

t [DEMARICATION OF EASTERN BORDER OF INDIA WITH PAKISTAN

100. SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have sent any communication to the Government of Pakistan regarding the interpretation of the Radcliffe Award in connection with the demarcation of Eastern border of India with Pakistan;

(b) whether the Government of Pakistan has sent her reply in the matter; and

(c) if the answer to part (b) above be in the negative whether the demarcation work will not be taken up until Pakistan's reply is received?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : (क) में (ग). पिछले दस सालों के दौरान में, भारत और पाकिस्तान की सरकारों के बीच, रेडक्लिफ गार्ड की अर्थ-व्याख्या (इंटरप्रिटेशन) के बारे में, बहुत सी लिखा-पढ़ी हुई है। तब से ऐसा कोई खत नहीं भेजा गया, क्योंकि रेडक्लिफ एवार्ड को ले कर उधर कोई नया झगड़ा नहीं उठा था। सीमा के जिन हिस्सों के बारे में कोई झगड़ा नहीं था, उनकी हदबन्दी का काम १९५० में शुरू कर दिया गया था और इसमें काफी प्रगति हुई है। झगड़े वाले हिस्सों की हदबन्दी, झगड़ा निबट जाने पर की जायेगी।

T[THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : (a) to (c). During the past 10 years numerous communications have been exchanged between the Governments of India and Pakistan regarding interpretation of the Radcliffe Award. No such communication has been sent recently as no fresh disputes about the Radcliffe Award have arisen lately. Demarcation of undisputed portions of the boundary has been proceeding

since 1950 and considerable progress has been made. Disputed portions will be demarcated after the disputes have been settled.]

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : 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."

It has become the custom, Sir, to discuss some such motion almost in every session of this House and in the other House and we welcome this occasion because we want the views of the House in regard to various aspects of our foreign policy. We want their advice in many matters and we want their support in the major lines of policy that we have adopted. In fact, this House—and the entire Parliament—has been good enough to support very fully the foreign policy of the Government of India even though there might have been differences in regard to many domestic matters. I do not say that everyone in India completely agrees with everything that we do in the foreign field, but I imagine that the main basis—and the main approach—of our foreign policy has a larger sympathy and adherence in the country than anything else. Even the criticisms that are made are either perhaps through some misunderstanding or in an attempt to give it greater emphasis and not challenging the main issue and the main approach.

I was just looking through a number of amendments which have been proposed to this motion. I looked at them with care and with an attempt to try to understand the viewpoint of the mover of the amendment. Except for the amendment of my hon.

friend Mr. Sapru, which in all modesty I will have to accept, I am afraid I cannot accept any others for a variety of reasons. There is a group of amendments by Shri Bhupesh Gupta and two other hon. Members opposite which point out what, according to them, have been our failings, though finally they end up by one amendment in which they say, add the following:

"and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government does not take due note of the growing machinations of certain elements who want to undermine and reverse the present foreign policy of India."

Now . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prime Minister, I have disallowed that amendment because it was very vague.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Even though you might have ruled out that amendment, the Prime Minister may be allowed to expand on this theme a little because we would very much like to hear him.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Thank you, Sir. I was pointing out the inconsistency of it, to say the least, when having criticised the foreign policy in a variety of ways, they refer in some irritation and annoyance to others who criticise it. In other words, by this amendment, the hon. Members stand up as the champions of our foreign policy, defending it against all attacker;. So, the fact is . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope the Prime Minister would not dislike that position on our part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not at all.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The fact, Sir, is that the hon. Member's own doxy is orthodoxy, everything else is heterodoxy, and that probably is the case with others too who criticise our foreign policy from any other point of view.

Now, normally speaking, in a debate on foreign policy specific issues of interest, of topical interest, are considered, and I shall no doubt refer to them, which are of peculiar interest to India. Yet all these specific issues, important as they are, very secondary in importance to the major issue in the world today, of the drift towards war or the approach towards peace, because that will govern all the other issues. And there is no doubt that the situation in the world today, while it is not without some hope, is nevertheless a very serious one, and a very grave one, and many thinkers in the world are very much perturbed at this trend of events. I should like this House to pay some attention to these broad aspects and not confine itself to some narrow issue which may temporarily be of interest to us. It is our good fortune or misfortune to live at a time of great change, of tremendous developments, which may bring good or evil to humanity. Living at this exciting period of human history, I would suggest to this House that we should take a view, in some perspective, of what has happened, what the position is today and what is likely to happen, and not confine itself to narrow issues. Then perhaps we might understand this tremendous theme.

Now, before I say much about this broader aspect, I shall refer to some of the special issues that will no doubt interest this House. Again, I should like to say that in considering any issue, we have to decide what method of approach we should adopt. It is easy for any hon. Member of this House or for me to express our opinions boldly about any issue if we do not care for the consequences. It is very easy to lay down high principles, but the difficulty comes in the application of those high principles, as we all know, because human beings are not governed by rigid rules, and each human being is different from the other, and to lay down certain rigid principles and expect everybody to follow them is perhaps not very wise. Now, the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] point is: what are we aiming at in the debate, in the speech that I deliver or any hon. Member does? Is it merely the repetition of those high principles which we pretend that we stand for or is it something which is meant to lead to something else, whether it is peace, whether it is a lessening of passions, whether it is a solution of a problem or whether it is a step in the right direction? It is important because we must know whether we are actively trying to achieve some result however small it may be or just trying to lighten our minds by giving expression in strong or moderate language to our views about the world in general. Now, surely, a Government, which is responsible or considers itself so or a body like this House, which obviously is responsible, has to consider these matters from this very practical point of view of trying to achieve results. I do not say that even this House or our Parliament can achieve major results in world policy because nobody can pretend that our influence is such as to mould world opinion or world actions, but all of us count for a little and in all humility we try to influence it to that little extent in certain directions. Now, why I am emphasising this matter is because some of the amendments show, and others too, that we are criticised sometimes for not taking up a bold and a gallant attitude in regard to some matters in jumping into the field and so on and so forth. Well, that may be a very gallant thing, but it has no relation to reality. That period of Rajput chivalry does not apply to modern politics, brilliant as it may be. The other alternative of course, is being drawn into the controversy of the cold war, that is to say, casting all the blame on the other party for the lack of success of efforts made towards peace. Now, the argument may be perfectly justified or not—I am not going into that—but if you seek to get an agreement with the other party, if you seek to win over the other party, it is not the best way to approach it to make a facet of it to begin with and to criticise it. That

