions are taking place. In the Indian Ocean today stand the U.S. Naval Units. Tomorrow, like the Sixth Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Seventh Fleet of the U.S.A. may be moving towards the Indian territorial waters. Who knows? Could you give me any guarantee that they will not move towards our territorial waters? When we said about the American Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, people did not believe us. Turkey was developed into an agent provocateur and then all these American Naval fleet and units began to move towards West-Asia. We are almost in the firing range of the American aggressor. This is a serious matter and proper note should be taken of it.

I have placed before you, as I view it, the international situation but I speak with great optimism. It is possible for us, by our united action, by mobilising the people, by making the Government act effectively and properly, to forestall every aggressive action on the part of the imperialists and to safeguard the security and independence of our country and that of other free countries in the world.

Thank you, Sir.

شری پیر محمد خان (جموں)
ایفڈ کشمیر: مسٹر ڈیٹی چیئرمین -
انٹرنیشنل سچویشن کے متعلق جو
کچھ کہا گیا ہے اس سے یہ معلوم
ہوتا ہے کہ ایک سختی یا ایک
جنگ کا اندیشہ جو کہ کافی پیدا ہو
گیا تھا وہ کچھ کم ہو گیا ہے اور
عرب ممالک کی دانشمندی سے ایک
ایسا ریزولوشن تیار کیا گیا جس پر
کہ سب کا مکمل اتفاق ہو گیا اور
وہ پاس ہو گیا ہے - یہ بہت اچھی
چیز ہوئی ہے -

اس کے ساتھ ہی یہ جو ہمارے
فرانٹیرس پر کچھ ترائبس ہیں یا
ہوئے ہیں یا ہونے کا اندیشہ ہے اس کے
متعلق میں کچھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں -
جیسا کہ پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے اپنی
سپیچ میں کہا ہے ایک فرانٹیر وہ
بھی ہے جو کہ کشمیر کے ساتھ پاکستان
کی سیز فائر لائن ہے - تو اس لائن پر
آئے دن چھوٹے موٹے ایسے ترائبس ہرے
دھتے ہیں اور بڑی اور ناقابل برداشت
چیڑیاں بھی بعض وقت ہوتی ہیں
جیسے کہ نلدیور میں ہمارے ۶ آدمی

[شری پھر محمد خاں]

پاکستانی فائونڈنگ سے مارے گئے تھے۔ اس کے علاوہ وہاں یہ بھی تکلیفیں ہوتی ہیں کہ ہمارے ملک میں ہم چلائے جاتے ہیں اور ان سے نقصان کیا جاتا ہے۔ اس کا مطلب یہ ہوتا ہے جیسا کہ مجرموں سے معلوم ہوا ہے کہ ایک آرگنائزڈ اسکیم جس کے تحت ہمارے میں ایک فرسٹریشن پیدا کرنے کی کوشش کی جاتی ہے۔ ہماری گورنمنٹ اور ہمارے ہیڈ آف دی گورنمنٹ کی کوششوں سے اور اچھی طرح ان چیزوں کا مقابلہ کرنے کی وجہ سے یہ چیزیں روکی جاتی ہیں اور مجرموں کو پکڑا جاتا ہے۔ اس سلسلہ میں اب ایک کانسپیریسی کیس ہمارے اسٹیٹ میں ایسے آدمیوں کے خلاف چل رہا ہے جس میں کہ ۲۴ آدمی اس کیس میں ان والوے ہیں۔ یہ سب چیزیں؟ یہ سب بارڈر ٹراپلس کیوں پیدا کئے جاتے ہیں؟ جو کچھ ہم سمجھتے ہیں اس کے ہم دو ہی مطلب سمجھتے ہیں۔ ایک مطلب تو یہ ہے کہ پبلک کی توجہ رولنگ پارٹی کی طرف سے جب ہٹانے کی ضرورت ہوتی ہے اور جب وہاں رولنگ پارٹی کسی خطرہ میں پڑتی ہے تو پھر ایسی چیز شروع ہو جاتی ہے۔ اس کا ایک اور بھی مطلب ہو سکتا ہے کہ ان بارڈر ٹراپلس کو بڑھا کر ان کو کچھ بڑے اسکیم میں پیدا کر کے پھر

یو۔ این۔ او۔ میں اور دنیا میں شور مچایا جائے کہ ہم پر حملہ ہونے والا ہے۔ بڑی لڑائی چھڑنے والی ہے یا چھڑ گئی ہے اور جلدی کوئی یونائٹڈ نیشنل فرسٹریشن بھیجی جائے یا کوئی ایسی چیز پیدا کی جائے۔ تو یہ مطلب بھی ہو سکتا ہے۔ ہم یونائٹڈ نیشنل کی تعریف کرتے ہیں کہ انہوں نے سویز کیڈال ٹراپل کے وقت یا ابھی جو مڈل ایسٹ میں ٹراپل ہوا ہے اس وقت کچھ ایسا ایکشن لیا جس سے وہ ٹراپل ختم بھی ہو گئے اور اس کا انجام بھی اچھا ہوا۔ جہاں بھی ایگریشن ہوا یونائٹڈ نیشنل نے بڑا اچھا اقدام کیا۔ مگر ہم حیران ہیں کہ ہمارے ملک پر جب ایگریشن ہوا ہے جس کو کہ دس یا گیارہ سال گذر چکے ہیں اور ہم یونائٹڈ نیشنل کو یہ چیز بتا رہے ہیں کہ اس ایگریشن کو ختم کیا جائے تو بھی ہماری طرف ابھی تک کیوں توجہ نہیں ہوئی ہے۔ ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ اب یونائٹڈ نیشنل اس ایگریشن کی طرف بھی توجہ کرے جو کہ پاکستان نے ہمارے ملک پر کیا ہوا ہے اور اس کو کہہ دے کہ وہ ہمارا ملک خالی کرے۔ ہمارے ملک کا مطلب یہ نہیں ہے کہ صرف کشمیر کا ملک بلکہ ہندوستان کا ملک۔ تاکہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان میں اس کے بعد اچھے تعلقات پیدا

ہوں اور کئی تکلیفوں سے دونوں ملک
بچیں -

مسٹر ڈپٹی چیئرمین - میں
اس ہاؤس کی وساطت سے سیکوریٹی
کونسل کو کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ اب
سیریس ہو کر اس معاملہ پر توجہ
دے اور اس ایکریشن کو ختم کرے -
اس کے علاوہ جو کچھ انٹرنیشنل
پالیسی گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی ہے
میں اس کی تائید کرتا ہوں -

†[آئی پور محمد خان (جम्मू اور
کاشمیر) : میسٹر ڈیپوٹی چیئرمین ! इंटर-
नेशनल मिच्युएशन के मुतल्लिक जो कुछ
कहा गया है उससे यह मालूम होता है कि
एक मल्ली या एक जंग का अन्देशा जोकि
काफी पैदा हो गया था वह कुछ कम हो गया
है और अब मुमालक की दानिशमन्दी
से एक ऐसा रेजोल्यूशन तैयार किया गया
जिस पर कि सब का मुकम्मल इत्फाक हो
गया और वह पास हो गया है यह बहुत अच्छी
चीज हुई है ।

इसके साथ ही यह जो हमारे फ्रन्टियर्स
पर कुछ ट्रबल है या हुए हैं या होने का
अन्देशा है उसके मुतल्लिक मैं कुछ कहना
चाहता हूं । जैसा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब
ने अपनी स्पीच में कहा है एक फ्रन्टियर
वह भी है जो कि काश्मीर के साथ पाकि-
स्तान की सीमा फायर लाइन है । तो इस
लाइन पर आये दिन छोटे मोटे ऐसे ट्रबल्स
होते रहते हैं और बड़ी और नाकाबिले
बर्दाश्त चीजें भी बाज बक्त होती हैं जैसे कि
नन्दपुर में हमारे छः आदमी पाकिस्तानी
फायरिंग से मारे गये थे इसके इलावा वहां
यह भी तकलीफें होती हैं कि हमारे मुल्क

में बम चलाये जाते हैं और उनसे नुकसान
किया जाता है इसका मतलब यह होता
है जैसा कि मुजरिमों से मालूम हुआ कि एक
औरनाइड स्क्रीम है जिसके तहत हमारे
में एक फ्रस्टेशन पैदा करने की कोशिश की
जाती है । हमारी गवर्नमेंट और हमारे हेड
आफ दी गवर्नमेंट की कोशिशों से और अच्छी
तरह से उन चीजों का मुकाबिला करने की
वजह से यह चीजें रोकी जाती हैं और मुजरिमों
को पकड़ा जाता है । इसी सिलसिला में अब
एक कान्सपिरेसी केस हमारे स्टेट में ऐसे
आदमियों के खिलाफ चल रहा है जिसमें कि
चौबीस आदमी इस केस में इनवोल्व्ड हैं ।
यह सब चीजें यह सब बोर्डर ट्रबल्स क्यों
पैदा किये जाते हैं ? जो कुछ हम समझते हैं
उसके हम दो ही मतलब समझे हैं । एक
मतलब तो यह है कि पब्लिक की तबज्जह
रूनिंग पार्टी की तरफ से जब हटाने की
जरूरत होती है और जब वहा रूनिंग पार्टी
किसी खतरे में पड़ती है तो फिर ऐसी चीज
शुरू हो जाती है । उसका एक और भी मतलब
हो सकता है कि इन बोर्डर ट्रबल्स को बढ़ा
कर उनको कुछ बड़े स्केल में पैदा करके फिर
यू० एन० ओ० और दुनिया में शोर मचाया
जाय कि हम पर हमला होने वाला है ।
बड़ी लड़ाई छिड़ने वाली है या छिड़ गई
है और जल्दी कोई युनाइटेड नेशन्स फॉर्म
भेजी जाय या कोई ऐसी चीज पैदा की जाय
तो यह मतलब भी हो सकता है । हम
युनाइटेड नेशन्स की तारीफ करते हैं कि उन्होंने
स्वेज कैनल ट्रबल के वक्त या अभी जो
मिडिल ईस्ट में ट्रबल हुआ है उस वक्त कुछ
ऐसा एक्शन लिया जिससे कि वह ट्रबल
खत्म भी हो गये और उसका अंजाम भी
अच्छा हुआ । जहां भी एग्जेशन हुआ युनाइटेड
नेशन्स ने बड़ा अच्छा एकदम किया ।
मगर हम हैरान हैं कि हमारे मुल्क पर जब
एग्जेशन हुआ जिसको कि १० या ग्यारह
माल गुजर चुके हैं और हम युनाइटेड नेशन्स
को यह चीज बता बता कर थक चुके हैं कि
इस एग्जेशन को खत्म किया जाय तो भी

[श्री पीर मुहम्मद खान]

हमारी तरफ अभी तक क्यों तवज्जह नहीं हुई है। हम चाहते हैं कि अब युनाइटेड नेशनल इम एग्रेसन की तरफ भी तवज्जह करे जोकि पाकिस्तान में हमारे मुल्क पर किया हुआ है और उसको कहे कि वह हमारा मुल्क खाली करे। हमारे मुल्क का मतलब यह नहीं है कि भिर्फ काश्मीर का मुल्क बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान का मुल्क ताकि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में इसके बाद अच्छे ताल्लुकान पैदा हों और कई तकनीकी से दोनों मुल्क बचें।

मिस्टर डिप्टी चैयरमैन ! मैं इस हाउस की बमातन में सेक्योरिटी कौमिल को कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह अब सीरियस हो कर इस मामले पर तवज्जह दे और इम एग्रेसन को खत्म करे। इसके अलावा जो कुछ इंटर-नेशनल पालिसी गवर्नमेंट ऑफ इंडिया की है मैं उसकी तार्ईद करता हूँ।]

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I believe our foreign policy suffers from the sin of double standard. Although we are, by and large, neutral as between the two power blocs, our attitude from time to time inclines to some kind of a support of one bloc, namely the Communist bloc. We judge the acts of the democracies and the totalitarian countries by different standards. We judge the foul acts of the Western democracies rightly, but for some inscrutable reasons we do not apply the same tests to similar acts of the totalitarian countries. When the whole of Eastern Europe, Sir, is suppressed with the help of the Russian army, we have nothing to say. We all know, Sir, that Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria and East Germany have communist regimes established in these countries with the aid of the Russian bayonet. There are large Russian armies in all these countries. The recent developments in Hungary, East Germany and Poland have amply demonstrated that the communist regimes in Eastern Europe can't endure

when the Russian armies are withdrawn. But has our Government ever protested or raised its voice against the stationing of these forces in these countries? It was only when Hungary rose in revolt that our Government advocated, somewhat feebly, Sir, the withdrawal of the Russian army from Hungary. But on the whole we keep quiet about it all. When, however, the U.S. and British forces enter the Lebanon and Jordan, we raise a hue and cry—and rightly so under the circumstances—even though these forces have gone there on the invitation of the legal Governments of these countries, howsoever unpopular these may be. The only argument that can be advanced in favour of the stationing of Russian forces in the East European countries is that the Government of these countries want these forces there. But aren't these Governments sustained by the support of the Russian forces there? There never was any doubt about the unrepresentative character of these Governments. But the recent happenings have removed whatever doubt there might have been. Why don't we, I ask, Sir, shout as loudly or even feebly about the withdrawal of these forces? It may be argued that there are foreign troops in West Germany and many other countries under the influence of the West. I firmly hold that these forces also should be immediately withdrawn. But can anyone doubt that British and American forces stationed in France and West Germany are there with the consent of democratically elected Governments? The Governments in these countries do not maintain themselves in office with the support of the foreign forces. This makes a world of difference.

Sir, I should now like to say a few words about Panchsheel. The principles embodied in Panchsheel are no doubt very laudable. But has the mouthing of this principle by most of the countries influenced these countries' standards of behaviour? I do believe, Sir that Panchaheel was born, as it was said elsewhere, in sin. I have not been able to appreciate the

remark of our Prime Minister, while referring to it, that we are all born in sin and we have to try to get out of it. I believe it is necessary, Sir, to ponder over this matter deeply. The principles of Panchsheel were enunciated while according approval, in an agreement with China, to the destruction of the freedom of Tibet. Even if Panchsheel was not born in sin, this agreement, Sir, certainly was. I believe we should be somewhat ashamed of enunciating such high principles while conniving at the emasculation of a weak country by a powerful neighbour. Our friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, has said something in regard to this matter. He has ridiculed whatever has been said by somebody. He did not name him of course and it is not proper perhaps to name the person. Apparently he was referring to a speaker in the other House. But he poured ridicule on what he said. I submit, Sir, that the communist Governments try to use this Panchsheel as a cover for doing what they are doing in Eastern Europe, in Tibet and so on, and for subverting the lawful Governments in the different countries of the world. I cannot understand, Sir, the amusement which was caused to my friend by the remark made in the other House or wherever it was.

It is said, Sir, that China has for long enjoyed the rights of suzerainty over Tibet. This, in my view, is an utterly wrong argument to support what China has done to Tibet. We too had acquired certain extra-territorial rights in Tibet. Nepal too had certain extra-territorial rights. But all these rights have been given up, and rightly so. But, Sir, they have not been given up in favour of the Tibetans; they have been surrendered in favour of the rulers of China. It was only when China occupied Tibet that we saw the wisdom of abandoning those rights. Possibly we would have done it even if the Chinese were not there on the scene; I have no doubt about it. Now, if we can give up our rights which are not

based on justice and are therefore obviously unwarranted, what moral justification can there be for China's not only retaining its rights of suzerainty but extending them into rights of sovereignty. Were the Tibetan people consulted in the matter? No country can have any rights over another country against the wishes of the people of that country. But we agreed to China's exercising these rights. Well, one can say there was no point in quarrelling with China when we were unable to make any difference. I submit, Sir, that this is an approach that is neither proper nor in keeping with the high moral tone which we are so fond of adopting. We must never approve of something which is patently wrong just because we run the risk of angering some country or its Government by not doing so. This is not what the Father of the Nation taught us. But then it is unfortunately only too true that we in this country do not follow his example to-day in any way. I do not agree, Sir, that China would have become very angry if we had not supported her in the retention and extension of her rights over Tibet. We support China in many things. We have incurred the displeasure of some of the Western democracies by lending our full support to the proposal of seating China in the U.N. I believe, Sir, we have done the right thing so far as this matter is concerned. We have developed friendly relations with China to the utmost possible extent. Why should we then support China even if she is in the wrong? Why should we care unilaterally for China's friendship? Why shouldn't she also care a little for ours? I believe, Sir, this is a matter which we must consider very seriously.

Sir, Nepal also for a long time paid some kind of a tribute to China and it can be argued that China had certain rights of suzerainty over Nepal also. In fact Nepal has been shown in some maps in China as a part of China. Are we going then to sign another agreement with China

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

by which the rights of the Chinese Government would be revived and recognised by us in Nepal? Goa is claimed by the Portuguese Government as part of Metropolitan Portugal. They say this has been so for hundreds of years. Are we going to agree to this because, if we don't, this Government will be offended? Just because a country, owing to its weakness, had been dominated by another country, would it be right to recognise this domination, Sir, as something proper or as something we must not raise our voice against? We are not able to do much in Goa. We are unable to free the Goans from the barbarous rule of the Portuguese. But shall we give up our demand for the freedom of Goa for fear it would displease Portugal?

Sir, much as I regret the loss of freedom suffered by Tibet at the hands of China, I could understand the Government of India acquiescing in it on account of its weakness and its anxiety not to cause annoyance to China. But to proclaim Panchsheel while recognising China's unjust rights in Tibet was a performance to which it is difficult to be reconciled.

Sir, it is an irony of fate that we have had Panchsheel agreements with the communist Governments which really do not believe in these high principles. I submit it was a little naive for us to believe that communist China would respect the autonomy of Tibet and be content with exercising only the rights of suzerainty over that country. There are reports that only recently a large scale revolt broke out in Tibet against Chinese occupation in which thousands of people were killed. That is our Panchsheel. May be, this report is incorrect, or highly exaggerated. But I have no doubt, and no one should have any doubt, that the Tibetans are smarting under the Chinese heels and they yearn for their freedom.

Now, how has Russia—another signatory to the Panchsheel—been respecting the principles of Panchsheel? By drowning in blood the revolution

of the brave Hungarian people. Now they are prosecuting their campaign of vilification against non-conformist Yugoslavia with full vigour. The Chinese have joined hands with them. What was Yugoslavia's crime? Only that Marshal Tito was not prepared to join the Russian bloc. In most other matters he sided with Russia, but he was not prepared to allow his country to be like one of the East European countries under the control and dominance of Russia. Even this slight difference was treated as heresy and a campaign of hate was opened against Yugoslavia. Aid promised to that country under an international agreement was suspended. In this connection I should like to say a few words about the attitude of our Prime Minister in regard to this matter. Even Nasser expressed his views criticising Russia's act. Nasser has not lost caste with Russia for that reason. But our Prime Minister said that it was not proper to make noise over the withdrawal of aid. We seem to have developed a peculiar attitude so far as Russia and China are concerned.

I should like to remark parenthetically how impatient and intolerant a dictator can be of everything he does not like. We read in the papers the other day that Marshal Tito had refused to meet Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and this when he visited that country on invitation. Not only Marshal Tito but many other members of the Yugoslav Government refused to meet him even though he had been invited to Yugoslavia by the Socialist Alliance which forms the Government. India's goodwill and friendship and warmth towards Yugoslavia were all forgotten and discourtesy was shown to a man of his eminence merely because during his visit to that country he did not confine his meetings exclusively to persons currently in official favour. Sir, we admire the experiments carried on in Yugoslavia in decentralising the economic structure. We admire, too, the association of workers with the management and the running of the factories, but we cannot be blind to the fact that the regime, like all Communist regimes, weighs heavily

on the liberties of the individual. How can the principles of Panchsheel flourish in such a context? I have no doubt that Panchsheel and dictatorship, whether of an individual—no matter how enlightened—or of a party are incompatible. If this is adequately realised we would cease to gloat over Panchsheel agreements with communist countries.