way, you will make it more difficult to get on with. I am not dealing with the merits of any question, but with the other thing, making an approach to the broad problems of the world. We are either making an approach with the intention of lessening the gaps, bringing these gaps together, winning over the other party if not completely at least to some extent or we are merely wanting to declare something that we have in mind loudly because we believe in it regardless of how it affects the main issue. Now, I do submit that there has been too much of this, what I venture to call, the cold-war mentality approach which, of course, is much more than what I have said because it is normally based on fear and apprehension, passion and prejudices as well as a desire not to appear to be cowed down by what the other party says, and a strange amalgam is produced out of all this which makes even relatively easy problems very difficult of solution. We have to deal here really not only with political, economic, military and like problems which are there practically, but we have to deal with something intangible in the minds of men—which comes in the way—fear and anger and dislike and all that and which is a dangerous thing in this background of hatred. Now, obviously, one cannot get over that major difficulty merely by going on criticising the other party even though that criticism might appear to be justified. You do not get over it; you may satisfy yourselves but I do submit that by pursuing that policy we will not help ourselves or anyone else.

I do not pretend to say that this Parliament or our country is superior in the sense that we are above passion, prejudice, hatred and fury. I do not say that in the least. As the House knows, we have fallen very low indeed in our passionate approaches to questions even amongst ourselves in the country but, as things are, there are a certain number of factors which help us. One factor is that we are geographically so situated

that we are not drawn into this controversy with that passionate fury that other countries no so favourably situated may be. That is a major fact of geography, not of our goodness or of badness. The other thing is that the past years, not only since Independence, but previously too, have, under the inspiration of the Father of the Nation, trained us to some extent to think in a certain way and not to lose ourselves in a policy based merely on fear and passion. We might be swept away occasionally by fear or by passion but we have tried to pull ourselves up. Therefore, because of these geographical and other factors we sometimes are in a position to help a little, not because of any special virtue on our part. I want to make that very clear because some people imagine that we consider ourselves very virtuous. I do not, and I speak in all honesty, consider my country more virtuous than the other countries. Some of our friends in our country appear to lay great stress on our high virtue and our spirituality in dealing with problems. Well, nobody can deny our great inheritance but that great inheritance of ours and the spirituality and other things are often shrouded up in something which is the very reverse of spirituality, and the gentlemen who generally repeat about this spirituality normally possess the least of it.

So, situated as we are, we have endeavoured, wherever we may function, whether it is the United Nations or bilaterally with other countries, to place our viewpoint as fairly and as clearly as possible but always in a context of emphasising the common points and not emphasising the differences. Differences have to be pointed out, of course, wherever they are, but it does make a difference as to what you emphasise. The other party knows what our viewpoints are and by emphasising the common points you produce a certain favourable reaction in the other party and it is easier to discuss matters even though you may disagree. Recently, within the last few days, we have

had a Conference here, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, and there were discussions on various subjects including foreign affairs. Now, it is obvious that there was a great deal of difference in the viewpoints represented by the Delegations to that Conference. If I may mention, take the Delegation from South Africa. The House knows how we differ completely and how our policy is different from that of the South African Government, but the South African Delegation came here and we welcomed it as individuals, as our guests, regardless of our differences. So also in other cases. Here is this Conference consisting of a strange variety of people. The newest arrivals in it are from Ghana and Malaya. There were representatives from Nigeria, from the West Indies and so on. There was this great variety representing an equal variety of nations and approaches and yet we met, discussed matters and expressed our viewpoints with some force, differed with each other and yet kept our temper, spoke in a restrained way trying to appreciate what the other has said and trying to make the

other understand what we feel. I do submit that if

there is no other virtue in our meeting than that we had met and spoken and discussed these matters in that calm and relatively objective way, this kind of thing is a great purpose. I wish that this particular temper of approach to problems and to differences could be applied in many other places also.

I should like to place before the House some other instances of how we endeavour to function. We do not always succeed, we do not function by ourselves, naturally. Recently, a resolution was passed in the United Nations on Algeria. Now, Algeria has become one of the major problems of the day. A terrible war has been going on there. The House knows that we in India, all of us naturally and inevitably, are in favour of the freedom and independence of Algeria, of the Algerian people. We have always said at the same time

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] that this question should be settled by peaceful methods. Unfortunately, war has gone on there and terrible things have happened, and continue to happen. Now, passions have been excited, and it is not an easy matter for any approach to be made to the Algerian problem which would bring people nearer to each other. Normally, every approach separates men. The United Nations, constituted as it is, can help but cannot force down any kind of solution. It has often failed. Take the South African issue, and India and Pakistan. The advice of the United Nations has not gone very far, and yet it would be wrong to say that the advice or the resolutions of the United Nations have failed. They have made a difference not only to world opinion but I am sure even in South Africa—may be not among the Government, but among the people.

However, here is this question of Algeria, a most difficult question. Yet, in co-operation with some other countries, India prepared a resolution which was passed unanimously by the Assembly. An extraordinary thing. Now, the resolution itself may not go very very far. It is a simple resolution, but it is an extraordinary thing that over an issue, which has roused so much passion, as Algeria a simple resolution should pass. The only country that did not vote was France. It did not vote against it, I mean it abstained from voting and all the other voted. Now, the wording of the resolution may or may not be important. But the passing of a resolution of that type itself created or was meant to create a temper which leads to peaceful negotiations, leads to lessening of tension, leads to an attempt to appreciate the reality of the problem, and so forth.

I gave this example of Algeria where very recently this step was taken by the United Nations, as showing how we feel about these matters.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Will the Prime Minister tell

us what resolution has been passed by the United Nations on the Algerian question? The papers announce only the fact that a resolution has been passed.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not quite sure if I have got it. If I have not got it, I shall get it. I know I have not got it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can state it tomorrow morning when you reply.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: We should like to have the resolution much earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But he has not got it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: He can get it in the course of the day.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I thought it must have appeared in the Press, and therefore I did not bring it. Just at present I do not know where it is. Anyway it is a resolution calling upon the parties concerned to deal with it and arrive at a settlement peacefully. However, I shall endeavour to place it on the Table of the House today.

Now, we are entangled in other problems. There is the problem of Goa. Then there is a different type entirely, the question of Ceylon, the people of Indian descent in Ceylon, a problem affecting many hundreds of thousands of persons in Ceylon, essentially a problem for the Ceylon Government and for the people of Indian descent there, but we are naturally interested in it and we should like to help in solving it. We treat it as a human problem, not as a political one, and in spite of the fact that much progress has not been made towards a solution, it is an advantage that we discuss it with Ceylon in the friendliest manner, and if we do not solve it today, there is hope of solving it tomorrow. At present I confess we are nowhere near solving it, and things remain where they are. I had a very friendly talk with the Prime Minister

of Ceylon who was here, long discussions we had, and we understood each other, I think, fairly thoroughly, each other's difficulties, each other's problems.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Will the Prime Minister enlighten us as to the nature of the problem and what the approach of the Indian Government is with regard to that problem.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: What problem?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: The approach of the Indian Government with regard to that problem—we would like to be enlightened on that issue.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: In Ceylon there are of course Indian nationals. There is no great problem about them, except that we should like Indian nationals to be treated as other foreign nationals with the same privileges, and not to be pushed out suddenly and in large numbers. But that is not the problem. The problem is of a large number of people of Indian descent who have lived in Ceylon, many of whom have been born in Ceylon, most of whom work in the plantations there, and who according to us should be Ceylon nationals—unless any of them choose Indian nationality—and about whom the Ceylon Government has not been very encouraging in making them its own nationals. There are these many hundreds of thousands of persons who in a sense are stateless, although they are in Ceylon. They are not Indian nationals, and the Ceylon Government has not made them yet its own nationals, and they remain in that fluid state. A few have become Indian nationals; a few, relatively few, I forget what the total number is, have been registered as Ceylon nationals, but most of the applications for registration as Ceylon nationals have been rejected by the

Government. So, they remain in that fluid state. As I said, it is not really our problem except sentimentally. It is a problem of our people living there. It is up to the Ceylon Government and those people to adjust and solve it, we can help in that. If any of those want to become Indian nationals and satisfy the qualifications for being Indian nationals laid down in our Constitution, of course we shall accept them. But we do not accept any persons who come under compulsion, who are compelled. We object to that. If they decide freely without any compulsion, we take them. Then there is the question of Goa again—a subject which has caused all of us much trouble, many headaches and may cause us many headaches in the future because of the extraordinary attitude of the Portuguese Government which, as I have said earlier, lives so apart from the modern world and modern thinking that it is difficult even to talk to them. Now, of course, we do not talk because our contacts have been cut off. But when we did try to talk to them, it was like talking to somebody in the middle ages. However ancient India may be, India thinks in the modern age and acts in the modern age. However, as some of the questions of today indicated, Portugal has discovered some kind of a pen friend in the President of Pakistan who has recently been visiting it and they are supporting each other in various matters. So, in spite of all this, in spite of the amazing anachronism of Goa being still a colonial possession, Goa is not something separate, but is right in the middle of India. The House knows how we have patiently tried to find a way to a solution and found great difficulties. The difficulties are still there, but we refused to talk of forcible or military methods. Many Members in this House have thought—and may still so think—that we have been acting weakly and that we must be much more positive and aggressive. Well, I will not go into that matter, but at the present moment, what I am pointing out is that we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] have to follow a policy which we pride to be an integrated one. We cannot do something which, in fact, goes against our policy somewhere else. We will spoil our policy in both places when we venture to say in the United Nations and elsewhere that all problems should be solved peacefully. We cannot at the same time talk of military measures because it happens to be to our interest to do so. Every one knows that, from a military point of view, Goa is not a problem and if the President of Portugal has said that, of course, India can take Goa in a day or two or whatever it may be the period, but we have not.

Then, Portugal went, on a slightly allied issue, to the International Court of Justice at the Hague. This is about Nagar Haveli and Portugal is asking for a right of passage through India, to cross Indian territory, to those enclaves which used to be in the Portuguese possession, but which liberated themselves about three years ago and which are now, well," more or less independent. They are not parts of the Union of India. No doubt, they want to be parts of the Union of India, but we have not accepted them because we want them to come through some normal processes, through some agreement and the like. Now, this matter . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay) v Agreements with whom—the people of Nagar Haveli or somebody else?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No, agreement over the whole Goa question. I say, we do not wish to isolate this separately.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: No, Sir. The Prime Minister said that the people of Nagar Haveli had liberated themselves and had become more or less independent.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: No 'more or less.'

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: They have become independent and that has not been integrated with India because the Prime Minister wanted some sort of an agreement. I want to know.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I said, there is no difficulty about our agreeing with the people of Nagar Haveli. I said that I did not wish to isolate this problem from the problem of the other Portuguese territories in India. When that problem is settled, then we take the normal steps about Nagar Haveli, because it produces a certain complication. One can proceed in these matters with some...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What are the complications?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Well, the complications are that I may do something which may be to the liking of the hon. Member opposite, but which is quite wrong.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister is this. Suppose Nagar Haveli came to India, what will be the complication? I will be happy and the Prime Minister will also be happy. Portugal may be unhappy about it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Nagar Haveli is in India. There is no difficulty about it. It is only constitutional. We do not wish to take a step because that step should apply not to Nagar Haveli separately, but to Goa and other places also. When the time comes, it will comprise all of them. Meanwhile, we carry on. There is no difficulty about Nagar Haveli.