I would like to say a few words about Israel. We all know Israel is almost a model State from the point of view of the socialist cooperative society that has been built up there. It will be a great pity if the present psychological warfare between the Arab countries and Israel continues with all its attendant evil consequences. Continuous tensions are bound to distort the psychology of both the Arab world and Israel. It is therefore necessary that the unaligned countries should make serious efforts to bring about an amicable solution of the problems in that region. It is to be regretted that India has not played the part which one could expect it to play in trying to get the Arab countries and Israel together. It is heartening to find that the Prime Minister recognises that there can be a solution only on the basis of the recognition of the fact that Israel has to continue to exist. With the amount of goodwill that India enjoys in the Arab world, it should not be impossible for our Government to make proper moves to end the perpetual crisis which exists in the area. Unless a proper solution is found, the world will be pushed to the brink of war from time to time on account of developments in the middle east region.

Now, a few words about Pakistan. So far as this country is concerned, the anxiety of our Government to develop friendly relations has been clear all along. In spite of the unfriendly and provocative utterances and acts of the Pakistan Government our Government has kept its head cool and it tries to solve the issues between the two countries in a spirit of maximum possible accommodation. But lately border incidents have increased and a sense of insecurity

prevails on our borders, particularly on the eastern borders. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has lately adopted a conciliatory tone while speaking about relations with India. But just when the tone has improved, border incidents have gone up. It must be made clear to the Pakistan Government that India Government's anxiety to be friend Pakistan does not mean that it considers itself absolved of the responsibility of protecting the life and property of its nationals.

I should like to say a few words about our relations with our neighbours and the way we function in the neighbouring countries. Although our relations are very friendly with Burma, Ceylon and Nepal, I am afraid there is a lot of illwill also towards us in these countries. Apart from other reasons, I believe one important reason why this illwill is there is that our men in the Foreign Service who go to these countries are not imbued with sympathy, at any rate are not imbued with sufficient sympathy, and do not have a proper understanding of the psychology of the peoples of these countries. I have no doubt that some of us who go to these countries conduct ourselves in a supercilious manner imagining that we are a much bigger and more powerful country. This naturally and inevitably causes irritation. Our country had and still has very friendly relations with our neighbour, Nepal. But reports came to us that there is a feeling of some hostility towards us in that country. We must try to understand why this is so. There is no point or sense in blaming it all on the politicians of the country. They were very friendly to us some time back. How is it that that friendliness has diminished? I think the manner of our functioning in our neighbouring countries has not been very satisfactory. What I suggest is that the men that we send out as ambassadors and so forth should not only be able but should be imbued with sympathy and understanding. We have one such in our Ambassador to Nepal. He has succeeded to

[Shri D. P. Singh.]

large extent in improving our relations with that country but we must admit that mistakes were made in the past and that perhaps even now there is room for improvement in the manner of our functioning. If we are not careful, I am afraid the same fate will overtake us in our relations with some of these countries that has overtaken America in her relations with India and many other Asian countries. I say this with a full sense of responsibility and I hope I shall not be misunderstood.

In conclusion I wish to say that it is a very happy development that the West Asian crisis has been resolved at the emergency session of the United Nations. The revival of mutual confidence and trust among the Arab countries will surely lessen tension in the Middle East region. The fears entertained in Delhi and elsewhere that a General Assembly meeting would not lead to a solution of the crisis has been happily belied. In fact, it appears now that the summit conference proposed for finding a solution of the Middle-East crisis would not have been such an outstanding success. The initiative displayed by the Arab countries themselves has been a very welcome development which could be possible only in a General Assembly meeting of the United Nations. In regard to this I would also like to make a few observations. We all want that there should be a summit conference of the big powers. There should be a conference to solve the outstanding problems that exist today and plague the world today but I have not been able to understand why Russia gave up its insistence on a summit conference for the resolution of the Middle-East crisis. It seems to me, Sir, that this insistence was given up because of some pressure which was brought on Russia, on the Russian Government, by China. It may be, I do not know—I hope I am wrong—that China may have felt why as against China, India should be represented when China is not there. Probably that was how China felt and that is why perhaps she prevailed upon

Russia to give up the idea and to agree to a U.N. emergency session. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I propose to be brief in my observations in this debate and to be rather careful in my choice of words, having regard to the delicate ground that we are called upon to tread. This debate on international affairs initiated by our Prime Minister, apart from its general importance, is most timely and opportune at the present juncture. The world has just passed through a super-crisis in international affairs, and has, at least for the time being, come out almost unscathed. I use the word "almost", because foreign troops have not yet pulled out of West Asia, although very favourable conditions have been created by the United Nations Resolution for their early withdrawal.

To my mind, the recent crisis has left behind some outstanding lessons for future guidance of nations, large and small. The Prime Minister has pin-pointed the crux of the situation when he said that only "a button had to be pressed" and "within twentyfour hours scores of cities would have been destroyed." The Soviet Union played a significant role in awakening the world to the immensity and immediacy of the danger. It issued its insistent calls to the great powers to sit around a table and resolve the crisis—to the powers who are not only great in armed strength and material wealth, but also to one Asiatic nation which is great in moral power and transparent sincerity of purpose. The Soviet Union has also shown that for securing unanimity of approach in the matter of procedure, it would make concession after concession without standing on a false sense of prestige.

Another outstanding factor that has emerged is the candid admission by the United States of America that the Soviet Union does not want war. This was clearly stated by the American Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, speaking recently before the Senate Foreign

Affairs Committee. It is a most welcome announcement from the American capital. If that be the position, complete cessation of cold war should follow as a matter of course. Struggle for ideological supremacy between rival theories and ways of life may be fought on a peaceful plane, with perhaps greater chance of success on either side, while the world may be spared the tension and fear and the nuclear tests and all the rest of it. Let the entire mankind be benefited only by a healthy rivalry in the field of scientific achievement devoted to peaceful purposes.

Sir, the recent unanimous resolution of the United Nations Assembly is a most hopeful sign on the West Asian horizon. It shows once again that the spirit of Bandung is not dead, that a resurgent Asia and Africa can reaffirm and re-establish their solidarity on the firm bedrock of nationalism, and that in spite of temporary differences the heart of the Arab nation is sound. May I also suggest, in all humility, that the spirit of independent India might have done its work in bringing together her West Asian friends in this supreme endeavour?

The great soldier-statesman of the Arab world, President Nasser, has come out in this crisis as an architect of peace and harmony in that troubled region. If I may be permitted to strike a personal note, it was on the 21st March last year, during the height of the Suez crisis, that I was called upon by the Calcutta station of the All India Radio to give a talk on international affairs. I utilised that opportunity to pay my humble tribute of appreciation and respect to that prince of nationalism, President Nasser, of Egypt, today of the United Arab Republic. These succeeding months have only heightened his stature and brought him nearer to the heart of India.

Sir, this reference to the Arab world will not be complete without an expression of greetings and good wishes to the new Iraq of today. Now that the United Nations resolution has

been passed with the blessings of all the members of that august body, may I express the hope that the great Arab nations in the abundance of their dignity and power may be inclined to look more kindly towards their tiny neighbour, which has also given its blessings to that unanimous resolution? Israel is a striking example of a small nation struggling for a place under the sun, through hard work, through science and culture, and a highly organised democratic system of Government, with no illwill towards any one. It may be recalled that when its air space was being violated by some Western powers for carrying troops to Arab countries, Israel's first impulse was to lodge a protest against such acts. I would also address an appeal to our Government, in view of the changing conditions in the West Asian scene, to consider whether the time has not come to lift the representation of Israel in this country to the level of an Embassy. From the newsletters published by the Israeli Consulate-General in Bombay, it appears that Israel is anxious for such representation and her Prime Minister has expressed in the Israeli Parliament Israel's disappointment at the delay. Israel is a great admirer of Indian philosophy and culture and her Prime Minister, the philosopher-statesman, Mr. David Ben Gurion, is a keen student of Buddhist philosophy and literature and of the philosophy of Shri Aurobindo. These cultural ties, to my mind, should lead to the forging of closer diplomatic ties, particularly as they might lead to closer relations between Israel and the Arab world through the good offices of India's Prime Minister, to whom every progressive statesman in that part of the world has given his confidence and affection.

Sir, one last word about Pakistan and I shall have concluded my observations. After what the Prime Minister has stated in this House, I do not desire to go into this matter at any great length. But coming as I do from West Bengal, I think, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not add my

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.]

voice to stress the urgency and danger of the situation so far as the border incidents are concerned. I remember, Sir, on one occasion in May 1950, I heard Mr. Feroz Khan Noon expressing himself in very strong terms against the talk of war between Pakistan and India. He said that those who talked about war should go to Korea and see for themselves what a war between two neighbouring countries really meant. In view of the ensuing visit of Mr. Feroz Khan Noon to this country, I recall these words deliberately and with a sense of responsibility because these words are in complete accord with the view which India has all along maintained, under inspiring leadership of her Prime Minister.

I shall conclude with the hope that the summit conference between India and Pakistan will result in lasting good to the two countries.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard an illuminating survey of the international situation as it affects our country, from our great Prime Minister and the House is in agreement with his point of view. He referred to the question of our relationship with Pakistan and spoke feelingly about it. The border incidents which have been taking place are the symptoms of a deep malady which is affecting that country. That country has accepted as its creed the creed of hatred. Now, ours is a different creed and we do not think that we can conquer hatred by hatred. I think we can conquer hatred by exhibiting in our daily life a spirit of friendliness. The Prime Minister referred to the speech of Nawab Mumtaz Doulatabana. I would refer incidentally to another speech of an ex-Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Suhrawardy. He said the other day that he was in favour of joint electorates in Pakistan because they would eliminate the Hindus from participation in the Government of that country. We are all in favour of joint electorates in this

country. But we are not in favour of joint electorates because we want our Muslim brothers whom we look upon as A class citizens to be eliminated from participation in the Government of this country. Our desire is that they should have greater participation in the country's government, they should show greater willingness to come into public life than they have been doing so far. The approach is completely different. I think the question of Kashmir or the question of border incidents, all these are minor issues. The real issue is one of attitude. Unless Pakistan has a progressive Government, a Government inspired by some other ideal than that of hatred for India, unless Pakistan has some other ideal than that of complete subservience to the most reactionary elements in the life of the United States or Britain or the West, there is not much hope of a real settlement in regard to Pakistan.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have to take care of our defences. The United States by giving military aid to Pakistan has forced us into a position when we have to spend money on our defences. But let us, in making our defences strong, remember that after all, Pakistan and India were at one time one country and that it is our desire that, though separated physically, we shall be one in spirit. It is from that point of view that I very much welcome the summit talks which are going to be held here. Mr. Feroz Khan Noon will have a cordial welcome in this country. And we hope that, even though something substantial may not come out of those talks, something will come out of those talks, at any rate, something so far as these border incidents are concerned.

I would like to say one or two words about Pondicherry. There is, as we know, a new Constitution being hammered out in France under the leadership of Gen. De Gaulle. That Constitution will have many new features and Gen. De Gaulle is hoping

to establish a new type of relationship among all the colonial possessions of France. I am not going into all those matters, though I hope that Algeria will get her independence. I should like the *de facto* situation in Pondicherry to be brought to an end to as speedily as possible. We should ask Gen. De Gaulle now to take early steps to transfer that territory in a *de jure* manner. The people of Pondicherry have a right to be regarded as first-class citizens of this country. They should have all the rights that we possess and let Pondicherry be our monument to French culture and French civilisation.

I would like to stress my appreciation of the manner in which the Arab countries came together and demonstrated their fundamental unity at the United Nations General Assembly. I am not going to criticise this part or that part of the Resolution. Possibly, if I were to frame that Resolution, I would have done it in a different way. I think there should have been a more unambiguous insistence upon the vacation of the Lebanon and Jordan by the United States and British troops. That however, is a very small matter. The important thing about that Resolution is that the initiative in West Asia was wrested from the hands of the West. It was exercised by the people of Asia. It was, therefore, a good Resolution and I welcome it as such.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I read of what had happened in the Lebanon and Jordan, I wondered whether we were living in the days of Clive or Warren Hastings or Wellesley or we were living in the twentieth century. I speak as a friend of the American people. My point of view is different in this matter from that of my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I speak as a friend of the American people. I can find no justification—no moral justification, no legal justification—for the action taken by the United States in the Lebanon. On the 11th June, a Resolution appointing an Observers Team, at the instance of the United

States, was passed by the General Assembly. The Observers reported that there was no massive interference on the part of the U.A.R. They made repeated observations to that effect and it was the view of the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they were right. I read the entire debate in the British House of Commons on the question of the Lebanon and Jordan. I think Mr. Bevan was right in saying that it was the happenings in Iraq which influenced the decision to land troops in the Lebanon and Jordan. He went to 2 P.M. the length of saying that President Eisenhower had Mr. Chamoun's letter in his pocket. Now he said that this was gun-boat diplomacy. The West has an interest in oil in the Middle-East. But you should not get oil by this gun-boat diplomacy. That is not right. So far as Iraq is concerned, I am glad that the regime of Nuri Syed is over. He had been a great tyrant in his days, and that was the fate that destiny had reserved for him. I do not approve of violence. I do not approve of terrorism. We have discovered for ourselves the way of non-violence. That is, of course, a way which has not been followed all the world over. I cannot understand this hatred of President Nasser. What is President Nasser's fault? He is a great Arab patriot. We had been struggling for independence in our country. Surely we cannot deny to the people of Arabia our sympathy in their struggle for independence and unity. I do not think that President Nasser is dreaming of an Arab Empire. There is nothing to show that he is dreaming of an Arab Empire. But let us not forget that the divisions which separate one Arab country from the other are of an artificial character. All these countries were a part and parcel of the Ottoman Empire, at one time or the other, and the Ottoman Empire was not noted for its wisdom. Turkey is not noted for its wisdom even today, because though the Baghdad Pact has disappeared, it has reappeared in another form. Instead of Baghdad Pact there is now the Northern Tier, the pillars of which

[Shri P. N. Saprú.]
will be Pakistan, Turkey and Iran. I am sorry for Iran, I am sorry for Pakistan and I am sorry for Turkey. It is not wise for them to get mixed up in this way with the power politics.

(Time bell rings)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I will take only one or two minutes and then finish my speech. Sir, some reference was made by the Prime Minister to the situation in the Far-East. We have a danger spot there, and I hope that it will be tackled with wisdom. The other day, I read in the papers that a respected leader of the Praja-Socialist Party described the policy of Panchsheel as a policy born in sin. Muslims or Christians may accept that doctrine. But as a Hindu I can say that we do not believe in this doctrine, of original sin. But may I remind that leader that the men who were responsible for the policy of the National Congress in the days when Lord Curzon evolved his forward policy with regard to the North-East frontier i.e., Tibet, were opposed to that policy? They did not think that it was right for us to have an outer post in Tibet. It is open to us to revise our policy after having achieved our independence or our views on how countries should function. I hope that the Socialist Party is not going to degenerate into a party of reaction or a reactionary party. I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the attack on the proposed summit conference within or outside the orbit of the United Nations was misplaced. We had never sought for any place in the summit conference. It was not only Mr. Khrushchev who wanted us to be invited to the summit conference, but also other highly respected leaders of world opinions. Mr. Harold Wilson, the shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, strongly suggested to Mr. Macmillan that Mr. Nehru must be invited. Mr. Diefenbaker, the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in Canada and the Prime Minister of Canada, wanted Mr. Nehru to be invited. And why did he want India or

Mr. Nehru to be invited? Because in regard to these big questions we have been taking an objective view, we have been taking the impartial view of detached observers. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like small and big nations to play a big part in the world, and I do not think there is any need for atom or hydrogen bombs. The question before mankind is one of survival. Either we survive or we destroy ourselves. The question is one of human survival. And therefore I can see no alternative to the policy of co-existence. It is, therefore, important there that there should be a summit meeting at an early date where problems of nuclear disarmament could be discussed. I am glad that the U.S.A. is going to suspend nuclear tests for one year. This matter should be considered in a big way and in an imaginative way. (Time bell rings) Mr. Deputy Chairman, the other day I was reading a book by Mr. Philip Toynbee known as "The fearful choice". He says therein that Britain should unilaterally abandon the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Many people would say that Mr. Philip Toynbee is perhaps mad in suggesting a solution of that kind. But it shows that there is a kind of dynamic thinking in the Western countries about these big problems, and it is a matter for regret, pity and disgust that there is no big thinking in the party which claims to be the leading party—the Socialist Party—in this country on these matters. That party is talking in terms which will not do any credit to itself or even to the Tories of the 'Daily Express' type. (Time bell rings) Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, for having given to me this opportunity to speak.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, India's international policy is based on peace and goodwill for the nations and it has earned a good name under our great Prime Minister because following the general principles, it takes up the cause of the weak nations against troublesome aggressive activities by

big nations. He has thereby created a position for himself and also the nation that he represents. On this occasion I will not even try to deal with the bigger matters though the other day a world crisis was brought about in our neighbouring countries and as a result of that a big change has taken place. I mean, the change in the Government of Iraq. What I would like to speak is about ourselves, the things that are troubling us, Indians, too much for so many years. Because of our general principles, perhaps for that, the nations who are interested in India are creating a lot of trouble for us. The affairs of Goa and Kashmir no Indian can forget even for a moment. We have endless troubles on these two frontiers and there is no knowing how and when these would be over. Over and above that, the latest are the Pakistan aggressions on the wide borders of India, particularly Tripura and Assam borders. Prior to these border affairs, there was infiltration of Pakistani Muslims in Tripura State as well as in the Cachar district of Assam. I have myself given notice of some questions regarding these and am told—though the time I gave has already expired—that enquiries are being made and I would be informed of the situation later on. But my information is that a big number of Pakistani Muslims have penetrated into these territories for 3 or 4 years and the number is now very well above 1 lakh.

Then again it has been quite clear that our troubles with the Nagas have been taken advantage of by our neighbouring nation and it has been proved and it has also created a tension in this country. It is difficult to see how these are happening. I come from East Pakistan and though I am a resident of U.P. for the last 35 years, still from time to time, I go to Calcutta and have contacts with the people who were living there. I know, as everybody knows, that the economic condition of East Pakistan now is not at all good. In spite of that, how are all these aggressive activities

being carried on on a wide scale? We know that there will be high level talks between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Pakistan. This is a good thing. But high level talks between Hindustan and Pakistan have taken place in the past and often the results have not been what were expected. So on this occasion too, we don't know what would be the result. At least while the talks are going on, while it has been decided that the two Prime Ministers would have a friendly talk over these matters, even now the situation has not changed effectively. High principles we must follow but we have to devise ways and means to stop unprovoked aggressions. As a nation it is our bounden duty that we must defend the lives and properties of our people on our borders. For that, a determined policy is essential. That policy must be followed by action. Mahatma Gandhi preached non-violence but he at times interpreted his method of non-violence. When a weak nation is being attacked by another big nation, the weak nation has a right to defend itself even through armed forces. So when, for a long time big border attacks are going on in the most aggressive way covering a wide area, we must think out some ways and means to counteract them. For that purpose I would place before this House a method, a way, to prevent such things and my suggestion is that we should raise a voluntary militia of the border people of Assam, Tripura and West Bengal. This militia should consist of people of the locality, selected men and reliable men, who would be trained and equipped by the Government. Our policy will never be aggressive in any way. But it should be strongly defensive against all aggressions. Aggression must be checked by all means and under all circumstances. If we raise a militia of volunteers all along the border, it will have a good effect both for ourselves and for the aggressive neighbours, because the people who dwell in the border areas will have encouragement and at the same time this will have a good effect on the

[Shri J. C. Chatterjee.]

aggressive policy of our neighbours. There are a large number of Hindus residing in East Pakistan even now and we know that their condition is not at all good. They are in a miserable condition and if they know that in their neighbourhood, there is some strength, this may in an indirect way, produce some good effect on them as well, on their morale. For this purpose also, the raising of a militia on that line would be very effective.

On this occasion, I will not like to speak much on this point, because the main thing I have not even touched. But I hope and trust that the authorities would think over this proposition and give effect to it, if it is thought to be proper and just.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa): Sir, is there quorum in the House?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, please go on.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Mr. Deputy Chairman, looking at the foreign policy of our Government, I am reminded of a very wise saying of the past which we should remember in formulating our judgment and our views on such matters. That saying is "Know thyself". Just as that man who knows himself well, with himself as the centre, draws the circumference of his relationships and of all his connections with society and with the nation most clearly and by such act, is most successful through self-knowledge, so also, in my opinion, that nation is most successful in all its policies, both internal and external, which knows its own standpoint, its own make-up and its own ethos best, because thereby it can draw a line of relationship with the rest of the world in a bold manner and in a definite manner, that a nation without such an outlook, such a grounding on itself, is unable to do.

Much has been said, Mr. Deputy Chairman, on the many failings and the many shortcomings of our external

policies. I do not want to repeat those observations too much and tire the House thereby. I shall only say that most of the shortcomings in our external policy lie, in my opinion, in the fact that we are not sure of our own centre. The House will remember, Sir, that some time ago there was a debate here on the Five Year Plan and I had remarked at that time that this planning seems to be a perpetual 'Shirshasan' for the whole nation. Exactly like that kind of lopsided planning, it seems to me that our external policy today is faulty, because it is eccentric. It does not base its centre in itself, but lays too much emphasis on outer relations with the result that it does not know where it stands. Hence, although all our intentions are good, we mean well, we mean to implement our ideologies throughout the world and by self-example establish a regime of peace in the world, although we have good intentions, we cannot really translate those good intentions into proper action, because of this eccentric outlook on our part.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I say all this although I endorse the basic principles of our external policy fully. The principles of Panchsheel are good on the idealistic plane. On the practical plane, however, they do not seem to be bearing much result. Our ideals and plans are well-conceived, but in my opinion, they are ill-executed. The vociferous signatories to this set of rules have proved to be its chief offenders and in this list I would like to point out that the Soviet Union, or the Chinese Republic and the United Arab Republic head the list, by their acts at different times. So this doctrine of Panchsheel which we are pursuing today, seems to be a unilateral pursuance. We alone want to observe them, in our acts. Others want to observe them only in their vociferous profession and not in actual practice. So, in my opinion, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the whole approach to this Panchsheel doctrine must be revised.

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

It must be re-orientated in a definite and more practical manner so that it will bear visible fruit in actual practice in this world and not remain in the domain of idealism as idle talk.

So many years of independence has not resulted up to date in good relationship with our nearest neighbours. As I say, I do not want to harp on that matter excessively because other speakers have spoken about it and, after me, many other speakers will be speaking further about it but, as in foreign policy so in all other things, the proof of the pudding lies in its eating. So far what are the actual benefits which we have gained from the external policy which the Government has been following so long? That is a question on which I should like more light from the Government.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): What do you want in the alternative?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: I will suggest it when the time comes. Have a little patience. It is Panchsheel, with a difference. In many things we say and we do, because of this lack of confidence on our part, we seem to be playing a double role. On one side we are critical in words about many things that the United States and Britain do but again we are naturally so afraid of antagonising them that we change our statements to suit their purpose and, may be, our purpose also to some extent. But the fact is patent that by such dilly-dallying and manifest changing principles we have not gained much. It is a sound doctrine, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to hold that whatever compromises we might be willing to make for our own interest, we should never agree to a compromise on matters of principle. In my opinion, we have, by our behaviour, been doing that, and so creating an air of weakness for ourselves in the international field and also in the minds of our own people. Hence, at this critical time, when the affairs of this country, in my opinion, are apt to lead us either

to an ideal goal or to an abyss, we should be very careful in what we do and in what we say. I have always, Mr. Vice-Chairman, cried out on the floor of this House against the mounting debts incurred by the Government from foreign powers for that lopsided planning about which I mentioned a little while ago and which I criticised as a perpetual *shirshasan* for the nation many days ago. Then, my friends on the other side would not hear me. They had rosy ideals and ideas about events and many pet illusions.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): But we always listen to you with rapt attention.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: That is very good of you. I am very grateful, but only listening will not do. Those words should be implemented by your party. Then only it will make me happy.

This sort of mounting foreign help for planning is ill-founded and is leading us even now to a very dangerous crisis. It was the motto of the materialistic schools of Indian philosophy in the old days.—

“यावज्जीवेत्सुखं जीवेद्दुःखं कृत्वा घृत्पिबेत् ।
मस्मीभूतस्य देहस्य पुनरागमनं कुत ॥”

“As long as you live, contract debts, drink clarified butter and be happy, for, once this body is reduced to ashes, wherefrom will it return again?” Now, the debts that we are incurring from the foreign powers today and thus binding ourselves hand and foot to them, in my opinion, is a realisation of that ancient doctrine today (*Time bell rings*.) I have been given 20 minutes by the hon. Chairman of the House.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Both of us have been given twenty minutes each, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): What time did you start?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: I started just now Sir. I have just got up.

In my opinion, we are surely bartering away the independence that we got with such sacrifice and at such cost to the nation and to our people by this reckless upholding of ill-considered planning through foreign capital. The so-called invisible strings of America and other foreign nations like England, Germany etc., are becoming gradually visible to us and as soon as the time arrives when we shall have to pay the interest on our foreign debts, we shall have to take further loans from them. So, Sir, our case is like the State of the man who has just become major and comes to his House to occupy it. He comes to claim ownership of the house for himself and his children. But when he comes to the house, he finds the bailiff sitting there to attach his house. Our position in India is gradually and dangerously nearing that critical state and, in my opinion, instead of our turning to the West and the Western Powers so much, in view of the Summit Talks having failed . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): They have not started.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: They never started. They were mooted but failed to start. It was a false start. There was, in fact, no start at all, like Addison's case, when he got up to speak but said "I conceive, I conceive, I conceive" and sat down. The hon. Chairman there said, "The hon. speaker conceived thrice but produced none". Similarly, these talks were conceived only but they produced nothing. They never came into effect.

Not that they are gone, it is my humble suggestion to the Government that in order to solve most of our problems we should again invite the Asian nations to a second Bandung conference and thereby forge a considered stand for all Afro-Asian coun-

tries on world problems that face us to-day. If such a conference and its deliberations fail, then it is my frank opinion and advice to the Government that it should seriously consider revising the reckless planning and the financing of such planning through foreign loans. Otherwise, that is, if we do not look out now, then I am afraid that the regular deterioration in planning and the financial strain on this country will lead us to chaos and to ruin ultimately.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): May I know how will this conference which my friend suggested fetch us the money?

DR. R. B. GOUR: The co-operation of all backward countries.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Naturally there will be the economic co-operation of all the backward countries and the pooling of resources.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: All bankrupts will join together.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: But you see Sir, that facts seem otherwise cause my friends here on the right say: What is the alternative?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Your suggestion means zero plus zero plus zero.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: The concept of zero is Indian; so it doesn't matter; the joint is that zero plus zero making zero is better than imagining that zero plus zero is one. That is what the Government is imagining to-day.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Zero plus minus quantities.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Patently they are gradually deteriorating to minus quantities.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Your twenty minutes are over now.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: I am finishing, Sir. All that I had to say I have said. I know it is the custom of the other side not to receive healthy advice. Well, I also know that those whom the gods choose to destroy they first drive mad. Therefore, I shall not waste any more words on such an audience. I end my speech by thanking you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity for expressing my opinions.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to participate in this debate. Sir, I have no hesitation in approving the policy of the Government with regard to external affairs whole-heartedly. Sir, the Prime Minister referred this morning to two questions which were of proximate concern to us both in time and space. First, he referred to West Asia, where the crisis has happily passed but, Sir, the situation is still full of possibilities for trouble because the main causes that have contributed to the unrest in this region are the weakness of certain countries, especially Jordan, the presence of Israel and the presence of oil. Sir, on these things no lasting settlement has been reached so far. Even the United Nations has said nothing about Israel. The Arab countries sponsored a resolution which said that they will live and let live and that they would broadly observe the principles of Panchsheel, but with regard to Israel, which is a thorn in the body of the Arab countries, according to them, no agreement has been reached. Sir, I hope that this problem would be solved satisfactorily by the General Assembly at the forthcoming session and that we will be able to contribute to the happy solution of this longstanding problem.

Sir, there is the question of Jordan. These small States, as the House well knows, were created after the first World War without any sound principles as their basis, and this is what the correspondent of the *New York*

Times says in regard to the creation of these small States in West Asia: "We did not fly troops to the Lebanon because of any sudden turn in that country's operetta insurrection. Iraq is the explanation. And Jordan, again insured by Britain, is not a nation at all. A map-makers' dream, it was created by Churchill and Lawrence over brandy and cigars to pay feudal debt."

So, Sir, this is the untenable position of some of these States. Even so it augurs well for the union of the Arab States to take place and to settle these problems peacefully and co-operatively.

Thirdly, there is the question of oil and oil has created several problems for the world, but in the present context the Western powers have to depend for the oil in the Middle-East on purely commercial terms. They cannot hold on to the idea that the oil in the Middle-East is their monopoly or that they can extract more than reasonable concessions from the Arab countries. So, Sir, if the Western powers reconcile themselves to get their oil requirements according to the normal practices of commerce and trade, then oil will cease to be the bone of contention, nor will there be any basis for the fear that the oil will not flow freely to the West. I think, Sir, the Western powers are slowly recognising the fact that there will be no difficulty in getting the oil provided they play the game.

So, Sir, if these three major issues in the Middle-East are settled, then we can look forward to a future of comparative peace and a just settlement in that region, and to bring about a happy consummation of the state of affairs there. I feel it is necessary not only for the General Assembly to bend its energies to the task but that it is also necessary for the summit conference to meet again and solve outstanding problems in this region. Sir, it has been said by some Members that the summit conference did not start off well; that it has failed. But I think, Sir, the conference is

[Shri N. M. Lingam.]

very much in the minds of the great Powers and from the prospects for the convening of the conference it looks as if it will not be long before a conference of this type will be convened and the great Powers will be able to settle the outstanding problems in this region.

The other important question that the Prime Minister referred to was our relations with Pakistan. He emphasized that geography and history have made it necessary for both the countries to live in amity and peace. If this basic approach to the question is followed by the Governments of the two countries then the most intractable problems that beset us can be solved peacefully. It is most unfortunate that some powerful parties in that country are vehemently opposing even the feeble efforts of the Government in power in coming to a settlement with India. We have seen that the Pakistan Prime Minister has said that Pakistan will not go to war over Kashmir or the canal waters dispute but no sooner did he utter these words than there was a furore in that country by parties like the Muslim League.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Then why is it they accumulate arms? For what purpose?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: They will realise that their accumulations . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Is it for mere fireworks?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: It may be fireworks on a grand scale and ultimately perhaps for their own perdition. But I think if we on our part, ignoring these provocations by certain political parties in Pakistan, consistently pursue a policy of friendship, a policy of amity, a policy which has as its foundation our intense desire that Pakistan also should be strong, should grow and should occupy its proper place in the comity of nations, then things will come to normality. The hon. Member has referred to the

firings along the two borders of the country. These border troubles, as the House knows, are symptoms of the deep-seated . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: Does the hon. Member mean that our policy towards Pakistan today lacks this approach?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: We have laid down this policy but I merely said that it is necessary that we do not swerve from this policy. We have to follow this policy of friendship and cooperation and we should not allow these provocations to deflect us from this policy. As the House is aware, the actions of Pakistan especially along the borders have angered us, have angered even the common people in the country, but it does not befit us, it does not befit a great country with the great ideals that we have been pursuing, to be deflected from this policy of friendship and cooperation towards our neighbour. It is true that we may have to put up with these border incidents and similar pin-pricks indefinitely but at the same time we should concentrate our efforts on removing the deeper causes for the troubles that are manifesting themselves and I think, Sir, time and developments in the world and inside the two countries will compel both the countries to realise that our salvation lies only in living in a spirit of cooperation with each other, in a spirit of accommodation and not in bellicose or aggressive attitude.

Having referred to these two problems, I would like to say a few words on the bases of our foreign policy. The Prime Minister while speaking on the international situation some time back summed up the situation in these words. He was then referring to the conference at Geneva. Then he said:

"Both these conferences were concerned with the countries and peoples of Asia yet the principal participants in the conference with the significant exception of China

were non-Asian States. This corresponds in some measure to the reality of the modern world, a reality that represents territorial, racial and political imbalance."

Sir, unfortunately, this is the reality that we see even today. There is this imbalance, territorial, racial and political and it is grudgingly that the Western Powers are persuading themselves to set right the imbalance in so far as it lies with them. Judging from some of the events that are happening in the world today, this imbalance is creating serious difficulties to the Afro-Asian countries. In regard to all the major policies and actions pursued by the Western Powers, the countries that have been affected are Asian or African. We hear of a United Nations Observation Group in the Middle-East; we hear of a truce team in Korea; we hear of a Supervisory Commission in Indo-China; we have also an International Observation Group in Ghaza; but we do not hear of such United Nations groups or organs anywhere in Europe or in other countries. For example, Germany is divided but we do not hear of an Observation Group there. We have several trouble spots in Eastern Europe but the United Nations does not come into the picture at all there. So I submit that this state of affairs reflects the present imbalance in the world. The Western powers are under the impression that West Asia, and indeed the rest of the world, is a chess board for them to play the political game. I hope that the developments that are taking place around us will force them to realise that they have to treat the rest of the world as their equals.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You are almost nearing your time.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: I shall finish in five minutes, Sir. So in this world of conflict, in this world of problems, we have to be very very careful in pursuing our policy. That policy has been so far one of non-alignment but

attempts are being made to see that we lean more towards one bloc or the other. So it is necessary that we should guard ourselves against this pressure, and sometimes temptation, to lean towards one group or the other because our foreign policy stems from our own past. The internal policy and the foreign policy of a country are but the obverse and reverse of the coin of national life and unless we are true to them, unless we vigorously pursue our national ideals, we cannot successfully have a foreign policy that will contribute to the strength and peace of the world. Sir, we are subjected to great pressure, pressure by our neighbours like Pakistan, and as an hon. Member has 3 P.M. referred, to economic pressure also. Also, there is the pressure from certain countries on the basis that we belong to one region, to one ethnic group or one camp, or one socialist ideal. It may be that we may have in common with other countries certain . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is no such pressure. How can you belong to the socialist camp when you are a capitalist country?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: I do not know. I do not refer to you. But it is said that we belong to the socialist camp, that the Western powers are opposed to the socialist camp, so India should oppose the Western powers. These are the pressures brought to deflect us from the policy we have been pursuing. So, we have to be doubly careful and see that we follow a path based on our own past, our own heritage and if our policy has been successful so far it is not because of our population, not because of our economic potential, not because of our military might, but because of the contribution that we have made to a world thirsting for peace, for amity. It may be that we are not able to make our full contribution. Sometimes our voice is inarticulate. Sometimes we do not play our part as worthily as we should. As the Prime Minister said,

[Shri N. M. Lingam.]

we do make mistakes. But it is well to realise that the success of our policy has been due to the impact of the aggregate of our cultural, spiritual heritage. Divorced from that base, our foreign policy does not make any impact on any one at all. So, while we keep aloof from the cold wars, while we disapprove of the armaments race, while we fight for peace, we have all the time to be aware that the basis for all these things is the part we are to play in history, namely, that we contribute to the spiritual and moral well-being of the world.

With these words, I sit down.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Rajah.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I heard the speech of the Prime Minister with care and attention and wanted to analyse how the foreign policy of this country is affecting the citizens of our land. I join issue with him that we have an independent foreign policy. So long as you are in the Commonwealth, you have no foreign policy of your own, and in one of the answers given by a British Minister in the House of Commons, she said Indians are British subjects. I opened my eyes . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Even now after independence?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Who said that?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: One of the Ministers in British Parliament. And on reading that statement. . .

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: When did he say that?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It was said about three months back. (*Interruptions.*) And when the announcement was made and it appeared in all the Indian newspapers, I put a short notice question in this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I did not read it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: He says he did not see it.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I would like the Chair to be brought into this issue and I would request you to go into the "Hindustan Times" of last May and then you will find that. The Deputy Minister of External Affairs will not deny that the question arose and a short notice question was placed in this House, which went to the Prime Minister, who refused to answer that question. These are the facts which are there. Now, let us proceed further.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): What was the question?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I did not bring the file. The question was not answered. The Secretary of our House will give all the evidence that is necessary in this matter. Now, Sir, let me proceed further on that issue. Then, we were called British subjects. It was an eye-opener to me. Then, I asked, am I really an Indian citizen with a republic as the basis, or am I a British subject? So, when the question arose, I tried to see and find out what foreign policy we have. Now, Sir, there was a crisis in West Asia. How did that crisis arise? It is not Arab nationalism as we understand. Our nationalism has brought about a pseudo-independent Government, in the nature of the Government which we are having today. But there already an independent Government was going on in every State. So, it is not nationalism as I understand nationalism in my country. There is something more. When Farouk was thrown out of the throne, when Nasser and Naguib took charge of the Government, it was an economic revolution that they brought about in that country. They wanted to see that the starving Arabs were provided with enough food and shelter and the starving Egyptians were made to live in economically

better condition. So, they found Farouk was a hindrance, as they found in Iraq recently that the King was a hindrance and they did away with them. And having done away with them, what did they do? They nationalised all the British industries in Egypt. Not only that. It brought about a war. By Nasser nationalising the key to life, namely, the Suez Canal, a crisis arose in West Asia some time back. And the crisis arose not because of Arab nationalism, as we understand our Indian nationalism, which resulted in a pseudo-independent Government, but as a genuine Government of that country wanting to bring economic benefit to their people and destroy the vested exploiters of British and other western nations, who were sucking the blood of those people of the Middle-East. Therefore, the real issue is whether we are to adopt an independent national economic policy based upon our strength and our population or to have a pseudo-national Government with begging bowls being taken all over the world. Now, what is the position? Now, you say, we objected to the marines of America getting into Lebanon and the British soldiers getting into Jordan. By remaining in the Commonwealth, you have abetted that crime. If you have strength and capacity you would stand and support in a way which will tell on the British. Well, we could have said you are getting into other people's lands, by sending your armies, where your economic exploitation is in jeopardy. So, we are going to retaliate against you by nationalising all the British industries in India. We are going to stop your loot from this country, which is to the extent of Rs. 250 crores every year from this country. We want to take steps so that our Indian nationals are fed and clothed. We do not want your loans from America; we do not want to import wheat from America. Our national manpower will be utilised fully to the extent of producing the food that we require and utilising our energy for the betterment of our own people, but not to feed you fellows in England and

America. That is the approach to a genuine, real national foreign policy. Now, having failed in that, the whole debate is unreal, all the talk that we have had.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Do you want our people to starve and not get food?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Having done something in that way, to show our back to ourselves and to keep our backbone to ourselves would amount to a real presentation of our foreign policy.

Now, Sir, we come to the border issue with Pakistan. Now, what is this border issue? The Prime Minister made two references—the minor issue being the border issue and the major issues being the Kashmir issue and the canal water issue. Now, is there any major issue and minor issue, when I am threatened, when every day I am subjected to bullets from my enemy, when my village is occupied by the enemy? And where is culture or civilization coming in when some marauder gets into my land, gets into my home and threatens my very existence?