But, this matter about the right of passage, as the House knows, was taken by the Portuguese Government to the International Court of Justice and we are contesting their claim there. We put forward six preliminary objections to the hearing of the Portuguese claim in the International Court of Justice. About a week or ten

days ago, the International Court of Justice gave their decision in regard to four of these preliminary objections, rejecting them and decided that, in regard to two of the preliminary objections, they would consider them ! further at the time of the final hearing of this case, which will probably take I place some time next year. Well naturally, we cannot—and I do not wish to—discuss the judgment of the International Court of Justice. There it is and we shall proceed to take other steps with regard to it.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VLTAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Does the decision go against our whole case?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: How can a decision on preliminary points go against the case? It does not deal with the merits of the case; it deals with the right of the International Court of Justice to hear the case. They said, we have a right to hear it. Even that they have not fully said. There, two objections still remain, which they will consider on the merits. It is open to them to hold on those objections even at this stage, that the suit does not apply.

In regard to Pondicherry, I should like to tell the House—we have been told, in fact—that in the course of a few weeks—may be a month or two—the French Parliament will presumably take the final steps, final legal steps. Practically, of course, steps were taken long ago. We have been expecting them for a considerable time past. But I do not think the delay has been due really to any basic objection there, but to the French Parliament's and the French Government's being entangled in their own internal affairs and controversies. In this connection, I should like to repeat what we said long ago about these French enclaves. The House may remember that, when this Treaty with France was signed and even before that, we had laid a great stress and made it clear that we would not change the status of Pondicherry without consulting its people. We

declared this and I want to repeat that, lest some people may think that we are going to impose any change on them. There are other various matters included in that Treaty. We are preserving the French language there. We have also preserved many things, because we do not want to change them which Pondicherry and the like enclaves inherited in the past without their consenting to it and having the chance. So far as the French language is concerned, we welcome it; we welcome the idea of having a centre in India where French will not only be taught as a foreign language but something in a better and deeper way, and which could be claimed to be a centre of French culture.

Recently, the Kashmir issue has been before the Security Council and our position was stated there with fullness and clarity by the Leader of our Delegation, Shri Krishna Menon. His exposition of our case was a fine one and I should like to pay a tribute to him. But a resolution was brought forward by a number of countries represented there which we thought was very wrong and which ignored and by passed what we considered the main issue in the case. We made our position perfectly clear in regard to this matter.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajas- than): If the exposition was so good and if the advocacy was so fine, why could he not convince the other countries?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Sometimes when the case is good and the advocacy is good too, even then I am unable to convince my hon. ¹ friends opposite. I have no doubt in many cases. . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: The point is that there were certain statements made by Shri Krishna Menon in the Security Council, which he withdrew later. If the advocacy was so good and the argument was good, there was no reason for him to withdraw what he had said there.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I suppose the hon. member is not referring to any advocacy but to certain remarks, sentences and phrases which Shri Krishna Menon used, for which he expressed regret. It was not part of his advocacy. It was really the result of the great strain and illness that he made those remarks and it was a question of lack of courtesy, not of advocacy. Under the great strain and illness he said something which he regretted and we regretted. So, he has rightly withdrawn those remarks.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: The statements made by Shri Krishna Menon, were they true?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Discourtesy is never right even though it may be true!

(Laughter)

So, after that, a resolution was put forward and we expressed ourselves clearly that we could not accept it. Thereupon the Soviet Union made it known that they would, if this was put to the vote, vote against it, which meant that they vetoed it. Thereafter the sponsors of that resolution decided not to put it to the vote and after some further consideration brought forward a very different type of resolution, which ultimately was passed. So far as we are concerned, we do not accept even this resolution although I must say that it does not contain most of the objectionable features of the first one. This resolution invites or requests Dr. Graham to come to India. Well, Dr. Graham, of course, can always come to India. He is welcome to India as he was previously; he is welcome now also. But we have made it clear that this visit should not be considered as some kind of continuation of talks on the old lines with Dr. Graham as regards demilitarisation etc. So, that is the position.

One matter that is causing us a great deal of concern is the developments, recent developments, in Indonesia. The House knows that we

have been of opinion and we have expressed it clearly in the United Nations and elsewhere that the claim of Indonesia for West Irian is a right one, is a legitimate one and it flows from the circumstances of the case and even from the various treaties made by Indonesia and the Government of the Netherlands, and I am not going into the legalities of it. That is our view. The Netherlands Government has a different interpretation of those treaties. So, I am not going into the legalities, but apart from strict law, the fact remains that all over Asia and elsewhere too, there is no approval left of foreign colonial possession. The time is long past when these conditions could be tolerated and from that standpoint alone, it is clear that such a continuation of colonial authority would only be an irritant and would continue to be an irritant and we hope that this matter would be settled peacefully between the Government of the Netherlands and the Indonesian Government. Many efforts have been made thus far without success. Only a short while ago a resolution was moved in the U.N.— I think it was about a fortnight ago. The resolution was a very simple one:

"The General Assembly, having considered the Question of West Irian (West New Guinea), viewing with deep concern that the prolongation of this political dispute is likely to endanger the peaceful development of that area, realising that a peaceful solution of this problem should be obtained without further delay;

1. Invites both parties to pursue* their endeavours to find a solution of the dispute in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter;

2. Requests the Secretary General to assist the parties¹ concerned as he deems it appropriate in the implementation of this resolution and submit a report of the progress to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly."

The House will notice that this resolution is very carefully worded, avoiding any offence to anybody. Purposefully it was so worded. Yet, it was nevertheless opposed by the Netherlands Government and by some other governments. Voting on it was ultimately 41 in favour, 29 against and 11 abstentions, that is to say, many more voted in favour of it than against. But it had to be passed by a two-third majority and because it did not get a two-third majority, it failed.'

Now, this was a great blow to the Indonesian Government and their people, that even this very moderate approach, which had been supported by so many countries—so far as I remember the USA abstained on this resolution, they did not oppose it, in spite of their great friendship for the Netherlands they did not oppose the resolution but abstained from voting which, if I may say so, meant half approval of the case, if not more—did not succeed. However, it was so. Now, this has led to a certain happenings in Indonesia which it is little difficult for us to understand or to appreciate. We hear about the happenings, we read in the newspapers and we also get some other accounts and all this has caused us great concern. Well, our sympathy is with the Government of Indonesia as the people of Indonesia in this matter, but we do hope earnestly that these matters will not be allowed to drift in such a way that a peaceful settlement is ruled out, that is in accordance with our own approach to these questions anywhere, and apart from that if conflicts occur on a different plane, no one knows where they would stop. There as elsewhere the attempted approach was one of conciliation, but unfortunately it has failed thus far.

Now, I should like to say a few words about this particular problem to which I referred, the old problem of war and peace. In one of the amendments something is stated about

India's voice being [listened to less and less in the world. Well, we do not, I hope, shout, and I hope we will never shout. But I do believe that what India says has some importance in the minds of people outside India, and that there has been a progressive appreciation and realisation of India's policy of non-alignment. And I am sure if those Members who have any doubt about this fact could have an opportunity of themselves: finding out what people in other countries think of India and her policy, they will be surprised, and they have to change many of their fast-held opinions. Now, in considering the world problem we come up against this business of cold war which has become now, whatever virtue it might have had in the past, completely illogical and leading nowhere. This business of people talking that we must be tough and we must speak from strength becomes rather unmeaning when strength is matched by strength and toughness can be matched by toughness and when the ultimate recourse to put an end to one toughness by war is ruled out, because everybody proceeds on the assumption that we must have no war. Why? Because war will not only destroy your adversary, but it will destroy yourself and the rest of the world. Now, that was the position even before certain recent advances were made in weapons like these ballistic weapons, and although this Sputnik and others are new weapons, they open out a prospect of other weapons of the most dangerous kind coming up. Obviously, no one country is going to have a monopoly. At the present moment the United States has some weapons which the Soviet Union has not got. No doubt the Soviet Union will get them and develop them. The Soviet Union has got the Sputnik and something else which the United States has thus far not got. No doubt the United States will have it in a month or two or in three months. It is always a question of delay of a little time between the scientists and others of one country and the other. And what is more, not

only the United States of America

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] and the Soviet Union, but gradually other countries will also possess these weapons. As they are beginning to possess them. The United Kingdom has the hydrogen bomb. So, whether one 'country is a little ahead of the other or not, the fact is that either of these giants has got enough material and bombs to destroy the other completely. And therefore any attempt by any one power, howsoever powerful it is, to coerce the other through military means involves destruction of both. Having arrived at that conclusion the natural result is that only a mad man will indulge in such an act. How then are you to solve these problems? If you rule out coercion by war or threat of war, how do you solve these problems? Well, cold war is not a method of conciliation. That is obvious, and you are ruling out war. So you hang between the two with no possibility of finding a way out of that deadlock. So, it becomes more and more obvious that these policies of toughness and threats and brandishing of the sword do not lead anywhere.

The other day, Sir, a very eminent American expert on Soviet and Russian matters—I think his name is Mr. George Kennan—delivered a series of lectures in some university in which he made certain suggestions. The suggestions are not novel. They have been made by others also. But the point was that this very considerable expert in these matters had arrived at these conclusions. He said, as many people now say and as was said here in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference by Mr. Gaitekell, that an attempt should be made at disengagement. This grappling together all the time like two wrestlers is not good enough. So, gradually one must disengage. And what the method of disengagement may be is a different matter. Mr. Kennan suggested as a first step towards disengagement that the various foreign armies in Europe should gradually be withdrawn. That is to say, the Soviet armies from other countries where they are stationed

should be withdrawn, and the other armies of the Western countries from Germany and wherever else they may be should be withdrawn. That is to say, both should simultaneously agree to withdraw. Now, in our own small way we have often suggested that the keeping of foreign forces in other countries is bad, and whatever virtue it might have had in the past, in the present day it does not help at all. So, it was suggested that they should be withdrawn, whether they are the Soviet forces or the forces of the Western allies. It is interesting therefore that a very eminent American expert has come to that view and has advocated it. But it is not only Mr. Kennan. This realisation is coming more and more to people's minds, even though many of them may not say so because they have a feeling that "if we say this, we might perhaps be weakening our country's policy and making the other country think that we are weakening." This is an inhibiting factor. But the fact remains that people are driven inevitably to the conclusion that there is no hope in pursuing the policies at present pursued. This constant wrestling, cold war, piling up of armaments and this frantic search for a more powerful weapon, the ultimate weapon and so on—and as one ultimate weapon comes, it is succeeded by another which is more ultimate still—where does it all lead to? Obviously, it does not lead anywhere except ultimately to destruction. So, when I said in the beginning that there were some elements of hope, I was referring to this gradual opening out of people's minds to these basic facts of the situation. But apart from this, the situation is bad enough. There is no doubt about it, and it has not been made easier by these latest discoveries like the Sputnik and others. Not that the Sputnik can do much. It has no military value. But as I said, it opens out the possibilities of greater and more destructive weapons which can destroy even the whole world. It was these thoughts which weighed with me and which made me issue a respectful appeal to

the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, and I was not presumptuous enough to think that I could advise them in this very difficult situation, because it is no good thinking that it is an easy situation to deal with and we have only to lay down a principle or repeat a slogan and the problem will be solved. It is a very difficult situation. Nevertheless, the burden on my mind was so great that I had the presumption to issue this appeal to them. It was not any particular thing in the appeal that counted so much as the basic fact that a new approach should be made to these problems, and a new approach can only be made by people coming together, and I do hope that it will take place.