I say, the first and foremost principle of any civilised, decent Government is to throw the enemy out of its land and tell him, "Do not come here. Do not wag your tail. I will cut it clear." It is not a question of sentiment. It is not a question of cultural approach to the problems. It is not a question of yourself civilised and the other man being a brute. There is a proverb in Tamil:

"Pambu kadikkavandal vedam othathe."

That means, if a snake with its poisonous fangs comes to bite you, do not preach the Vedas to it. Take a stick and finish it. If that is the position by which you are going to deal with the opponent, you are doing a good thing. Shri Krishna said to Arjuna:

"हतो वा प्राप्स्यसि स्वर्गं जित्वा वा मोक्षसे महीम् ।
स्मादुत्तिष्ठ कौन्तेय युद्धाय कृतनिश्चयः ।"

[Sri H. D. Rajah.]

He told Arjuna, "Your relations are there. But they are not relations. Now you see them in a different perspective. You fight them. You kill them. If you kill them, you go to enjoy the full fruits and benefits of life. But if you are killed in the battle, you go to Heaven. In both ways, you are benefited. Therefore, Kounteya, get up. Fight your battle. Do justice to your people and to me."

I do not want my Assamese friends to live in perpetual fear, to migrate, to run away. Where are your guns? Your guns are ineffective because the opponents are in possession of nuclear weapons and all useless junks of the British are sold to you for defending your country. There was a destroyer which was bought by our people and that destroyer was to be repaired by spending Rs. 50 lakhs from our Exchequer and a question was raised whether that destroyer was necessary. It has destroyed our economy and it has no function in this world to perform. That is the position of the destroyer that your Navy is having today. If this is the method by which our Armed Forces are equipped I can understand Pakistanis squatting in our villages and ourselves squatting in this House and talking until the villages will be in possession of the Pakistanis and we will not be able to displace them. I had occasion to go to Kashmir and see things for myself. I asked every Mussalman there—because 99 per cent. are Mussalmans there, as you know, Sir. Every man with whom I had to do something or other, either in the shop or in a boat or in any place or in a taxi, invariably said, "If there is a free and fair election, I am for Pakistan."

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Let me tell you the truth and then decide what you should do. It is not because they are economically benefited by India which throws crores and crores of rupees into that area, but because

the Koran is there. What happened in the North-West Frontier Province when Congressmen, the late Dr. Khan Sahib, the great Red Shirt leader, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, and others were ruling there? When a referendum was taken, 90 per cent. of the people voted for Pakistan, you divided the country. The North-West Frontier Province went to Pakistan.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Is not my hon. friend aware of the fact that elections were held in Kashmir and that the representatives of the people voted that Kashmir should go to India? Then, what is the meaning of saying that free elections should be held there?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I do not want to join issue with our friend Mr. Mirza, because if he sees me privately alone, I will convince him what has happened in Kashmir. Let us not waste the time of the House on this.

Therefore, let the issue be decided once and for all. Our monies are spent there. But there will be no effect. I can tell you this much. That is the position with regard to that area.

You have ruled out war. I agree with that. May I say that I am not a war-monger? I am the most peaceful man. The words will look terrible, but they are nothing but words. Look at them in a proper, rational perspective. That is all my request to you in this House, when you analyse the situation. What is the next solution? Your weapons are junks. The party opposite is supplied with up-to-date weapons by a power which is not very friendly to you. Then there are the methods by which we want to develop ourselves. Do not waste your money by purchasing these foreign useless junks from the Britishers and enrich their coffers. You unilaterally declare that you are for peace. You proclaim to the world that you are disbanding your army and our internal security also will be taken care of by others. This is one method. Then real Gandhism will

come into the picture. You are all Gandhi-ites. You have some ideas about practical life. But your weapons are very terrific when the local people agitate against you and ask for something and you shoot them down. But when the weapons are utilised against the opponent, they are not very effective because they are not a match to the superior weapons that the enemies are having in their possession. There are all sorts of useless weapons in this country. That is the point which we have to understand and make out a case. If this is not possible, I entirely agree with the Prime Minister that war is out of question. This present state of crusade for peace is the most ennobling endeavour that we can ever think of. But it requires the consent of two parties. It is not only for you to make love to somebody. That love should be reciprocated. If that is not the case, what is the use of my love to the other person? Then it becomes a matter which I must think over. I must then threaten you. For threatening you, I have no weapon. Therefore, in the absence of a weapon, in the absence of my love not being reciprocated, what can I do? This is a problem which must be seriously thought of. So, what have we to do?

DR. R. B. GOUR: You believe in love after threats?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: *Sama, dana, bheda* and *danda*. By *sama*, you try to pacify; then *dana* comes by which you offer something; then comes *bheda* and you cajole him and if he does not come to any terms, then there is *danda*, you threaten him. That threatening is there, nobody can dispute under any circumstances.

Therefore, with regard to our policy with Pakistan with whom we would like to remain as good friends, with whom we would not like to go to war, either have superior weapons from whichever source you are able to get them, mind you, or unilaterally, declare peace and produce a Ghandhian army, for you all to live, remaining on the frontier and let the enemy

walk over your dead bodies in this country and let the international public opinion decide who is the aggressor and why they have come into this country, disregarding all international canons of law and justice.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Who will lead the army?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Of course, the Congress leaders. Others are all only camp followers. There is food and shelter for them. Therefore, if this is the method which can be adopted, there is some meaning in your neutrality. When such kinds of military equipments are given, we are unable to do anything.

Another important point is with regard to our internal problems. We cannot keep things against the wishes of people. If you, first of all, decide to make up your mind that you are really developing an independent foreign policy, that policy must be such that the people will stand by you and back you. How is it possible when my belly is suffering for want of food, when I am not getting enough employment in this country, when the man-power of this country is not harnessed for proper production and ultimately, when the existing system of society is such that the Britisher is guaranteed to loot this country and carry away a fair portion of our products from here. Then the foreign policy becomes a chimera. I cannot say anything more. Let us develop that internal strength. This requires a combination not only of the Congress party's efforts, but also of all the right-thinking, patriotic citizens of this country, whose resources must be harnessed by the Government as a national Government—and not a party Government which has nothing to give the country—and they should strengthen the shoulders of the weak. We have to pull the weak together and make them strong in order to make this country more and more prosperous and make the people live a contented life.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, from mid-day up to the moment when Mr. Rajah rose to speak we have been debating a serious problem with all the seriousness it deserved. It is good that Mr. Rajah introduced a spirit of levity in the discussion. Perhaps he spoke in all seriousness, but somehow or other, the logic he advanced brought in that atmosphere of levity into the entire discussion.

Sir, in his reference to Pakistan he started with a reference to the Gita, which if he did not misquote, certainly he did mistranslate. This quotation was made use of as a call to war against Pakistan, just as in the Gita Sri Krishna meant it as a call to war. If that passage has any reference in this context, it was a call to war. However much he might try to qualify it, it is in the present context of affairs an impossible proposition. And to think in terms of war in respect of Pakistan is, I do not know what else to call it, something like day-dreaming. The world is not such a simple thing today as it was in the days of Kurukshetra two thousand eight hundred years ago. It is easy to deal with Mr. Rajah, it is not very difficult either to deal with my esteemed friend, Mr. Bhanj Deo. After all he spoke for himself and the burden of his discussion was: What have we done after all by the policy that we have been pursuing in regard to foreign affairs, and what are the actual benefits gained? Being a realist that he is, he naturally wanted to approach the whole problem in a very pragmatic and practical manner. Certainly I do think that to be pragmatic in certain matters, and especially in matters of foreign politics, is perhaps a good thing. But if he was speaking in terms of benefits, then let us be grateful for the policy that is being pursued by my country, because India has at least been spread the experience of being drawn into the cold world of today. Look at the whole situation in Asia, whether it is in South-East Asia or West Asia or in the Far-East or in Africa. Each single

country has been drawn into the cold world, whether it likes or not. India has been spared that experience at least. If there has been no other benefit, this alone is one of the highest benefits that any country can reap by its own policies. Sir, leaving all other smaller details aside, another very great benefit that we have been able to reap is that after all in our big Five-Year Plans we have been receiving help from practically all the world over. The whole world today is practically divided into two camps. This country perhaps is one of the very few that have been drawing material benefits from both the camps. And practically there is hardly any country except, of course, our neighbour, Pakistan, which is ill-disposed or inimically disposed towards this country. This is one of the greatest benefits that we have reaped by pursuing the policy that we have been doing. Let us not refer to other details.

Now, Sir, coming to the mover of the amendment, the Leader of the Communist Party in this House, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I must say that it is perfectly understandable that he should toe the line of his party—(Interruption)—each one of us follows his or her party line, and it is perfectly understandable if Mr. Gupta also did so. But I am just presenting a question of logic before the House. Mr. Gupta presented the line of the Communist Party, i.e., he delivered a tirade against Western democracies. Now the spokesman of the Praja-Socialist Party on the other hand presented another thesis and that thesis was that the Western democracies alone were not at fault but there were other totalitarian powers also that were equally at fault. Now these two Opposition Parties represented in this House cut across each other. Therefore when the two Opposition Parties present to us two conflicting views—(Interruption)—our position becomes very clear. And that position is that we stay out, that we steer clear of both the camps, whether they are Western

democracies or whether they are some other powers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would like the hon. Member not to misunderstand the position of the Communist Party. I have never asked the Government to join the Socialist camp. I hope, Sir, that I made my position very clear.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: That is the impression at least Sir, that I gained from his speech. If he meant something else, he may take advantage of some other occasion to explain his position. But what I was trying to impress upon the House was the mere logic of facts as presented by the two Opposition Parties in this House this afternoon, which dictates or necessitates or even justifies the policy that we have been pursuing.

He has in his amendment asked the Government to take note of the stationing of warships of certain foreign powers in Singapore and in the Indian Ocean as well as some other hostile activities etc. I believe the Government of India is wide awake to take note of a situation which has been widely published in the newspapers. It is being taken note of by any Foreign Affairs Ministry, that is worth its salt. Therefore I don't think that any amendment of this kind is necessary, and if warships are being manoeuvred in the Straights of Singapore by some power, there are other things that are happening elsewhere in the world. Everything is being taken note of and having taken note of these things, the Government of India have chosen to pursue a policy that takes note of everything but does not speak in aggressive tones. . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: Does he know that the Prime Minister did not even mention this situation? If he had taken note of it, he would have mentioned it. Obviously it is a serious situation.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: In a speech of half-an-hour, one does not mention everything that occurs in every corner of the world.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It is a very serious matter.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: In the same breath one was complaining that the Government of India in the External Affairs Ministry did not pronounce itself very strongly about the American intervention in Indonesia. We don't believe in using strong words. We don't believe in taking up an aggressive attitude, be it in Indonesia, be it in my own country; even in respect of Pakistan hardly ever have we pronounced ourselves in any aggressive tone or temperament. I have been very recently to Agartala and I have some knowledge of the border situation. I have some knowledge of what has been happening there. I know that our people are agitated but let me at the same breath tell that on our side of the border, there is perfect morale. People are not afraid. I know they have been obliged to leave some of their homes, and three days they have been away in a village and after 3 days they went back. This has been happening. It disturbs the economic position, it disturbs the agricultural position. Everything is admitted but would aggressive tone and temperament break the bones? Would it solve the situation? One of my esteemed friends, Mr. Chatterji, has offered a suggestion for raising an Indian militia, if not for anything else, at least for defence purposes. This again, I submit,—though it has been raised from my side of the House, even then I submit—that it would be thinking and speaking in terms of, if not war; atleast aggressive attitude. It will be misinterpreted. One might say: "What do we care about what interpretation Pakistan is going to put on what we do on our side of the country?" I humbly submit that it does. We cannot do or say anything in the present context of the world that might give scope or reason for suspicion. Why should we? After all, these are irritating problems no doubt—what has been happening on the Pakistan border. It is very exasperating at times but it is in such crucial times that a nation gives proof of its own

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.]
breed. It is at times like this that a nation gives the proof of what mettle it is made of. Here we have laid it down ourselves that we believe in reaching solutions by consultation, by negotiations, by following a path of non-aggression and if we ourselves do not follow it, can we ask Pakistan in all conscience to do it? Therefore I believe that all such talks of a call to war, of raising a militia, of doing this or that or doing any provocative action in the context of things in which we are at the moment is just fruitless talk.

But having said this and having given my fullest support, not only fullest support, but I think that the amendments that have been moved are most uncalled for and unnecessary, I would refer to one or two things. I believe there is one thing which is, I know, not lost sight of, namely, that there have been several changes of Government in France in the meanwhile but I would like to mention a point that has not been mentioned—it was not mentioned in the Lok Sabha and it has not been mentioned in this House also. I wish to remind the House about the *de jure* transfer of the French possessions in India. It has been held up for the last 3 years and in the meanwhile there have been several changes of Governments and the latest change of Government in France is a real cause of anxiety to many, many Indians.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: With our foreign policy, why should we be anxious?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: It is a cause of our anxiety because we pursue a liberal and a progressive policy and we are slightly disturbed that the future policy of France may not be a policy that we would like them to pursue. (*Time bell rings.*)

Therefore I would earnestly call attention of this House to this question which may not go by default.

Since the bell has gone I would not like to say anything more but extend our heartiest appreciation of our foreign policy, not only appreciation but also we do believe on this side of the House that it is the only policy that a country, with the training, tradition and temperament that we have inherited, could pursue.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the hon. Member, Shri Rajah, in a deplorable speech, enquired whether we had any foreign policy. He answered his own question in the negative because he said that he had read in some paper that some British Minister had stated in the House of Commons that Indians were British subjects. I have not seen any such statement by any British Minister in any of the papers that I read.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: The Secretariat will give you the correspondence with regard to that matter.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I should like the people who are zealous of the independence of India like Shri Rajah to remember that our position is determined

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: We have contributed more to independence than Dr. Kunzru himself. Let me tell that very clearly in this House.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I quite give him every credit but I wish to point out to patriots like Shri Rajah that our position is determined not by what any British Minister says in the House of Commons but by the Constitution of India. How could a person who is interested in the future of India and who is aware of what there is in our Constitution forget this cardinal fact and deride us by telling us what some British Minister is supposed to have said about our constitutional position?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I say that Dr. Kunzru need not trouble himself because the British Minister

did not say what Mr. Rajah said. I will explain that later. He did say something but Mr. Rajah's inference as to what he said was not correct.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: This will be an interesting episode if the Secretariat placed the record before the House for the edification of all of us. I put a short notice question to our Prime Minister. He was good enough to refuse to answer it

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: For the simple reason that short notice questions are on matters of urgent public importance. If he had put in a normal question, I would have answered it. I don't see why we should accept short notice questions which are not important or urgent.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I felt sure even before the Prime Minister denied any British Minister having made any such statement, that no British Minister could have said such a thing.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: The Hansard of the House of Commons will prove it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let us not go into it now.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: However, as I have pointed out, our position is determined by the Constitution of India and not by the law of any other country or the statement of a minister of any other country. It is obvious, therefore, that India is an independent country, and it is not merely independent, it is a republic and no monarch is, therefore, the head of the Indian Republic. Now, it is open to any person to criticise the Indian foreign policy. But I do not think it is open to any person to doubt the competence of India to have a policy of its own.

Another question that was tied up with this was that of the relations between India and Pakistan. We have been twitted not merely by Mr. Rajah, but by others also, with not being strong enough to deal with Pak-

istan in connection with the border incidents. It must be apparent to anyone who looks at the facts, that Pakistan can gain nothing by resorting to these border incidents. Does anybody even in Pakistan believe that Pakistan can get hold of any part of Indian territory by this method? The Pakistan Government may be trying to convince its own people of its independence and strength by resorting to such tactics. But I think its people will soon be disillusioned when they find that the policy, the unwise policy, pursued by the Pakistan Government, has led to no result at all. Why should we then, in these circumstances, lose our heads? We can see things normally. We can feel sure of our strength. There is no reason, therefore, why we should get upset over the border incidents. The other day the papers wrote a great deal about the occupation of Tokergram by Pakistan. But Tokergram has now been vacated by the Pakistan troops. I do not know what the results of the talks that the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan are going to have will be, but since the Prime Minister of Pakistan is reported to have said to his party that his intentions in coming here is to arrive at a genuine settlement of all border questions with the Government of India. Let us hope that an understanding will soon be arrived at. Sir, there is no doubt that the policy of Pakistan has led to a great deal of annoyance and irritation in this country. But it is not the duty of the Government of India to yield to feelings of annoyance and irritation. Its business is to restrain the people, to make them look at the real position and to guide them in such a way as to serve the best interests of the country. I think Sir, both in this matter and with regard to its expressions of opinion on questions of foreign policy relating to many parts of the world, the Government of India has observed a wise restraint. It has, during the last twelve months spoken with the self-restraint that is expected of the governments of big States like India. I am sure that this policy of wise restraint that has been

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] followed will increase the influence of India for the good and will make other States to be more inclined to listen to India than perhaps they were before.

Next I would like to say a word about Western Asia. The main question there which relates to the position of the Lebanon and Jordan seems to have been happily settled as a result of the acceptance of the Resolution put forward by the Arab nations there.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

It is true that that Resolution does not constitute a victory for any of the rival blocs. But it does seem that the purpose that the Arab States have in view will be gained. The Prime Minister, while referring to the Resolution that had been passed said that it showed that there would be greater cooperation between these States in future, and that they would work together for the common good. But there are two other features to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. The Resolution also says that each Arab State pledged itself to abstain from any action calculated to change the established system of government. I have no doubt that this wise pronouncement or assurance by the Arab States will tend to remove tension in the Middle-East and bring about the harmony that is absolutely necessary in the interest of the development of the Arab nations.

Another point that deserves attention is the request made in that Resolution to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to consult with the Arab countries of the Near-East, with a view to possible assistance regarding the development of institutions designed to further economic growth in these countries. This is a point that was referred to by President Eisenhower also in his address to the U.N. Assembly. I hope the richer nations will be prepared to give the Arab States the financial assistance that they urgently require in order to raise the standard of living of their peoples.