Now, war, today, it is said End rightly said, is likely to be completely different from even the last World War. The weapons are different. Any General who thinks in the terms of the last World War and prepares for the next war on that basis, well, he is not at all good and he will have the surprise of his life when the next war comes. In other words, a General has to think on different lines. I do submit that in international affairs which are so intimately connected with defence and war potentials and the like—in international affairs also—we have to think on different lines and get out of our old rut. Nothing preserves that rut so much as the cold-war mentality. In fact, the cold-war mentality is no mentality at all. It is cold war. Thinking does not come in so much, because it is suppressed by passion and anger, and therefore the most dangerous part of the situation is this mentality going on and befogging people's minds and filling them with dislike and hatred and thereby possibly leading to some kind of incident which even Governments may not know—any odd General may do something in a fit of madness, in a fit of excitement, in a fit of loss of nerves, and that may bring all this catastrophe without even the knowledge of the Government con-

cerned, because once somebody lets loose these terrible weapons, the others will follow step by step.

Therefore, our approach in this matter is not that we do not like this country or like the other country and so we run it down and say it is at fault and others are not at fault, even though some of our arguments may be occasionally justified. It is a bad approach. The new approach, that can help is the approach of not laying stress on differences but rather laying stress on similarities, on common points and on common dangers. That is the approach of reconciliation, and I do hope that progressively people in other countries will adopt that approach. The people in every country, I believe, do think in that way, but the leaders who have to shoulder these heavy responsibilities naturally have to consider every aspect of the question, and it is very easy for us, sitting or standing at a distance, to criticise them without realising all the difficulties they have to face. So, I issued that appeal and day before yesterday, I received a reply from Mr. Bulganin, Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. The reply, I believe, is in today's press. I do not know whether the whole of it is there but at least most of it is there, and naturally it deserves the fullest consideration. I am grateful to Mr. Bulganin for dealing with this matter at such length and suggesting that this kind of atomic tests should be suspended. That is what we have been saying for a long time. It is not so much the actual suspension of the tests that is good and will help in clearing the atmosphere but the avoidance of the spirit of the atomic tests being applied to people's mental processes, Governments' mental processes, i.e. it is the approach to each other in anger and trying to run each other down which is coming in the way more than even the atom bomb today. I earnestly hope that this new approach will be made by the great leaders. We are small fry; in this matter we have no presumption that we can play an important part, but

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] we do wish to play an independent part, because that is the only way we can serve our country and the rest of the world. Sir, I move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

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

I have received a number of amendments. They may be moved now without any speeches.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I move:

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

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

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets to note that wrong handling of our foreign policy and incorrect understanding of the international situation have resulted,—

(i) in the passing of a resolution by the Security Council partially reviving the Graham Mission;

(ii) in the lowering of the prestige of India in asking for financial aid and loans from countries in the Western bloc on the plea that it is necessary if India is to be saved from totalitarianism;

(iii) in the weakening of our voice in the Councils of the World for helping the cause of peace and disarmament; and

(iv) in the diverting of large sums of money which are urgently needed for the fulfilment of the Second Five Year Plan to the purchase of war equipment for the defence of India."

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets to note that wrong handling of our foreign policy and incorrect understanding of the international situation have resulted,—

(i) In the passing of a resolution by the Security Council partially reviving the Graham Mission; and

(ii) in the lowering of the prestige of India in asking for financial aid and loans from countries in the Western bloc on the plea that it is necessary if India is to be saved from totalitarianism."

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that India, though a Sovereign Democratic Republic, continues to remain a member of the Commonwealth.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the Kashmir issue is still treated as part of the problem connected with foreign affairs.' "

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I beg to move:

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government has not expressed its whole-

hearted support to the people and the Government of Indonesia in their present struggle to secure the liberation of West Irian."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government has not fully taken into account the serious threat to the security and territorial integrity of India arising out of declarations made by the President of Pakistan during his sojourn in Lisbon and Madrid."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government does not still recognise the need for second conference of the Asian-African Powers in order to face the aggressive actions of the Western Powers in the Afro-Asian region."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government does not recognise the need of establishing full diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic"

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government does not express its disapproval of the continued existence of the British armed forces in Malaya and of the attempts to draw the Malayan Federation into the SEATO."

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

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the Government does not declare that the latest resolution of the Security Council on the so-called Kashmir issue can only further complicate the situation and has no validity as far as India is concerned."

90 R.S.D.—3.

(These amendments also stood in the names of Dr. R. B. Gour and Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendments are now before the House. You may sit through the lunch hour and go on till after 5 and stop at about 5-30 or so, and the Prime Minister will be good enough to answer tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have just sent a paper to Dr. Kunzru. It is a cutting from a newspaper. I find that the full details of the resolution are not there but there is some reference in it. I have sent it to him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, you have disallowed two of my rather significant amendments.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I tabled these amendments with a view to impressing upon the Government that it is not only necessary to have, broadly speaking, a correct foreign policy but it is also necessary to see that the conditions inside the country are such that would enable the Government to maintain that foreign policy. That is why I moved these amendments as a matter of caution against certain developments inside the country which seek to undermine the present foreign policy of the country. I do not see any inconsistency in that. Sometimes, a friendly critic is better than sycophants. Very often he is better than a sycophant, and sometimes probably a 'friendly critic brings better judgment to bear on things and throws a new light on matters on which they are in disagreement. Because we broadly support the foreign policy of the present Government, we are intensely interested in defending it and not only in defending it but also in seeing that the agencies that are against that foreign policy or that seek to subvert that policy do not get the upper hand in the situation. This is the kind of co-operative effort which

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] I think such a statesman as the Prime Minister of our country should not fail to understand.