Anyone reading the resolution would congratulate the Arab States on the realism displayed by them and on the wisdom shown by them in trying to bring all the Arab States together. Sir, in this connection, one has naturally to think of the Baghdad Pact. The Baghdad Pact really became a shadow of itself when Syria joined Egypt in forming the United Arab Republic and, as a consequence of it, Iraq and Jordan formed a United Monarchy. It will be remembered that when Jordan became a member of the United Monarchy, it made it clear that it would not have anything to do with the Baghdad Pact. Virtually, it seems to me, that the action of the Jordanian Government killed the Baghdad Pact and now, though we do not know what the position of the new Government of Iraq will be, I think we can safely predict that it will not be a party to the Baghdad Pact. If this turns out to be true, no Arab country will be a member of the Baghdad Pact. If Iran also leaves it, nothing, not even a shadow of the Baghdad Pact will be left. I do not mention Turkey, Sir, because the position of Turkey is special and the traditional relations between Turkey and Russia have not been of a very happy character. Sir, although as a result of the discussions that took place in the Special Session of the United Nations Assembly and the fact that world opinion was brought to bear on a very difficult question, the position of the Arab States in Western Asia has become much stronger, we ought to remember that the Arabs are not confined to Western Asia only. Apart from Egypt they control two States, Tunis and Morocco, and there is a third territory between Tunis and Morocco known as Algeria which is at present a possession of France but whose people are in agreement with the people of Tunis and Morocco. At a conference held recently in Morocco, which was attended by the representatives of Tunis and Morocco and by the rebel Algerian leaders, it was agreed that a federation of these three countries would be established. Just as the Arab States of Western Asia want to

be in a position to work together, so also the Arab States of North Africa want to be in a position to work jointly. Indeed, they want to form a federation which will include not merely these three States but also Libya. Unfortunately, this consummation is prevented because of the French control over Algeria. We know, Sir, that France treats Algeria as an integral part of France, as a part of the metropolitan area, as a department of the country. But, Sir, whatever you may do, you cannot change the feelings of the people of Algeria. Are they, who are different in race, in language and in culture, from the people of France, prepared to recognise their country as a department of France? It is not realistic, Sir, to regard Algeria as an integral part of France simply because there are about a million Europeans there. The fact that the rebels have been fighting the authorities in Algeria, in other words, the French Government, for four years is proof positive of the fact that they are not prepared to accept the position assigned to them by France. Now, what has to be done to remove this tension in North Africa and to bring about that peaceful atmosphere which we hope will exist in future in Western Asia? It was hoped, as a result of the visit of General De Gaulle, Prime Minister of France, to Algeria that he would be able to find some solution to the problems that divide Algeria and France at the present moment but, unfortunately, the Constitution drafted by him does not alter the position of Algeria at all. There is no provision relating specially to Algeria there. The outlook, therefore, for that part of the world is weak and, if fighting goes on there, tensions will increase not merely in that country but also in Tunis and Morocco and perhaps also in Egypt and Western Asia. I see no wisdom, Sir, in such a policy. General De Gaulle is reported to have said in Madagascar the other day that it will be open to the people of Madagascar to accept the Constitution that he had framed or leave France and become totally independent. I wish he had made such an offer to Algeria. Had

he done so, I have no doubt whatsoever that . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: For Algeria, he has made an offer which will give them exactly the same rights as Frenchmen. There would be a common roll.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I need not go into all that. I have visited that country. I know the conditions prevailing there and I also know the promises made by General De Gaulle but the fact remains that these promises of his have not satisfied the Algerians. General De Gaulle, when he was Prime Minister, passed a law allowing Algerians to vote freely in the elections that were coming up but the elections were rigged up by the officials; they not merely influenced the voters but they put forward their own men. The Algerians, therefore, cannot rely merely on the word of General De Gaulle and even when they are given equality of civic rights with the Europeans, their demands will not be satisfied. They want to be as free as France itself is. They are, so far as I could find out, prepared to work with France but not in a subordinate capacity. They pointed out to me the position of India in the Commonwealth and they said, "Well, no power on earth compels you to be in the Commonwealth. You are there at your own free will. We may, in the same way, work with France in future but the relations between us and France must be decided by us and not by France herself."

4 P.M.

Sir, I have referred to this matter because the work done by the Special Session of the United Nations Assembly will not be completed unless peace is restored to North Africa. As long as there is a running sore in Algeria, the peace of mind of the Arabs will continue to be disturbed wherever they are living. France will be wise if it takes its courage in both hands and tells the Algerians that it is for them to decide their own destiny. The European population of a million does stand in the way of any Government

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

that wants to follow so liberal a policy, but I do not think, Sir, that in the present circumstances military action alone will ever enable France to get the Algerians on its side. Its financial position has already been weakened considerably as a result of the fighting that is going on in Algeria, and I fear it will become even weaker in future however strong the party in power or the President of France may be as a result of the acceptance of the constitution prepared by General De Gaulle.

Sir, there are small nations not merely in Asia and Africa but in other parts of the world and I should like to refer to one of them before I deal with any other question, and the country to which I want to refer is Yugoslavia. We know, Sir, the unfortunate differences that existed between Russia and Yugoslavia while Marshal Stalin was at the head of affairs in Russia. But some time after his death the Russian leaders tried to follow a different policy and Mr. Khrushchev and Marshal Bulganin visited Yugoslavia and a communique was issued in June, 1955, which recognised that different countries could pursue different roads to socialism. Now a stronger statement or at any rate a similar statement was issued when President Tito of Yugoslavia visited Moscow two years later. The statement that was then issued said: Holding the view that the roads to the condition of socialist development are different in different countries and that any tendency to impose one's own views in determining the roads and forms of socialist development is alien to both sides, the two parties have agreed that their cooperation should be based on complete freedom of will and equality and on friendly criticism and on the comradely character of the exchange of views on disputes between our parties.

SHRI D. P. SINGH: That view seems to have been discarded now.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: As a result of this one hoped that good relations

between Russia and Yugoslavia would continue to prevail, but I know, Sir, that early in 1958, at the Seventh Congress of the League of Communist Parties the Yugoslav Communists passed a resolution which showed the differences between them and the Russian Communists. And the differences were not small. Some people may be inclined to call them fundamental, but both Russia and Yugoslavia recognised in 1955 and again in 1957 that every independent country had the right to pursue its own policy in order to achieve socialism. Even though the Yugoslav resolution may have implicitly contained a criticism of the Russian policy, there is no reason why it should have perturbed the leaders of Russia so much as to incline them to attack Yugoslavia almost daily for its views and to go so far as to call President Tito as the Trojan Horse of the imperialists. What is equally regrettable is, Sir, that China should be taking part in this campaign against Yugoslavia. We do not expect Russia and China to change their views, but surely, if they believe in co-existence, they must allow a small country like Yugoslavia to go its own way.

Sir, before I sit down I should like to refer to the execution of Imre Nagy with three or four of his associates. Sir, if he was a traitor the Hungarian Government could have tried and executed him soon after the suppression of the Hungarian revolt. But at that time they promised the Yugoslav Government safe conduct for Imre Nagy and his followers. Nevertheless, soon after they left the Yugoslav legation, they were arrested and now they have been executed more than a year and a half after the suppression of the revolution, and it seems to me, Sir, that this was due to the worsening of the relations between Russia and Yugoslavia and perhaps on account of, it seems, the adherence of China to more orthodox views than those held by Mr. Khrushchev. In any case it is highly regrettable, and what has been done is as far removed from the policy of co-existence as black can be from white.

Sir, before I sit down I should like to ask the Government to say something about the present position of Indonesia. Our news agencies did not inform us fully at any stage about the developments that were going on in Indonesia. We know the cause of the troubles at the bottom; they are due to internal factors, but we understood from what was published in the newspapers that the rebels were receiving help from foreign quarters. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I should like to have some information on that point from the Government of India and I should also like to know what the present position is. The Government of Indonesia seems to have gained the upper hand in Sumatra, in Borneo and in Celebes, but one would like to know when a complete settlement of this question is likely to take place and whether the restoration of peaceful conditions is still being hampered by foreign help to the rebels. Sir, we are at least as much interested in the future of Indonesia as we are in any Arab State in Western Asia and I think that the Government of India should, when dealing with questions of foreign policy, give us full information about the situation in Indonesia. The Indonesians have been our friends. We have tried to help them as much as we could in the past and I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the people of India are as much interested in their independence and welfare as they ever were.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, just a few weeks back the great powers were poised for a great war and anything might have happened and then we would not have been sitting like this in this cool airconditioned place discussing things in a gentlemanly way because the world might almost have been devastated by that war. Now the ghost of a war has receded but it is there in the shade; it has not disappeared; it has just receded and we cannot take it easy. But the crisis, as it were, suggested to me a lesson that the world does not want war.

Even the great Powers are afraid of war; they are afraid of the weapons that they possess for war. They are unwilling to use those weapons because . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Because it would be suicidal.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: . . . they know that it is suicidal; it leads them nowhere but to self-destruction. That lesson, I believe, has been rubbed into our minds so that even the great Powers dare not forget that war means a major war and a major war is not a war but it is just suicide and destruction. That lesson, I would rather think, has been learnt even by the great powers but I do not think that the other lesson of how to prepare for peace, how to adopt the ways of peace, has been equally learnt. They have talked so much of positions of strength that they hardly think of positions of peace, positions of goodwill. I do not think the world has turned the corner so as to adopt the ways of peace. We are afraid of war; we are afraid of each other; we are afraid of suicide but we are not kind to each other. There is no goodwill at all. What has been happening all these years shows that goodwill is yet utterly lacking. But every cloud, as they say in English, has a silver lining and this too had a silver lining. This direct aggression, that was how it was called, almost all countries, not only the people but the Governments, condemned. Everybody thinks—I think we all think—that it was direct aggression, this landing of troops in Lebanon and Jordan. They call it direct aggression and they condemned it. Even the Governments condemned it and I should say in a sense the General Assembly of the United Nations also condemned it very politely, not in the Opposition's way, but very politely by refusing even to discuss the posting of what is called the 'peace force' in those countries but at the same time insisting that these foreign troops should be evacuated at an early date. They did not say like the Russians, immediately, but they said at an early date. To my mind this is condemna-

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

tion of this direct aggression. It is not a small matter. Even those powers which were expected to support America and U. K. have not done so. France spoke in two voices; Germany spoke in a hushed voice and the rest condemned it outright and I think America has taken note of that. This too is something great that today we are able to say that this is aggression, this is wrong and this must not be done. This is a great achievement.

Now, when I review the situation I find another great thing and it is that the doctrine known as the Eisenhower Doctrine, which was initiated only last year, has been exploded completely. That has been buried five feet deep and everything that has happened has happened because of and in spite of the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine. I find that in the Arab world a complete transformation has taken place—unexpected by you and I, unexpected by the Arabs themselves—under the pressure of the Eisenhower Doctrine, under the pressure of this military occupation called direct aggression. Each one of the things that have happened must have shaken up, I think, the President of America. You and I never thought of a U. A. R.—United Arab Republic. Today it is a real genuine all-encompassing, comprehensive United Arab Republic in which Sudan and all sorts of Arab countries have joined spontaneously and inevitably. This is a tremendous thing which gives me joy, which gives everybody joy. It was so tremendous that even the opposition was completely silenced within the U. N. O. and even those who were prevaricating and evading the issues had to agree to this Resolution born within 24 hours, sponsored by all the Arab States in the U.N.O. A great transformation it was.

This Eisenhower Doctrine was based also on the thesis that there are two Arab worlds; not one but two, one with its centre at Cairo and another with its centre at Baghdad. With two centres they thought that they would

be able to keep each other in balance, so that the so-called vacuum may be filled by the great Powers. Now, America is a great power and they thought that America could quietly follow the footsteps of England because there was a vacuum which England occupied but which England could not keep on occupying. But it was found that there was no vacuum at all. Today the whole Arab world looks up not to Baghdad but to Cairo. Sir, it was the object of U. K. when it invaded Egypt two years back to demolish Col. Nasser and today we find that they have built up Col. Nasser. They have built up many Nassers. There are Nassers in Baghdad; there are Nassers in Syria. All round there are Nassers and they have all joined together and they look upon Col. Nasser in Cairo.....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: And I may add, if I may interrupt my hon. friend, as I was recently there in Egypt, there are two names on every lip; that is Nasser and Nehru.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: There is another thing about this Eisenhower Doctrine which astounds me and almost hurts me. America, a great democratic country, always talking of the free world and itself the leader of the free world always speaks of others as if they were of the slave world and this leader of the free world is supporting Chiang-Kai-Shek, Syngman Rhee, Hussein, Feisal Ibn Saud and others. America seems to have a very discriminating taste; she has discovered exactly the people who are suited to her but who do not at all suit to the people in those countries, just the wrong men in the right places. It wants to persist in putting wrong men in the right places and that in 1958. If this was 1300 or 1400, one could see that Hussein has a place and everyone of them has a place. We all know that here in India the princes had a place; the jagirdars had a place. But today we know that they have no place at all except in the American diplomacy, a country which boasts to

be the leader of the free world. I am not at all able to understand this. If anybody has demolished the regimes there—obsolete feudal regimes—it is America itself. It went up to support them and it has completely demolished them. I think Chamoun will have to sail by the last American destroyer to New York. I do not think he will be able to stay on in Lebanon even for a day after they leave. I think even this Prince of Amman, Prince Hussein, perhaps he will not be very wise in staying where he is, when the last soldier leaves the place. He is not safe there. None of them is safe there. Has America thought over this wonderful matter? Within a few hours the King in Baghdad was killed and Nuri was killed—he was the strongest man—as if a fly had been smashed; and it happened, as if always that Colonel Kassim had been ruling there. And just look at it. The whole world has recognized the new regime of Colonel Kassim and America recognized this Kassim. Russia recognised it too. England landed its troops in Jordan because of the happenings in Baghdad. England landed its troops in Amman because of the happenings in Baghdad. But in a few days, I think not even a week, they all recognized the new regime and rushed to give it recognition. And yet America does not give recognition to China. It gives recognition to the new regime of yesterday which has come by murder overnight as a legitimate Government, but it will not recognize China. It will take its seventh fleet, eighth fleet, twelfth fleet out in the seas. Its fleets are always on show in each and every place. For the last few years we find that their fleets are running about to Singapore, Formosa, Korea, everywhere. They might show their fleet at Madras, I cannot say, or Bombay tomorrow. I cannot say what they are about. They are on show everywhere

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: And backing the wrong horse.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: It appears to me that this policy has completely
47 RSD—6.

failed and I think even America, and even Mr. Dulles—I do not know how he has got that name—I hope even Mr. Dulles will wake up to it. This has been so much of a shame. What is obvious to us is not obvious to them. I am certain that he is a very intelligent, a very shrewd man. But he does things and says things, I cannot think of and it is difficult for me to say that he is an ordinary human being with ordinary commonsense. I am very sorry to say that, because the things that have happened show that they are completely wrong. And yet they persist. In this there is disaster not only for them, but also for the world.

Coming to another point which is this, that though the spectre of war has receded, the threat of war is yet there. Though hot war is not there, cold war is there. Now, in their own democratic language the Americans call it indirect aggression.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Five minutes, Sir. They call it indirect aggression. I call it the cold war. They have merely interchanged the whole thing. Will you kindly tell me who indulges in it more—the Americans or the Russians?

AN HON. MEMBER: Both.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Both want cold war. I personally feel both want to enter the cold war. They want the thing to boil over, but not spill over into hot war. The Americans want it to boil, just short of the brink. They call it brinkmanship. American craftmanship anywhere is brinkmanship, just bring to the brink, but no war. They stop short of the brink. It is too dangerous. May be they have a very fine game to play. A drunken man may do it; a sober man does not do that kind of brinkmanship. Today there are certain points on which the great powers can agree and should agree. They are called 'neutral' points, very simple points. A child

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]
 can tell them that. Stop the tests. Your own scientist say so; the world says so. Ban the nuclear weapons. It is very easy. Withdraw your troops from foreign countries and your bases and do not give arms to anybody and everybody, for any cause and every cause. Do not give arms to Pakistan. I have no time to deal with this. Pakistan is misbehaving. Do not give arms to anybody for the matter of that, much less to Pakistan. I would say cultivate some cultural, commercial ties trade, good manners—things of that kind which are very easy to cultivate. These are natural things. But permit me to say so, I even despair of these things. Political things are complicated, technical and require marvellous ingenuity and patience for solution. But I may tell you that even in the United Nations it is the small countries and not the great powers which have played an important role. The great powers have to accept quietly, unwillingly what the small powers say, and even today it is a great strength that the small powers are standing together, banded together and are creating world public opinion. Ours is also small in a way, but great in another way. I do think if the world is to adopt the ways of peace or take the first step towards peace, then we too have a place; small nations, the Arab States are the States which alone can compel these great powers to talk in a different language, to learn the language of good manners.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the United Nations General Assembly, by passing a resolution sponsored by the Arab countries, has for the time being saved the situation in West Asia from developing into a catastrophe. The American aggression in Lebanon by landing its troops in Lebanon, the British aggression by landing its troops in Jordan, had almost brought the world to the brink of war. The revolution in Iraq on the 14th of July is a land-mark in the history not only of the Arab world, but of the whole

of Asia and Africa. Though I appreciate the stand taken by the Government of India in demanding the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan, I failed to understand why so much delay was caused in recognizing the republic of Iraq. There appears to be something fishy about it. President Nasser of Egypt embodies the spirit of the Arab world. One great thing that he had done two years ago, the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, is again a land-mark in the history of the backward countries. He was bold enough, he was courageous enough to nationalise foreign capital. For that he won the approbation of the colonial countries and because of that he became the symbol of Arab nationalism. Sir, the Anglo-American policy that has been pursued in West Asia was condemned by almost all countries of the world. Though for the present the situation in West Asia has calmed down, the threat of war has not wholly receded. In South-East Asia, a situation which can explode at any time is developing because of the way in which American warships are stationed near about Singapore. This is a matter which the Government of India and all other peace-loving Governments of Asia and Africa should take note of. If the policy pursued by the American Government is not put an end to, if a strong warning is not administered to that country, I am afraid we may be involved in a situation from which it will be difficult for the Government of India or for any other country to escape and there may be a world catastrophe.

Sir, the continued non-recognition of the Chinese People's Republic by America and its continued non-admission into the United Nations Organisation have made that world organisation not a very real one. Six hundred million people have not been recognised and the dead corpse of the so-called Nationalist China continues to be recognised. This is a matter of shame. Though the Government of India has been advocating the admission of the Chinese People's Republic into the

United Nations, we have not done enough to see that the unreal situation is changed at the earliest.

The Anglo-American powers by entering into the NATO, SEATO, and the Baghdad Pacts—these are actually war pacts—have created a situation by which the peace of the world is threatened. The Baghdad Pact has now been almost shattered, because the regime in Iraq has now changed and a revolutionary Government has come into being. Pakistan, a party to the Baghdad Pact has not fared well in this game. It has almost acted like a puppet or a stooge of the Anglo-American powers. Great Britain with whom we have links and with whom we have formed a Commonwealth association, is not playing fair. It is encouraging all countries which are not disposed towards us in a friendly manner, to work against us. It has encouraged the South African Government in not according equal rights to the Indian citizens there. Great Britain has not protested against the continued possession of Goa by Portugal. On the other hand, by its participation in the NATO Pact along with Portugal, it has betrayed India. Similarly, it has betrayed us in many other ways, with regard to Kashmir, with regard to our relationship with Pakistan and with regard to our other neighbouring countries and it has not played a fair game. It is a shame to the Government of India, to the people of India and to our self-respect to continue our association in this Commonwealth. I urge upon the Government of India to cut away our links from this Commonwealth. Sometimes, it looks as though this continued membership of India in the Commonwealth is dictated by the capitalist class in India. It is true that Indian manufactures find a market in the colonies of the British Empire and our membership in the Commonwealth will certainly bring some profits to the Indian capitalists. Our Government pursues a policy which is not in the interests of India or in the interests of world peace.

Coming to Pakistan, it is our neighbour. We were together until some years ago, but now we are separated. The policy that we should pursue with regard to Pakistan must be a friendly one. It is true that the policy pursued by Pakistan towards India is many a time provocative. The border incidents, the tussle that is going on about sharing the canal waters and most important of all, the position of Kashmir, these are all things which are in the way of friendly relations between India and Pakistan. We should not despair of what is happening there. But we should try to follow a constructive policy with regard to Pakistan. It is true that the Government in Pakistan is a Government not representing the true feelings or the true character of the Pakistani people. The Government of Pakistan is playing the game along with the foreign powers. America, by its supply of arms to Pakistan, is taking it into the field. We must try to follow a policy whereby this border question, this canal waters question and this Kashmir question, are all solved amicably and satisfactorily. In this connection, I welcome the talks that are going to take place between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan on the 10th of September. I trust that these two heads of Governments will come to an amicable settlement. Though it is said that the question of border incidents will be discussed, I would urge upon the two Prime Ministers to discuss all the problems concerning both the countries.

The border problem is a very difficult and intricate one. We have nearly four thousand miles of frontier with Pakistan out of which nearly two thousand five hundred miles are on the eastern side. Between Assam and the rest of India, there is only a 40-mile wide corridor and Assam is surrounded by three foreign powers. We have four different systems of administration there. We have got the Assam Government, the Union Territories administered by the

[Shri Mulkha Govinda Reddy.]

Central Government, the NEFA and then the Naga Hills. Here is a problem. A constructive suggestion that I would make is that all these areas should come under one administration, and under the guidance of the Central Government they should pursue a more constructive policy and should be more vigilant. These border problems can be easily settled if the demarcated line comes into being. The Radcliffe Award was given some years ago. It has not yet been carried out. If the line is demarcated, then there will not be much trouble and there will not also be many border incidents. (*Time bell rings.*) Just one minute, Sir. I therefore urge upon the Prime Minister, who is also our Foreign Affairs' Minister, to follow a bold policy with regard to Pakistan and arrive at some everlasting solution of these problems. Then only peace in India, peace in Pakistan, peace in Asia, and in fact peace in the whole world, will reign supreme. Thank you.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the people of India and our Parliament have taken rather a keen interest in the international affairs. The reasons for this are obvious. One, of course, is the legacy of our freedom movement which was given a definite orientation in this direction by our Prime Minister. Pandit Nehru, linked, and rightly so, our freedom movement to similar currents elsewhere in the world, whether it was China, Spain or any other country where freedom was in jeopardy. The second reason is the advance of science. As science is advancing, this wide world is shrinking and shrinking in size so much so that the international situation and interplay of international affairs impinges, and impinges vitally, on the internal situation of every country, whether that situation is political, social or economic. We have seen ourselves how our Second Five-Year Plan received a serious jolt when the world was faced with the Suez crisis.

After that Sir, nobody in this country under-estimates the influence that any international situation can have on the very development of this country.

When the present discussion on the international situation was planned, it was done under the darkening shadow of war. The whole world thought that the situation was really very grave and there was that danger of war breaking out at any moment. Happily that situation has now passed and that danger is now staved off. But as other speakers in this House have stated, we must not be complacent and think that the danger is over. The danger is there, because the causes of that conflict have still not been very satisfactorily removed. The problem still continues, for instance, in the Middle-East. Sir, hon. Members here have talked of Arab nationalism. As my friend, Mr. Malkani, said, the contention of the Western Powers was that after the British quitted from the Middle-East or France quitted from Syria, a sort of vacuum was created. Well, that argument has been exploded. We have got to face the facts as they are in the Middle-East. The position now is that the people of the Middle-East want to decide their own destinies themselves and they feel that all the resources lying in their countries belong actually to them and therefore they must have full control over them. But the imperialist countries want to prevent them from doing so, and in that process they put up or prop up Governments or individuals who do not have the backing of the people and who would dance to their tune and play as mere tools in their hands. And so long as this policy is followed in the Middle-East, the danger of war is always there. Naturally, Sir, if you put up an individual or set up a regime which does not have the backing of the people, the people will certainly oppose that regime, and then you interfere in their internal affairs under a very wrong excuse that the Government of that country has

invited you to send your armies there. I do not think that this can be called as facing the realities of the situation. If the Western countries want to face realities, they have got to reckon with Arab nationalism in West Asia and there must be no dilly-dallying about it. In that case they have got to withdraw their forces from Lebanon and Jordan. Happily in Lebanon some solution has been found out, but one does not know whether they will allow that solution to work or not. We know, Sir, that the new President General Chehab, is taking over in September, and we already know his views in the matter. Let us see whether the American forces are going to be withdrawn or not when he takes over. So far as General Chehab is concerned, he had made no secret of his views, even when he was the Commander-in-Chief, when he had not been elected as the President of Lebanon. He had in very unmistakable terms stated that all foreign forces must withdraw from the country. So far as Jordan is concerned, well, all of us know fully well about it. But for the British army being there, the King of Jordan, King Hussain, would not have been able to live there even for a day, and the State of Jordan which had been created by the British imperialists after the First World War would have disintegrated, and disintegrated in a day.

As I said, the international situation is facing certain complications because the Western countries refuse to recognise facts. Unfortunately they choose to move in their old mental grooves of colonialism. Now look at, for instance, China. Our Prime Minister has been saying, and so has every wise statesman been saying, that China must be recognised as a fact. Here is a country inhabited by 600 million people, and it has got a Government which claims the allegiance of all the people as a whole, whose authority is established throughout China. Formerly, Sir, the country was torn up in small bits. There were war-lords here and war-lords there; one part of the

country was occupied by Germany, another by America, others by England and Japan, and so the whole country was dismembered. But now there is a Government the authority of which is established throughout the country, over 600 million people. But there are people in this world, who do not have the sense to realise that even in their own interests they must recognise China.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madness.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA: It is necessary in the interests of the peace of the world of which they talk so much. There cannot be any peace in the South-East Asia, there cannot be any peace in the world, till they agree to recognise and to admit into the U.N. Assembly a nation of 600 million people, whatever their policies are. You may not agree with the politics of that country. We do not agree with the politics of many other countries but the reality is that China is a fact. It has got to be recognised. What I was saying was this . . .

(Time bell rings.)

Will you give me another five minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, your time is up.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA: I will try to finish. I was just giving an instance of the unrealistic policies pursued by the Western Powers. The mention of China came up. What we see from the papers is that even USA is coming to realise the foolishness of the policy pursued by it in regard to China. They have come to realise it. For instance, America does not like the policy of Russia but they feel that since Russia is in the U.N. it is susceptible to world opinion. You have no influence over the Chinese opinion now. If China comes into the World Assembly, certainly it will have to face realities and be susceptible to world opinion and to that extent the peace of the world will be strengthened and achieved.

[Shri Trilochan Dutta.]

Only one point more. There was a friend here—Mr. Rajah—who made an unfortunate reference to Kashmir. I kept quiet at that time as I did not feel like interrupting him. He said something which was very amazing that 99 per cent. of the people of Kashmir stand for Pakistan and if there is a plebiscite they would vote for Pakistan. This is a statement which is completely untrue. I come from Kashmir, I have been in the freedom movement there and I will assure the House, not in any spirit of bravado or propaganda that the freedom movement in Kashmir has had very deep roots. Rather it was the only movement in Kashmir and so far as the people of Kashmir are concerned, they fought shoulder to shoulder with the Congress here, with the freedom fight here. They were the first people from whom Jinnah got the defeat of his life. When Jinnah was at the height of his power, when very few Muslim leaders had the courage to face him, in Kashmir he was faced by the people, by large crowds of people, and his policies there were rejected by them. In 1947, even the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, said 'I see a ray of light only in Kashmir'. When a large part of the country was disturbed, when communalism held sway in the country, that was the place where the people kept their heads level, where Hindus and Muslims did not fight. I will not say that there was no trouble anywhere, there might have been—but, by and large, they were peaceful. Even today I feel that the people of Kashmir and their hearts are with India. Now and then a certain situation arises. They may have certain grievances and they may have certain things to say. But this is only temporary. They may have certain grievances in that state of mind. But that does not mean that they are no longer friendly to India. Their heart is with India. If they have any grievances, I very much hope that the Prime Minister of this country, whom, we are proud to claim as coming from our part, and the people of this country

with whom we have fought shoulder to shoulder, would try to understand our problems and the situation in which we are, and try to help us. With these words, I would thank you and end my submission, Sir.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Kashmir is a part of India and it belongs to the whole of India.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA: Yes, it belongs to the whole of India.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this morning in his speech, the Prime Minister referred to three points. First was the Mid-East crisis, second was the principle or concept of Panchsheel and the third was in regard to the border troubles with Pakistan and the visit of the Prime Minister of Pakistan to India. I would therefore refer, in the short time at my disposal, to only these three points. He stated that we were nearly on the brink of war. Wars are not new things. From the beginning of the world there have been wars. There have been weapons as devastating and as deadly as atom bombs and hydrogen bombs. Civilisation has survived, mankind has survived. Wars will continue and let us hope that mankind would still survive but as long as there are ambitious nations and powers and as long there are zealous small nations and powers, who at any cost would fight for the integrity of their territories, there would be wars and they have to be faced. The Prime Minister has stated that in this Mid-East crisis realisation has been brought to the Western Powers that Arab nationalism is not a thing to be played with. It is true—and sometimes good comes out of evil—that this has happened. But I see a thing which we had not realised and to which we had not in our foreign policy given much importance and in regard to which also the realisation has been brought to us. It has been our habit and custom in the past that whenever any crisis came, we jumped to the forefront and gave expression

to our protests, etc. Our emissary, Mr. Krishna Menon, would have been flying to all corners of the world to settle matters and be an intermediary. There would be statements and statements from the Prime Minister in the House and outside but realisation has been brought to us that this policy has done more harm than good to us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Therefore we, on this occasion, had kept our mouth shut and have been very quiet. We have talked less. Our emissary has been confined to Delhi itself and the result is this that some satisfactory result has come out. Also we have not so far given importance to Israel's existence. We were afraid of incurring of the displeasure of Arab nationalism. But now it is a matter of gratification that our Prime Minister has realised that Israel has come to stay and it will stay and on this realisation and only on this realisation any satisfactory settlement in the Mid-East can be guaranteed. As far as it goes, it is very satisfactory and we have also made some progress in the adjustment of our foreign policy in regard to Mid-East.

Now the question arises as to whether we have made, in our enthusiasm, some mistake in regard to this 5 P.M. little summit conference. We have been a little hasty also when we were invited by Mr. Khrushchev to be included in this, without waiting for invitations from other powers. This has created a little jealousy also and other powers have protested and the result is that the summit conference has disappeared.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: How can our Prime Minister help it?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It has caused a little disappointment also to our Prime Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is your reading of the situation.

DR. R. B. GOUR: He was Prime Minister of Bikaner and so he knows.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would like to submit with regard to our policy based on Panchsheel, that idealistically speaking, the Panchsheel is a very good concept. I should even say a gospel. But in practice, does it have any value? The Prime Minister himself was compelled to say in this House some time back that some of the nations with whom he had joined in partnership in this concept of Panchsheel, are debasing this concept. And further, this morning he stated that the strength of the policy of a nation depends on the strength of the home front and he referred in this connection to the military power and also to economic strength. When he said so I thought he would include the policy followed by a country in its internal affairs also. I would like to know, therefore, whether this policy of Panchsheel is conducted or followed on our home front also. Have we not seen what is happening in our own country when dealing with women, children, men, old and young? Do we use any discretion in shooting them down? After all what have these people in Gujarat and Maharashtra done in our country? They only want their aspirations to be fulfilled. How was it that in Ahmedabad and in Bombay people were shot indiscriminately? What was their fault?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please confine yourself to the subject under discussion. We are concerned with the foreign policy now.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is a debate on Foreign Affairs.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I never interrupt any hon. Member, I want a little indulgence, because my time is short.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will have other occasions to criticise the home-policy. Speak on foreign policy.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: By these interruptions my time is wasted.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Because it is irrelevant.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: What I say is, if in our home policy we strictly observe Panchsheel, we have a right to observe Panchsheel in our external affairs also. But because Sardar Patel is not here, the Gujerat people are like orphans and they have to cope with this injustice. There is no Maharashtrian leader . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He was very strongly against such things.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: ..and so Maharashtrians could be treated like this. Therefore, what I say is, we have to practise Panchsheel in our own home affairs before we can have any influence with Panchsheel in foreign affairs. Similarly you should observe it in your Government in a practical way. But we know how people who were legitimately working for Hindi agitation in the Punjab were jailed and how they were beaten, and when the Chief Minister of the Punjab found it difficult to remain in that position the Prime Minister came out to give him a good chit on the eve of his securing confidence from Congress party so that he could remain, with Prime Minister's influence as Chief Minister. This is the Panchsheel you see. If this is the Panchsheel on our home front, naturally, what influence can Panchsheel have in our foreign affairs?

Of course, our Prime Minister is a very great man and he is a man of ideals, the spiritual heir of Mahatma Gandhi, and he stands for certain principles. But Panchsheel seems to have no meaning because of human failure of some of his followers, of his countrymen and his partymen. Therefore, I submit though it will be a loss to the Congress, it will be a gain to the nation and to the world if he were to leave off his Prime Ministership and preach Panchsheel like Buddha and

Mahatma Gandhi. It will be a very great thing for the world and for India.

Since the time at my disposal is so short, I come to my last point and that is about our relations with Pakistan. But before I do that, I will just refer to a remark of the Prime Minister in his Independence Day speech this year, where he spoke with pain and indignation because in a country that has ceaselessly preached the doctrine of *ahimsa* and of Panchsheel to the world, strife and violence are so common. This thought of his is very relevant to this point.

Next I come to our relations with Pakistan. This morning the Prime Minister referred to the speech of Mian Mumtaz Daulatana. I do not know whether he was ever a Congressman or not, because generally ex-Congressmen speak like that. But whether he was or not is immaterial now. But he said he was nurtured in the hatred preached by the Muslim League. I would like to submit that one of the former Prime Ministers of Pakistan, Ch. Mohd. Ali was no politician till he came into the Ministry of Pakistan. As far as I know, he was a finance man and he was in the Government of India's service when India was undivided. He had nothing to do with the Muslim League. He is not even now associated with the Muslim League. But I would like to read out what he says here. This is what the paper says:

"Ch. Mohammed Ali, former Prime Minister said here today that war between India and Pakistan was inevitable."

Then he goes on to say:

"Prime Minister Nehru had ordered his army chiefs in 1950 to prepare for a war against Pakistan. The Indian Army Chiefs informed Mr. Nehru that they were running low stock of aviation spirit which would last only for about a week and that they were not sure of overrunning Pakistan within that period and Mr.

Nehru was compelled to withdraw that order."

Could you expect such a thing, of all persons, from our Prime Minister, a man of peace? The mere use or mention of the word "war" is repulsive to him.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: When was that speech made?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It was made on 4th June. When a non-Muslim League ex-Prime Minister of Pakistan can entertain for India such thoughts, then naturally it is a matter for concern. He said many more things. But for want of time I have given only the main point.

Now, what is to happen? Of course, we will extend a very warm welcome to the Prime Minister of Pakistan. I might also submit that if we tried to see the utterances and feelings of the present Prime Minister for our country and our Prime Minister, we would know what we can expect from him.

However, when he comes here, India will extend to him the warmest of welcomes. The usual buntings and flags will, I believe, be put up. A banquet will be given, formal speeches will be made and there will be cordiality on both sides but, in the background of what Pakistan has done, I, coming from one of the border States, would submit, that we are forgetting the lessons of history. The lessons of history are lost on us. Muhammad Ghor invaded India nine times. Eight times, Prithviraj Chauhan defeated him and forgave him but on the ninth time, he defeated Prithviraj Chauhan, took him to Ghor as a prisoner, blinded him and ultimately killed him. There, the question was only of one man being killed but here it is a question of the whole country. What is the policy of Pakistan in regard to India? As there were eight invasions of India by Ghor, Pakistan has already invaded India in eight different ways.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Prithviraj consulted the astrologers before defending

himself; we are not going to do that I suppose.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: They deliberately push dacoits on our border. My friend, Dr. N. R. Ray,—he is a very brave man—was saying that the border was very safe and that anybody could live there. I invite him with his family and a few of the Central Ministers also to come and live on our side of the border. For hundreds of miles, there are no human beings; no human being can stay because either the dacoits will take them away and on payment of ransom free the people or, if no ransom was forthcoming, kill them. If the dacoits are not successful, then they will send their armed constabulary or their forces in the garb of dacoits. There will be this first invasion, second invasion and so on. Even when the announcement has been made that their Prime Minister is coming to India for an amicable settlement of the border problem, see what is happening. Have the Pakistani forces stopped firing across the border? Take, Sir, the case, of the village Tukergram which belongs to India. There is no doubt about it. Our Defence Minister in his speeches round the country says that even if an inch of the soil of the land of India is attacked by Pakistan, they will be taught a lesson. I am glad our Prime Minister is sitting here now. That village is now under the occupation of the Pakistani forces. It was occupied on the night of the 6th and 7th August and even though twenty days have passed by, we are calmly sitting. Nothing has happened.

(Time bell rings.)

Since I am pressed for time, I will not speak about the seven or eight points that I have got noted. These people come at random inside our territory and shoot our people. We can do nothing about it. Even where a meeting was taking place under a white flag, they can come and do whatever they want including killing our policemen. We might again demand compensation from them as our Prime Minister threatened to do

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

but it is laughed at. This is not the first time that we are having such a meeting. Pakistan has been allowed far too long to believe that it can get away with anything but if it is made to see that every unfriendly act will invite instant reprisals, it will teach them a lesson. We do not attach much importance to this conference. In the last eleven years, we have had a number of such meetings and conferences at various levels but without any result. It is sincerely hoped that something good would come out of this meeting. We would naturally not be hostile; the history and geography of that country is there which we cannot over-look but we cannot allow a thorn on our side to remain. If we are careless, gangrene will set in and the whole body will rot.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, with all these criticisms from the Opposition, let me say that the foreign policy pursued by our Prime Minister is hailed by the world, and every Indian, irrespective of caste or creed is behind the Prime Minister. The recent events in the Middle-East and the part played by India in averting a crisis clearly shows that the foreign policy followed by India under the leadership of our Prime Minister is acknowledged by everyone. The logic of cold war and the war of nerves amongst the big powers made the countries of the Middle-East mere pawns in the game of international chess. Now, the wave of nationalism is gaining ground among the Arab countries. The Arab countries are not going to tolerate the interference either by the Western Powers or by the Eastern Powers. As matters stand today, if a few countries, if a few Arab States are in the hands of Western Powers, there are a few countries also that are in the hands of the Eastern Powers but, Sir, the part played by India is such that the world has come to know, both the Eastern and the Western blocs have come to know, that they must take their hands off the Middle-East.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, the Prime Minister has left and the hon. Member can be less enthusiastic now.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Whether the Prime Minister is here or not, we say that his foreign policy is a success and the world is under a great debt of gratitude to our Prime Minister. If there is any man to whom the great Arab countries are indebted to, if there is any man to whom the Arab countries are under a great debt of obligation, it is not Nasser but Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India. But for the interference of our Prime Minister, what would have been the state of the Middle-East? It is his foreign policy, it is his policy of Panchsheel that averted the great crisis in the Middle-East.

Now, Sir, coming to our neighbour, Pakistan who is entertaining us with bullets every day, let me not use aggressive language because this morning the Prime Minister made it clear that no purpose would be served by using aggressive language. I agree with the Prime Minister in what he says but, Sir, our patience is exhausted. Experience has given the judgment that any more patience with this Pakistan is not going to pay us. If we do not defend our hearths, if we do not defend our self-respect, let me say that life is not worth living. Even a worm may turn any day. No doubt, Sir, our Panchsheel is a message given by our Prime Minister to the world, but, there is an end to that when we deal with aggressors. The Quoran says: "God's curse is on that man who is an aggressor; curse is on that nation that is an aggressor. Aggressors are probably mortals." Let me say nothing about that, the meeting that is going to come up very shortly. Liaquat Ali Khan met; Muhammad Ali met and Iskander Mirza met, but, what is the outcome of the meetings? Now, Noon is going to meet but Noon is an honourable man. Let us expect something from him. (Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You please go on.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Sir, I am not an aggressor; I am a lover of peace. I am a great devotee of Jawaharlal Nehru who is the prophet of peace but yet, Sir, let me say as a Muslim that I have to defend my nation; I have to defend my self-respect.

Sir, I remember and let me remind the Prime Minister of that historic message that was given by Lord Shri Krishna on the battle field of Kurukshetra when Arjuna hesitated, when Arjuna refused to fight his own kith and kin. When he came on the battle-field to fight he saw his own kith and kin before him and he hesitated and said: "Have I to shed the blood of my own kith and kin?" Lord Shri Krishna preached and said, "Oh, Arjuna, in fighting for a cause do not be carried away by personalities. Fight for principles is one thing; respect for principles is one thing; respect for personalities is another. Therefore fight for the cause, Oh, Arjuna! Fight on; Fight on." If there is a noble cause to fight for we should not yield to the aggressor, and if we do not kill the sinner it is a sin both according to Islam and according to Hinduism.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am sorry to have to use this opportunity to make certain observations in relation to the observations made by a party leader on this side. I am sorry, Sir, that an hon. Member belonging to the Praja Socialist Party had so spoken this morning, but I am happy that that was the solitary voice in this House. Sir, he said that Panchsheel was born in sin. He repeated, in fact, what the Leader of his party in the other House had said.