Now, we are very grateful to the Prime Minister that he at least made some reference to the problem of Indonesia. Indonesia today is very much in our mind and that is what ought to be. It was about 8 or 9 years ago, in 1949 that at the initiative of the Government of India and of the Prime Minister in particular, a conference of 17 nations was held in Delhi on the question of Indonesia's independence and at that Conference, on January 20, the Prime Minister made a speech which appears in this book *Independence and After* published by the Government of India and the speech is titled 'Crisis in Indonesia'. Supporting the cause of Indonesia's independence against the aggressive actions of the Dutch Imperialism at that time, he said:

"The next step should be to aim at the elimination of colonialism. It must be appreciated that so long as any form of colonialism exists in Asia or elsewhere, there will be conflict and a threat to peace."

This is what he said. The sentiments expressed and the views expressed in that speech in that Conference would be shared by everybody . . .

(Interruptions.)

It was an inspiration not only to the Indonesian people but also to others. Today again, for no fault of her own, Indonesia has been placed in a difficult situation. It was negotiated in 1949 that within a year of the transfer of power, West Irian would be transferred peacefully to the independent Indonesian Republic. This was the commitment the Dutch colonial rulers made at that time. They have never cared to keep this commitment. On the contrary, all these years, it has been their endeavour to strengthen their position, to maintain their base there in order to direct attacks against the resurgent Indonesian Republic.

Eight years of experience tell us as to how the Dutch Imperialists have been guilty of treachery and treason, have been guilty of violation of the pledges that they made, have been holding West Irian not for development purposes but for maintaining forces which are clearly directed against the Indonesian Republic. Eight years of conspiracy, eight years of machinations, eight years of attempts against the Indonesian Republic have been the bitter experience of the great Indonesian people who have moved in majestic steps today to liberate that territory of theirs. This is the story. As against that treachery, Indonesia has shown great examples of patience and endurance. For eight years they have shown their readiness to discuss this question with them, and seek a solution peacefully and through negotiations. They went to the U.N. organisation and placed the matter before them in order to seek redress of their national grievances, in order to seek justice before the bar of that world organisation. I can only quote from the speech of their Foreign Minister in the U.N. organisation. He pleaded for the restoration of West Irian to the Indonesian Republic. That is what he said in his speech. He said:

"We trust that this session of the General Assembly will answer this question consonant with the faith, patience and moderation shown for so long by Indonesian people, and will adopt constructive recommendations for a final and peaceful settlement of the problem of West Irian."

This is what he said. He then said in his speech:

"So far Indonesia has concentrated on the United Nations front in the hope that this world organization may be able to help both sides to settle the issue by negotiations."

Now, in that he also warned that:

"This should not be considered a mere matter of routine, although this was the fourth time the Assembly would deal with it."

file made it very clear that as far as the Indonesian Republic was concerned, they were ready to settle this question through peaceful negotiations. Now, we have seen what has happened to the resolution, that innocuous and very moderate resolution, which was moved in the United Nations General Assembly. The resolution could not be passed because the Western Powers opposed it. The Prime Minister said that America abstained from voting but everyone knows that but for the support of the United States of America but for the military support, backed by NATO Powers, Netherlands, would not be in a position to last one single day in the West Irian territory. Everybody knows that the Western Powers sided with Netherlands in seeing that that resolution could not be passed. Indonesia's last hopes were shattered to the ground. The Indonesians went to the World organisation for redress and for justice, for getting back what belongs to them but whatever they tried to do, they did not succeed because others stood in the way. This is what happened. Naturally, in that situation they had to take some other path, but remember that as the resolution was turned down in the U.N. organisation, there was an attempt on the life of Mr. Soekarno, the President of Indonesia and there has been of course attempts inspired by the Western Powers to overthrow the legally constituted Government of Indonesia. We also get reports in the press that off the West Irian coast, the naval forces of the Dutch are being strengthened and there has been a greater concentration of forces than before. This is what has been the activity on the side of the other party. Naturally, having no other alternative, having had the door to negotiations slammed to their faces, the great people of Indonesia, true to the cause of independence, true to the Bandung Declarations, came forward and peacefully moved into action so that sense could dawn upon the Dutch Imperialists and the liberation of West Irian could be secured. Things are not at

all violent there. The people have risen with great confidence, moved by great patriotism, to take possession of the Dutch establishments there, the undertakings and others, which are the last vestiges of colonial domination there. After all colonialism exists not merely in certain military forces, nor in certain political arrangements but also in the economic system and in the economic order. In Indonesia today one billion dollar worth of foreign capital is invested of which 70 or 80 per cent, belongs to the Dutch. The plantations, coalmines, the banks and various other institutions which are the life of the nation—the big assets of the nation—are still in the hands of the Dutch Imperialists. These became not only the centres of economic exploitation of that country, these became also the centres of intrigue, centres of corruption, centres of subversive activities directed against the republic of Indonesia. Today the people have risen to their own statute and they are only settling account with the dismal past. I have not a doubt in my mind that the Indonesian people will triumph over the forces of Dutch Imperialism colonialism and enslavement. The question is what are we going to do? Is it not our duty to express our solid support to the cause of Indonesian independence and their present heroic struggle? Sir, I am pained to see certain reports in the newspapers from which it appears that our Foreign Affairs Ministry has been approached by the Netherlands Government to do a little job for them, that we have been asked to persuade Indonesia to exercise caution. I should have liked the hon. Prime Minister to have thrown a little more light on this particular aspect of this question; the issue is not merely diplomatic. Here, we in India have pledged ourselves to the Bandung Declaration and Indonesia is a partner in *Panchsheel*. Indonesia is a neighbour whom we have supported in the past. So, in this their hour of trial it is our duty to express our support and solidarity with the cause of Indonesian inde-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] pence and make it known to the world, no matter what happens, no matter which diplomat calls on the Prime Minister, that the Government and the people of India are solidly on the side of Indonesian independence and that we support the cause that they fight for. That should be our approach, today and that is what is expected of the Prime Minister.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON) : Has the hon. Member any evidence to the contrary, to show that we have not followed that policy?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is only expressing his desire.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: But after the Prime Minister's statement there is no need for such remarks.