Now, Sir, it is very unfortunate that voices against Panchsheel in our country are becoming more vocal these days. We have therefore to take these voices in our country with a little seriousness. Sir, it is not Panchsheel that was born in sin, but I must with all the emphasis at my command say that it is these ideas against Panchsheel that are born in sin committed in Washington.

Sir, he referred to Tibet and said that the sin was committed in Tibet. I do not know what he meant by it. I do not think any serious political party in this country has ever suggested that Tibet was something separate from the mainland of China. I never thought, Sir, that any political party in this country would have welcomed or even suggested an alternative to what happened in Tibet, the alternative of creating an independent State of Tibet under the arms of the United States of America. That was the alternative.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It was part of Kashmir according to history.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Therefore I think, Sir, such remarks in this House by responsible leaders of political parties are real sins to history, to politics and to foreign affairs of this country. Sir, I must also say that he had some words to say against the Chinese Government. He had also some words against Panchsheel to offer to this House. But what is it that he said? He said that Israel was a model State, where cooperative socialism was in operation. Well, I am afraid, if that is the cooperative socialism of the conception of my hon. friend here, then what else is born of sin, I cannot understand. We all agree that Israel has come into existence. Did we not openly express ourselves when Nasser said that Israel shall not be allowed to take its ships through the Suez? We did say that that was not the correct attitude to take, that we did not agree with him there, and we did try to persuade Nasser that he must change his attitude towards the passage of ships. Nevertheless, why is it not realised that the Western Powers have created Israel not for the sake of Jews but for the sake of a tension spot in the Middle-East, not for the sake of a peaceful country to be dwelt in by Jews who had been persecuted by Hitlers and fascists in Europe but for the sake of driving a dagger into the back of the Arab nations there. It is this situation, Sir, that complicates the position of Israel and I do not

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

know, if that was the State of their conception, the model State of their conception for co-operative socialism to thrive in, well, then, what else can the Western Powers do against the cause of peace and for the sake of wars? I should like to ask my hon. friend that question. Now, Sir, one single thing prejudice against the socialist Soviet Union in international affairs and communism in our country, that guides their entire attitude towards problems and policies. Now it is this particular subjective attitude of prejudice that guides their entire policy and approach to international affairs or even national questions.

Now, Sir, this is a negative approach. Well, there might be an innocent approach and I should have conceded it had it been innocent. But, Sir, they think and they say that in everything that the Soviet Union does there must be something wrong about it but in everything that is done elsewhere, well, there is nothing wrong about it. That seems to be the approach. Here I am reminded, Sir, of my young daughter who innocently believes that girls are born of women and boys are born of men. Well, this reminds me of that. But I am sorry to say that while my girl is innocent this speech was not innocent; this approach was not innocent. Now, therefore there seems to be something fundamentally wrong with the approach. They must go into it and they should themselves make a little serious rethinking. Sir, I think it is time now for us to think over this whole matter in the correct perspective. We have ourselves fought for freedom and we know what it means. Therefore, our policy must be one of anti-imperialism, for freedom; there can't be any question of non-alignment on the question of freedom versus slavery; there can't be any question of non-alignment on the question of peace versus war, because we want peace; we want construction. I can't understand why it embarrasses certain gentlemen in this country or even in this House when in certain of

our policies on some of the issues facing the world, issues of war and peace, issues of freedom and slavery, we find ourselves in common cause with the socialist countries? Why should it embarrass us, Sir? It only means that a right cause is being supported by right men. That is all. So why should it embarrass us? Why should that particular incident where we found ourselves along with Nasser and Khrushchev on the question of the Suez crisis or if we find ourselves with the countries of the socialist camp on the question of the Lebanon or if we find ourselves with the Soviet Union in recognising the Iraqi republic first why should it embarrass us?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But there is no fault in Guy Mollet finding himself with General De Gaulle in the latter's cabinet?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Yes, Guy Mollet was a socialist leader and is now in De Gaulle's cabinet. Well, that does not matter.

Therefore what is this approach? It only means that these gentlemen want that we should not align ourselves even with freedom; we should not align ourselves even with peace probably. Then what? Do they mean that we should keep neutral in questions of war and peace? Do they mean we should keep neutral when peace is attacked, when freedom is attacked, when the American armies are in the Lebanon or the British armies are in Jordan thwarting the freedom movement there? Well, there is the history of our own freedom movement and, in fact, our foreign policy must be based if on anything on these things. We know what imperialism means and therefore we want freedom and we know what freedom is, and let us not forget that we ourselves, as a nation, are also committed to socialism. Therefore we should know what capitalism also means in the world. Therefore I hope, Sir, that this matter will not be viewed that way. This is nothing but

a diversionist speeches if there was no other problem in the whole world. Except Israel, that there was no greater sin in this world except Panch-sheel, that there were no worse and wicked people than those of the countries of the socialist camp. If that is the approach to the problem, I must say it is a diversionary approach. It is an approach which is meant to mislead the people, to place false dangers before the people, to raise false issues before the people and to divert them from thinking on the real problem. In his speech I never found anything about Singapore; we never found even a mention of how nuclear weapons are being supplied to Syngman Rhee or South Viet-nam or to Chiang-kai-Shek in Formosa. We do not know whether that is a question that worried them at all; we do not know whether these SEATO, Baghdad Pact and other forces are worrying their mind and what their attitude is towards them. As I told you, only one thing conditions their approach to all these things and that is their prejudice. Red baiting and Soviet hating will not lead you to any independent foreign policy or independent approach to problems that are arising in this world.

سید مظہر امام (بہار) : جناب ڈپٹی

چھوڑیں صاحب۔ میں ڈپٹی میں اس لئے حصہ نہیں لے رہا ہوں کہ صرف پرائم منسٹر کی تعریف میں چلے باتیں کہوں۔ مگر حقیقت یہ ہے کہ آج دنیا میں جو پیس ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں اس کے لئے اگر کوئی شخص سب سے زیادہ ذمہ دار ہے تو وہ صرف پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو کی ذات ہے۔ یوں تو پورے ہندوستان کا نام ہے ہمارے چند دوستوں نے اس پر اعتراض کیا ہے۔ حقیقت یہ ہے کہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر کے دماغ کا یہ نتیجہ ہے ان کی اس

پالیسی کا ہی یہ نتیجہ ہے کہ آج ہمارے دیس کا جو وقار ہے وہ دنیا کے لئے ایک مثال ہے۔ میرے خیال میں شاید دنیا کی تاریخ میں اس طرح کی کوئی مثال مشکل ہی سے مل سکتی ہے۔

آج آپ عرب ملکوں کو دیکھ لیجئے وہاں پر کوئی بھی مہو منڈت ہوتا ہے کوئی بھی ریولوشنری موومنٹ ہوتا ہے تو اس میں جواہر لال کا بھی نعرہ لگایا جاتا ہے۔ یہ ہر ایک ہندوستانی کے لئے فخر کی بات ہے۔ اس میں شک نہیں ہے کہ میں ان چیزوں کو دیکھ رہا ہوں جن کی وجہ سے عرب ملکوں کے معاملات ختم ہو گئے ہیں اور وہاں پر امن قائم ہو گیا ہے۔ لیکن میری یہ ذاتی رائے ہے کہ وہاں پر ابھی امن قائم نہیں ہوا ہے اور نہ ہی ہونے کی امید ہی ہے۔ اس کی سب سے بڑی وجہ یہ ہے کہ اس وقت دنیا میں دو بڑی طاقتوں کا پاور انفلوینس ہے اور وہ اس کو سب جگہ قائم کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ جب تک یہ طاقتیں اپنے پاور انفلوینس کو دنیا پر سے نہیں ہٹا لیں گی اس وقت تک صحیح معلوم میں دنیا میں امن قائم نہیں ہو سکتا ہے۔ آج ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ دنیا میں جو انڈیپینڈنٹ ملک ہیں وہ کسی دباؤ کی وجہ سے یا کسی ایڈ کی وجہ سے ان دو گروپوں میں سے ایک میں ملتے چلے جا رہے ہیں۔

[سید مظہر ام'ام]

انڈیا ہی ایک ایسا ملک ہے جو کہ اس وقت کسی بھی طاقت کے ساتھ نہیں ہے اور اپنی ایک نیوٹرل پالیسی اختیار کئے ہوئے ہے۔ اس لئے میرا گورنمنٹ سے یہ سنجیدگی ہے کہ افریقہ، عرب اور ایسٹ ایشیا میں جو ملک انڈیپنڈنٹ رہنا چاہتے ہیں یعنی جو یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ وہ کسی بھی گروپ میں شامل نہ ہوں۔ نہ کسی کی ایڈ کے لالچ میں آویں اور نہ کسی دباؤ یا طاقت کے ذریعہ کسی کے ساتھ شامل ہوں تو ان سب ملکوں کا ایک تیسرا بلاک بنایا جائے جسے وہ پیس بلاک کہا جائے۔ اس طرح کے ملک آپس میں بیٹھ کر ایک کانفرنس بلائیں اور یہ فیصلہ کریں کہ وہ ایک دوسرے کی مدد کریں گے۔ جہانگیر ہو سکے گا ہم تمہاری آزادی کو قائم رکھنے میں مدد کریں گے اور تم ہماری آزادی کو قائم رکھنے میں مدد کرنا۔ اگر اس طرح کی شرط ان ملکوں کے بیچ طے ہو جائیگی تو اس صورت سے دنیا میں امن قائم ہو سکتا ہے۔ جیسا کہ میں عرض کر چکا ہوں کہ اس تیسرے بلاک کا نام وہ پیس بلاک ہوگا جو نہ روس کے ساتھ رہنا چاہتا ہے اور نہ امریکہ کے ساتھ جانا چاہتا ہے بلکہ وہ تو ایک آزاد زندگی بسر کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اور ان کی پالیسی بھی آزاد ہونی چاہیئے جیسا کہ اس وقت مصر۔ عرب ممالک کے متعلق اپنی پالیسی پر چل رہا ہے۔

عراق اور انڈونیشیا بھی ایک الگ پالیسی پر چل رہے ہیں جسکو ہم ایک نیوٹرل پالیسی کہہ سکتے ہیں۔ اسی طرح بہت سے کونٹریز ایسے ہیں جو کہ نیوٹرل پالیسی پر چلنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اگر ان سب ملکوں کا ایک گروپ بن سکے جو کہ دو بڑی طاقتوں کے درمیان بیلنس رکھ سکے گا تو بہت ہی فائدہ مند ثابت ہوگا۔ اگر انڈیا نے اس بارے میں پہل نہیں کی تو دنیا میں کوئی ایسا دوسرا ملک نہیں ہے جو اس طرح کا گروپ بنا سکتا ہو۔ اس لئے میں یہ عرض کروں گا کہ ہمارے رائٹ منسٹر کو اس معاملہ میں فارورڈ ہونا چاہیئے اور اسی طرح کے تمام ملکوں کو بلا کر اس طرح کی بات کرنی چاہیئے تاکہ وہ سب مل کر ایک انڈیپنڈنٹ پالیسی بنا سکیں دوسری چیز جس کے بارے میں بعض دوستوں نے بہت زور دیا ہے کہ ہماری گورنمنٹ کو اسرائیل کے ساتھ قیپو، سمیتک ریلیشنس قائم کر لینے چاہئیں اس سلسلہ میں اس ہاؤس میں اہلے دوستوں سے یہ کہوں گا کہ جو گورنمنٹ کی پالیسی اس معاملہ میں ہے اور جس طرح سے وہ چل رہی ہے اس کو چلیے دیں اور اس پر زیادہ زور نہ دیں۔ آپ عرب ممالک اور اسرائیل کا بیک گراؤنڈ دیکھیں کہ ان کے درمیان نا اتفاقی ہے تو وہ کیوں ہے۔ جب تک آپ اس بیک گراؤنڈ کو نہیں دیکھیں گے تب تک کوئی سمجھوتہ ان

دو ملکوں کے درمیان نہیں کرنا سکتے ہیں۔ آپ کو یہ معلوم ہونا چاہئے اور میں ہاؤس کی واقعیت کے لئے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ واشنگٹن اور یورپ سے یہودیوں کو لاکر عرب ممالک کے درمیان کیوں بیٹھایا گیا ہے۔ اس کا مقصد کیا ہے؟ ان کا مقصد یہ نہیں تھا کہ یہودیوں کو وہاں پر زمینیں دی جائیں۔ زمین تو دنیا کے دوسرے حصوں میں بھی بہت پڑی ہوئی تھی۔ لیکن ان کا اصل مقصد یہ تھا کہ دو ہزار سال پرانی تاریخ کو ملت کر پھر سے سارے عرب ممالک پر اپنا ایکسپینشن کریں۔ میں اپنے دوستوں کو بتلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ عرب ممالک کے لوگ اس چیز کو کبھی بھی قابلیت نہیں کر سکتے ہیں کہ ویسٹرن طاقتیں ہمارے مکہ مدینہ اور سارے عرب ممالک تک اپنا ایکسپینشن کریں۔ ایک طرف تو ویسٹرن طاقتیں اپنا ایکسپینشن کرنا چاہیں اور دوسری طرف وہ ان ملکوں کے ساتھ دوستی بھی کرنا چاہیں، یہ بالکل ناممکن ہے۔ اولاً میں تو یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ اسرائیل اس وقت امریکہ اور ویسٹرن طاقتوں کا ایک ملٹری کیمپ بنا ہوا ہے اس میں کوئی سیٹی میٹل باپ نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے گورنمنٹ نے جو پالیسی اختیار کی ہوئی ہے اس کو ہی چلنے دیا جائے۔ گورنمنٹ کے اوپر یہ زور نہ ڈالا جائے کہ وہ اسرائیل کے بارے میں اپنی پالیسی کو بدلے اور اس کے ساتھ یہودی اور ڈیپلومیٹک ریلیشنس قائم کرے۔ اس لئے میری ہاؤس نے یہ عرض ہے کہ اس بارے میں ہماری گورنمنٹ کی جو پالیسی ہے اس کو ہی چلنے دیا جائے۔

تیسری چیز میں پاکستان کے متعلق کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ پاکستان کے متعلق اس ہاؤس میں بہت سی باتیں ہوئی ہیں۔ میڈیا پاکستان کے متعلق ذاتی خیال یہ ہے کہ وہ ایک انڈیپنڈینٹ کنٹری نہیں رہا اس کی پی ای کم ویسٹرن طاقتوں اور امریکہ کے ماتحت چل رہی ہے۔ میں تو یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک نے ہی لیبنان اور جاردن میں امریکی اور برٹش فوجیں اتارنے کے خلاف زبردست آواز دینا میں بلند کی تھی اور دخل دیا تھا چنانچہ یہی وجہ ہو سکتی ہے کہ امریکی اور ویسٹرن طاقتوں نے جب یہ دیکھا کہ انڈیا تو امن میں ہے تو انہوں نے یہ مناسب سمجھا کہ اگر وہاں پر گڑبڑ شروع کرادی جائے تو وہ ہمارے خلاف آواز بلند نہیں کر سکے گا اور اس طرح سے ہماری فوجیں جاردن اور لیبنان میں قائم رہ سکیں گی۔ اس لئے اس نے پاکستان سے ہماری مشرقی سرحدوں پر فائرنگ اور گڑبڑ پیدا کرنے کے لئے اشارہ کیا ہو جس کا نتیجہ ہم یہ دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ پاکستان نے ہماری سرحدوں پر فائرنگ کرنی شروع کر دی۔ پاکستان اپنے کو ایک اسلامی ریپبلک کہتا ہے لیکن وہ بھی عرب ملکوں کی غلامی کا سب سے زیادہ حمایتی ہے۔ اس نے بار بار عرب ملکوں میں ویسٹرن اور امریکی دس۔ اندازی کی حمایت کی ہے۔

[سید مظہر امام]

جب انگریزوں نے سویز نہر پر حملہ کیا اور امریکہ نے لیبنان میں اپنی فوجیں اتاریں تو پاکستان نے ان سب باتوں کو جسٹیفائیڈ کیا - جس ملک نے اپنے کو امریکہ اور ویسٹرن ممالک کے ہاتھ اس طرح فروخت کر دیا ہے اس کے بارے میں کیا رائے قائم کی جا سکتی ہے - اور کیا اس کو ایک آزاد ملک کہا جا سکتا ہے - امریکہ کی کچھ فوجی مدد کی وجہ سے وہ سب کچھ کرنے کو تیار ہے - آج ترکی - ایران اور پاکستان ایک گروپ میں ہیں - اگر کن امریکہ پاکستان سے ترکی یا ایران سے کہے کہ عرب ممالک پر حملہ کر دے کے وہ کسی عذر کے بغیر ان پر حملہ کر دیگا - اس لئے پاکستان سے کسی طرح کی امداد رکھنا بالکل فضول ہے -

اس کے بعد میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس وقت یونائیٹڈ نیشنل مینس میں جیسی باتیں ہو رہی ہیں ان سے ہمیں کوئی زیادہ امداد نہیں رکھنی چاہئے -

اس لئے میں تھوڑے فورس چاہتا ہوں تاکہ وہ دنیا کی ایک طاقت بن کر اپنا فیصلہ خود کر سکے - آج فرانس دنیا کی ان پانچ طاقتوں میں سے ہے جو سینیوریٹی کونسل میں بھرتہ کر دنیا کی قسمت کا فیصلہ کر سکتی ہیں کیونکہ ان کے پاس پاور آف ویٹو ہے - یہی وجہ ہے کہ وہ آج الجیریا کے

لوگوں پر ظلم کر رہے ہیں وہ جو روز ان کی ایلیٹس کی طرح شوٹنگ چل رہی ہے اس کے باوجود فرانس ان کا مالک بنا ہوا ہے اور اس کے وہاں دھتے کیا امید کی جا سکتی ہے کہ یونائیٹڈ نیشنل مینس یا سیکوریٹی کونسل میں الجیریا کے ساتھ کوئی انصاف ہوگا -

ان الفاظ کیساتھ میں ہول ہارٹیدلی گورنمنٹ کی پالیسی کو سہورت کرتا ہوں -

†سیدد ماجرہر امام (بہار) :

جناب ڈپٹی چیئرمین ساہب ! میں ڈبेट میں اس لیے حصہ نہیں لے رہا ہوں کہ صرف پرائم مینسٹر کی تالیف میں چند باتوں کا ذکر ہے۔ مگر حقیقت یہ ہے کہ آج دنیا میں جو چیزیں ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں ان کے لیے اگر کوئی شخص سب سے زیادہ ذمہ دار ہے تو وہ صرف پंडित جواہر لال نہرو کی ذات ہے۔ یوں تو پورے ہندوستان کا نام ہے۔ ہمارے چند دوستوں نے اس پر اعتراض کیا ہے۔ حقیقت یہ ہے کہ ہمارے پرائم مینسٹر کے دماغ کا یہ نتیجہ ہے ان کی اس پالیسی کا ہی یہ نتیجہ ہے کہ آج ہمارے ملک کا جو بگاڑ ہے وہ دنیا کے لیے ایک مثال ہے۔ میرے خیال میں شاید دنیا کی تاریخ میں اس طرح کی کوئی مثال مشکل سے ہی مل سکتی ہے۔

آج آپ عرب ملکوں کو دیکھ لیں گے کہ وہاں پر کوئی بھی موبائٹ ہوتا ہے، کوئی بھی ریسولوشنری موبائٹ ہوتا ہے تو اس میں جواہر لال کا بھی نام لگایا جاتا ہے۔ یہ ہر ایک ہندوستانی کے لیے فخر کی بات ہے۔ اس میں شک نہیں ہے کہ میں ان چیزوں کو دیکھ رہا ہوں جن کی وجہ سے عرب ملکوں کے معاملات ختم ہو گئے ہیں اور وہاں پر امن قائم ہو گیا ہے لیکن میری یہ باتی رائے ہے کہ وہاں پر ابھی امن قائم نہیں ہوا

[] Hindi translation.

है और न ही होने की उम्मीद है। इसकी सबसे बड़ी वजह यह है कि दुनिया में दो बड़ी ताकतों का पावर इन्फ्लूएस है और वह इसको सब जगह कायम करना चाहते हैं। जब तक यह ताकतें अपने पावर इन्फ्लूएस को दुनिया पर से नहीं हटा लेगी उस वक्त तक दुनिया में सही माइनों में अमन कायम नहीं हो सकता है। आज हम देख रहे हैं कि दुनिया में जो इंडिपेंडेंट मुल्क हैं वह किसी दबाव की वजह से या किसी ऐड की वजह से उन दो ग्रुपों में से एक में मिलते चले जा रहे हैं। इंडिया ही एक ऐसा मुल्क है जो कि इस वक्त किसी भी ताकत के साथ नहीं है और अपनी एक न्यूट्रल पोलिसी अख्तियार किये हुए है। इसलिये गवर्नमेंट से मेरा यह सजेशन है कि अफ्रीका अरब और ईस्ट एशिया में जो मुल्क इंडिपेंडेंट रहना चाहते हैं यानी जो यह चाहते हैं कि वह किसी भी ग्रुप में शामिल न हों न किसी की एड के लालच में आवें और न किसी दबाव या ताकत के जरिये किसी के साथ शामिल हों तो उन सब ऐसे मुल्कों का एक तीसरा ब्लाक बनाया जाये जिसे "पीस ब्लाक" कहा जाये। इस तरह के मुल्क आपस में बैठकर एक कांफरेंस बुलायें और यह फैसला करें कि वह एक दूसरे की मदद करेंगे। जहां तक हो सकेगा हम तुम्हारी आजादी को कायम रखने में मदद करेंगे और तुम हमारी आजादी को कायम रखने में मदद करना। अगर इस तरह की शर्त उन मुल्कों के बीच तय हो जायेगी तो इसी सूरत से दुनिया में अमन कायम हो सकता है जैसा कि मैं अर्ज कर चुका हूं कि इस तीसरे ब्लाक का नाम "पीस ब्लाक" होगा जो न रूस के साथ रहना चाहता है और न अमेरिका के साथ जाना चाहता है। वह तो एक आजाद जिन्दगी बसर करना चाहते हैं। और उनकी पालिसी भी आजाद होनी चाहिये जैसा कि इस वक्त मिस्र, अरब, मुमालक के मुतल्लिक अपनी पोलिसी पर चल रहा है। ईराक और इंडोनेशिया भी एक अलग पोलिसी पर चल रहे हैं जिसको हम

एक न्यूट्रल पोलिसी कह सकते हैं। इस तरह से बहुत से ऋद्रीज ऐसे हैं जो न्यूट्रल पोलिसी पर चलना चाहते हैं। अगर उन सब मुल्कों का एक ग्रुप बन सके जो कि दो बड़ी ताकतों के दरिम्प्यान बैलेंस रख सकेगा तो बहुत फायदामन्द साबित होगा। अगर इंडिया ने इस बारे में पहल नहीं की तो दुनिया में कोई दूसरा ऐसा मुल्क नहीं है जो इस तरह का ग्रुप बना सकता हो इसलिये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर को इस मामला में फारवर्ड होना चाहिये और इस तरह के तमाम मुल्कों को बुलाकर इस तरह की बात करनी चाहिये ताकि वह सब मिलकर एक इंडिपेंडेंट पोलिसी बना सकें। दूसरी चीज जिसके बारे में बाज दोस्तों ने बहुत जोर दिया है कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट को इजरायल के साथ डिप्लोमेटिक रिलेशन्स कायम कर लेने चाहियें इस सिलसिला में। इस हाउस में अपने दोस्तों से यह कहूंगा कि जो गवर्नमेंट की पोलिसी इस मामले में है और जिस तरह से वह चल रही है उसको चलने दें और उस पर ज्यादा जोर न दें। आप अरब मुमालक और इजरायल का बैंक ग्राउंड देखें कि उनके दरिम्प्यान नाइतफाकी है तो वह क्यों है। जब तक आप इस बैंक ग्राउंड को न देखेंगे तब तक कोई समझौता इन दो मुल्कों के दरिम्प्यान नहीं करा सकते हैं। आपको यह मालूम होना चाहिये और मैं हाउस की वाक-फियत के लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि वाशिंगटन और यूरोप से यहूदियों को लाकर अरब मुमालक के दरिम्प्यान क्यों बैठाया गया है। इसका मकसद क्या है? उनका मकसद यह नहीं था कि यहूदियों को वहां पर जमीन दी जायें। जमीन तो दुनिया के दूसरे हिस्सों में भी बहुत पड़ी हुई थी लेकिन उनका असल मकसद यह था कि २००० साल पुरानी तारीख को पलट पर फिर से सारे अरब मुमालक पर अपना एक्सपेंशन करें। मैं अपने दोस्तों को बतलाना चाहता हूं कि अरब मुमालक के लोग इस चीज को कभी भी टोलरेट नहीं कर सकते कि वेस्टर्न

[सैयद मजहर इमाम]

ताकतें हमारे मक्का मदीना और सारे अरब मुमालक तक अपना एक्सपेंशन करें। एक तरफ तो वेस्टर्न ताकतें अपना एक्सपेंशन करना चाहें और दूसरी तरफ वह उन मुल्कों के साथ दोस्ती भी करना चाहें, यह बिल्कुल नामुमकिन है। अब तो मैं यह समझता हूँ कि इजरायल इस वक्त अमेरिका और वेस्टर्न ताकतों का एक मिलिटरी कैम्प बना हुआ है उसमें कोई सेन्टीमेंटल बात नहीं है। इसलिये गवर्नमेंट ने जो पालिसी अस्तित्व की हुई है उसको भी चलने दिया जाये। गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर यह जोर न डाला जाय कि वह इजरायल के बारे में अपनी पोलिसी को बदले और उसके साथ व्योपार और डिप्लो-मेटिक रिलेशन्स कायम करे। इसलिये मेरी इस हाउस से यह अर्ज है कि इस बारे में हमारी गवर्नमेंट की जो पोलिसी है उसको ही चलने दिया जाय।

तीसरी चीज में पाकिस्तान के मुतल्लिक कहना चाहता हूँ। पाकिस्तान के मुतल्लिक इस हाउस में बहुत सी बातें हुई हैं। मेरा पाकिस्तान के मुतल्लिक जातीय ख्याल यह है कि वह एक इनडिपेंडेंट कंट्री नहीं रहा। उसकी पोलिसी एकदम वेस्टर्न ताकतों और अमेरिका के मातहत चल रही है। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क ने ही लेबनान और जोर्डन में अमरीकी और ब्रिटिश फौजें उतारने के खिलाफ जबरदस्त आवाज दुनिया में बुलन्द की थी और दखल दिया था चुनावें यही वजह हो सकती है कि अमरीकी और वेस्टर्न ताकतों ने जब यह देखा कि इण्डिया तो अमन में है तो उन्होंने यह मुनासिब समझा कि अगर वहां पर गड़बड़ी शुरू करा दी जाय तो वह हमारे खिलाफ आवाज बुलन्द नहीं कर सकेगा और इस तरह से हमारी फौजें जोर्डन और लेबनान में कायम रह सकेंगी। इसलिये उसने पाकिस्तान से हमारी मशरकी सरहदों पर फायरिंग और गड़बड़ी पैदा करने के

लिये इशारा किया हो जिसका नतीजा हम यह देख रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारी सरहदों पर फायरिंग करनी शुरू कर दी। पाकिस्तान अपने को एक इस्लामी रिपब्लिक कहता है लेकिन वह भी अरब मुल्कों की गुलामी का सबसे ज्यादा हिमायती है। इसमें बारबार अरब मुल्कों में वेस्टर्न और अमरीकी दस्तन्दाजी की हिमायत की है। जब अंग्रेजों ने स्वेज नहर पर हमला किया और अमरीका ने लेबनान में अपनी फौजें उतारीं तो पाकिस्तान ने उन सब बातों को जस्टीफाइड किया। जिस मुल्क ने अपने को अमरीका और वेस्टर्न मुमालक के हाथ इस तरह फरोख्त कर दिया है उसके बारे में क्या राय कायम की जा सकती है और क्या उसको एक आजाद मुल्क कहा जा सकता है। अमेरिका की कुछ फौजी मदद की वजह से वह सब कुछ करने को तैयार है। आज टर्की, ईरान और पाकिस्तान एक ग्रुप में हैं अगर कल अमेरिका पाकिस्तान से टर्की, या ईरान से कहे कि अरब मुमालक पर हमला कर दे तो वह किसी उज्जर के बगैर उन पर हमला कर देगा इसलिये पाकिस्तान से किसी भी तरह की उम्मीद रखना बिल्कुल फिज़ल है।

उसके बाद मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त युनाइटेड नेशन्स में जैसी बातें हो रही हैं उनसे हमें कोई ज्यादा उम्मीद नहीं रखनी चाहिये। इसलिये मैं थर्ड फोर्स चाहता हूँ ताकि वह दुनिया की एक ताकत बन कर अपना फैसला खुद कर सके। आज फ्रांस दुनिया की उन पांच ताकतों में से है जो सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल में बैठकर दुनिया की किस्मत का फैसला कर सकती है क्योंकि उनके पास पावर आफ वीटो है। यही वजह है कि जो आज एल्जीरिया के लोगों पर जुल्म कर रहे हैं वह जो रोज उनकी एनीमल्स की तरह शूटिंग चल रही है इसके बावजूद फ्रांस उनका मालिक बना हुआ है और उसके वहां रहते हुये क्या उम्मीद की जा

सकती है कि यनाइटेड नेशन्स ने या सेक्यो-रिटी कौंसिल में एल्जीरिया के साथ कोई इन्साफ़ होगा ।

इन इलफ़ाज़ के साथ मैं होल हार्टेडली गवर्नमेंट की पोलिसी को सपोर्ट करता हूँ ।]

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a very burning question and certainly I wanted that I should open my lips with all precaution. There is no doubt about it that the international situation today is not what it was yesterday. Let me say that the burning problems are still there. There is no doubt about it that problems like Hungary, problems like Suez Canal, Korea, all these are not there at present. But there are so many problems which have been created by the present situation and by the present intervention of the Western Powers in the Middle East that unless that situation is wholly—not partially—removed from the arena of the Middle East, the threat and the danger of world war is still there. I want to say one thing. Many things are spoken about Arab nationalism, but Arab nationalism is not the creation of today, it is not a recent creation. Let me go back to history, to the days when there was the Ottoman empire and the entire Ottoman empire was very closely related, closely associated with India and the Indian people. From that time the nationalism used to be there with the Arab people, when the present Arab countries were embraced by the Ottoman empire at that time. I do not want that the history should be forgotten. It was fifty years back that the movement of young Turks was there and because of this Sultan Abdul Majeed Khan had to abdicate. All these were signs of nationalism which was there fifty years back, in the Arab world at the time of the Ottoman empire. It was because of this eyesore that after the First Great War there was a common

plan between America and England and these European powers to dismember the Ottoman empire and break that empire into pieces. The result of it is today, before our eyes, those Middle East States which are existing today. They are the creation of America and Britain after the First Great War. Why was it done? It was done simply to play with the eastern people, with the eastern world and the Middle East as they are now playing with us today, as we are seeing. I say the question of Lebanon is there. We say these are sovereign States. Sovereign States have got a sovereign right to exist. They do not depend upon the intervention and interference of other European and Western Powers. We are seeing that the forces of Europe, the forces of Britain and America are still in Lebanon and Jordan. It was said by our Prime Minister some time back that the forces from Jordan would be withdrawn just after the Presidential election there. I was doubtful, but respectfully I could not express my doubts. I say that my doubts have been confirmed today. Even now, when so many questions have been solved with the great wisdom of the Arab people and of those Arab States, the tension in the Middle-East has been greatly removed in view of their united resolution, united decision, I am still doubtful that the Western forces which are working underhand, and openly on the surface, will allow the Middle-East people, those sovereign powers to remain in peace. I think that is the great and fundamental threat for the entire world.

One thing I must say about Pakistan affairs. My friend has just said that a third bloc is required to safeguard our independence and to make ourselves strong. I strongly oppose this move. I think we are already in the midst of two powers and so many others powers which are called Western Powers. What will the third power do for us, unless we make ourselves and make our feet strong on our own soil. Of course I hesitate

[Shah Mohamad Umair.]

but I want to remove this hesitation. to express in this House at this time of Foreign Affairs debate that there is only one way out for us. It is not a third or second bloc, or creation of any new bloc for our safety, but I suggest that the union of India and union of Pakistan, with united army and united military forces of India and Pakistan alone is the lasting solution. Every bit of effort of every Indian should be made to this end. Our Prime Minister is so sincere, he is so truthful and he is always anxious to see that no damage should be done to Pakistan, no harm should be done to India. So, it is very easy that we should make our united efforts for the reunion of Pakistan and India, for the united military forces of India and Pakistan. I can say that that part which has been separated from our own body, that part of Pakistan is still our flesh and blood, and if we can impress upon them, if we can persuade them, if we can put our honest effort before them and our sincere wishes before their people that in this reunion the mystery and secret of your existence and the secret of your progress exists and the secret of the progress of India also exists, I think this reunion can undoubtedly be achieved and will serve the purpose of peace and prosperity. No third bloc will be required if this reunion is achieved at any cost. I think India is prepared to do it. I will not use hard words, strong words about Pakistan. Pakistan has done so many things that they cannot be counted. But one thing at this stage when the meeting of the two Prime Ministers is going to be held, I will certainly, most humbly, most sincerely submit to the Pakistan Government and to the Pakistan people that at least now after a lapse of ten years, we should come to reason, we should come to senses and we should realise that our safety and our existence depends not upon the Baghdad Pact. Their safety does not depend on military pacts with America, but their safety and progress depends upon the reunion with India. They

were flesh and blood of India. They are still flesh and blood of India. And they can very safely come together and make themselves strong, make themselves progressive, and also give India a chance, afford India the opportunity to make itself strong, in combination with Pakistan. The help of other European and other Western powers or other Asiatic powers may not be required to come to our help and to our rescue if Pakistan and India only reunite—and their military and armed forces are unified, and then alone I say the Western powers—whatever they may be—will have no chance to exploit and harm us. Of course, it is unfortunate that there are these questions—the border incidents and the canal water problems—and these may create some complexities and difficulties in the way of Pakistan and India coming together. If they overcome those difficulties and are once reunited, they can be the first and enviable power in the world without the necessity of any third or fourth bloc.

The foreign policy of our country has made mark in the world and it has earned appreciation from nations in the east and the west for which not only we Indians, but other countries also are proud. At least, if one more effort is made on both sides to achieve the reunion of India and Pakistan, I have no reason to be disappointed, and everything will be O.K. on permanent footing.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I had no mind to intervene in this debate. But it is the comments offered, in the first instance, by the Leader of the Communist Party on the speech delivered in the Lok Sabha by the Leader of the Praja-Socialist Party there and further the comments offered by another hon. Member belonging to the same party upon the speech given by my friend, Mr. D. P. Singh, which bring me to my feet to reply back to the charges made. Our case was never against Panchsheel or co-existence as such. If any party in India has sincerely and faithfully supported the

principle of Panchsheel or co-existence, it is the Praja-Socialist Party. All that we meant to say was that the co-signatories of the declaration of Panchsheel were not sincere in their professions like our friends in the Communist Party. We have seen it. It needs no argument. Examples have been cited in this House more than once. I need not dilate on that. What kind of Panchsheel is it to threaten and coerce Yugoslavia to submit to the dictates of Soviet Russia and China? What kind of Panchsheel is it to drench Hungary with blood, to quench the revolution of the people by blood? It is said that the agents of foreign imperialism were conspiring in Hungary. The same plea is raised by the United States of America that the agents of the U.S.S.R. were conspiring in the Middle East. The attitude of the P.S.P. is perfectly neutral in these matters. They condemned in unrestricted terms the aggression of the U.S.S.R. in Hungary as they have condemned the aggression of France and England on Egypt.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Will you recognise American help to the Indonesian rebels?

DR. A. N. BOSE: That is the kind of Panchsheel you talk about. You never leave any opportunity to slander the United States of America and you never leave any opportunity to uphold any of the misdeeds done by the U.S.S.R. According to your vocabulary the U.S.S.R. can do no wrong and whatever the U.S.A. does is wrong. The P.S.P. never adopts an attitude like that. It condemns with equal voice the misdeeds done by the eastern or the western camp. We have no Russo-phobia. We are not afraid of Communism. We are not afraid of any 'ism' anywhere in the world. But we are always vigilant about the liberties of the people.

47 R.S.D.—8.

(Interruption.) Nobody interrupted you when you rose to speak. You will have other occasions to reply to the charges. I am only defending myself. There are lots of charges against Soviet Russia, against the Communist countries of the eastern bloc. But I am not here for that. I am only here to defend the policy of my party, to defend the real neutralist attitude, to defend the real Panchsheel. What Acharya Kripalani said in the Lok Sabha and what my friend said in this House is simply this, that you profess Panchsheel, but you do not practise it. You are always casting slanders against the U.S.A. Is that the spirit of Panchsheel that you are trying to follow? Whenever there is any criticism offered to any of the policies of the U.S.S.R. you decry the critic as an agent of the U.S.A. You decry him as an agent of dollar. That is not the attitude of Panchsheel. That is not the real approach towards co-existence. Your very argument, your very brief, in favour of Panchsheel decries your sincerity. This proves your insincerity. It shows that you are at heart opposed to the U.S.A. in every bit. You want to strangle them just as the U.S.A. wants to strangle you. You are two parties, irreconcilably opposed to each other. But we want to co-exist with each whatever be the internal conditions, the internal policy of the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. We want to side with both on equal terms. I know that it is open to you to vilify us for any criticism offered even honestly as inspired by the dictates of the U.S.A. or by payments from the agents of the U.S.A. But I ask you to consider, are you consistent in your plea for co-existence and Panchsheel when you cannot tolerate any criticism of your system, any criticism of Soviet Russia, any criticism of any State in the eastern bloc?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In West Bengal, we are working together despite my hon. friend's criticism. I cherish their comradeship.

DR. A. N. BOSE: I am speaking about your speech in this House, not about what you are doing in West Bengal. Try to be more tolerant about the criticisms that are offered by others and to be a little more vigilant about your own faults, about your own defects. About Israel, while my friend admits that it has come to stay and that Israel has got to be given passage through the Suez Canal, still he said that the formation of Israel was motivated by England and America and that they were criminal in forming the independent State of Israel, in forming a homeland for the Jews, although after it has been formed, it is quite clear that . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: I did not say that.

DR. A. N. BOSE: . . . they should be given the right of passage through

the Suez Canal. When even a right thing is done, you criticise it because it was done by the Western countries and you impute some motives to the doing of these things.

I did not at all think of intervening in this debate. I appeal to my friends to be more sober and moderate in their charges which they make against any other party, whether inside or outside the House.

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

The House then adjourned at fifty-eight minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 27th August 1958.