DR. R., B. GOUR: (Andhra Pradesh): What about the Press report?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know the Government of India generally support it, but what about any practical action?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should not rely on press reports.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Now, there is no need, after the Prime Minister's statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, if you think that I suffer from that weakness, then it is the duty of the hon. Deputy Minister to disabuse me of such malady. Let them say that the press report is false, what is stated in the press report is materially false. I would accept that statement of the hon. the Deputy Minister. She never speaks any falsehood. She always says the truth, I know. Let her say it. Here, in this report it is stated.

"It is needless to say that India's attitude to the latest developments in Indonesia is not one of unqualified approval, though India has stood by Indonesia over that country's complaint about West Irian and

has favoured, the proposal for negotiations with the Netherland."

This report in the *Statesman* seems to have emanated from the Foreign Office of our country. You know, a kind of the reporting goes on which is generally tipped by the officials.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Why does the hon. Member assume that it has emanated from our Foreign Office? What is his evidence to say that?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is no evidence, but it is for them to contradict it. Here is a statement made. Suppose I tell Mr. Sapru, "You did not do certain things rightly", then it is his job to get up and say that I am wrong and then ask for evidence. That is how we proceed in life. Now time is short and though I like interruptions—I always enjoy them—since here the time is short, I may be forgiven if I am not in a position to give full attention to the interruptions that hon. Members may make.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE; They only say that what is stated here is not correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They should state it, that is what I say. The reporter here—"from our political correspondent" speaks in a strain as if he had some conversation with some prominent officer or some personality of importance.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): How do you prove it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will you ask him to sit down Sir? He is a lovable person, but he should sit down. Let him not get agitated like this. I do not say it is all gospel truth. But all that I am saying is that here is a report which you should either own up or disown. This is all that I am saying. That is the position. I would not like India to function in a manner that they may encourage directly or indirectly. Dutch imperialism or may not be an inspiration or support to the fight that the Indonesian people are waging today.

It is not a question of diplomacy at all, Mr. Deputy Chairman. We are talking about broad policy. How it should be implemented in details, it is for the Prime Minister and the Deputy Minister and the Foreign Office to work out as far as diplomatic circles are concerned. Here in India we should express our view, as in the case of Suez. In the case of Suez, the Government spoke out, that it was right for Egypt to fight for the just cause, that the action of the French and British imperialists was wrong. Similarly, it is time that we expressed categorically that our solidarity and our support are behind the cause of the Indonesian struggle. That is how we should carry forward the spirit of the conference that was held in 1949, a conference at which the Prime Minister made the speech to which I had occasion to refer just a few minutes back,

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would only like to add that there is a lot of foreign propaganda about chaos in Indonesia, about violence in Indonesia. There is no chaos at all there. It is all imperialistic propaganda and it will be regretted that our Indian news agencies that circulate news here do not bring us the news that we require. They are fed by Reuter and others with stuff which emanate from imperialistic quarters. There is no chaos whatsoever. The Indonesian people have risen to take charge of their own destiny and see that the part under Dutch occupation is freed. That is all. There is no chaos. There is absolute calm and absolute peace. If the Dutch will not use the destroyers, if they will not resort to violent actions, if they will not invoke the NATO authority and power, there will be absolute peace. Of that I have not the least doubt in my mind, from the accounts that we have received about the situation in Indonesia. The people in subject countries are peaceful. It is the other people, the enslavers, who force violence upon them. If we are concerned about violence, we should have addressed ourselves not to the Indonesian people, but we

should tell the Dutch that they must realise that the day has come when Indonesia should be completely free. They should react properly to the situation before they can send their diplomats to call on the Prime Minister of our country.

I would also like to refer to the question of Algeria a little, because 500,000 patriots have been killed there by French imperialism and murder and pillage have become the rule of the day there as far as French imperialism is concerned. Five hundred thousand people have died and they are maintaining there an army of 500,000 and French imperialism spends as much as two billion Francs every day to wage their imperialistic war against the Algerian people, no matter what crises it creates in French political life. Today the Algerian policy of the French ruling class has become the undoing of many a government that has come and gone. You have seen that today they have got a Government there which is the twenty-fourth since the war and the Algerian policy is such that it is not acceptable to the French people. It is not acceptable even to many sections of the French ruling class and the opposition to that policy is growing. Still the war is going on. In this connection I would refer particularly to the case of the twenty-two year old patriot Djamila who has been sentenced to death on fake charges and she is awaiting the guillotine. I would like to know if we cannot, if our Government cannot do anything to save her from the guillotine, a patriot who was arrested and tried on false charges and who has been sentenced to death. That should rouse our sympathies today and I think if we raised our voice it should be possible to save her life. She is an Algerian patriot and the case against her is absolutely false and it has been proved so. The French courts in Algeria are military courts, courts of assassins and murderers, and we do not attach any importance to these courts which wage the war against Algerian independence and the Algerian people.

I Shri Bhupesh Gupta. J Mr. Deputy Chairman, next let me touch on the question of the NATO Council which is meeting on the 16th of this month; that is to say, in a matter of a few days. We are told that instead of the usual Foreign Ministers, the Heads of the Governments will assemble, Heads of the fifteen NATO Powers. President Eisenhower who was suffering from illness and who was moving from Gettysburg to the Capitol and then back seems to have decided to be present there. What are they discussing there? The NATO Council meeting should be taken note of. They are going to lay war plans and they are going to intensify the war efforts there. It is already known from the Macmillan-Eisenhower Meeting Communique which says that the inter-dependence of the NATO Powers should be developed. This inter-dependence means that the Western countries should be brought still more under the heels of American imperialism, should be brought more closer and should fit better into ' the war-plans of the United States of America; their Command should be integrated. It also means that they would be compelled to surrender their sovereign rights so that the U.S.A. can become the master of the whole NATO show. Already, America is the master and it wants still greater authority. What is most alarming for us is this that the Communique has declared that they do not want to give up the nuclear tests at all or to give up the armaments race which is costing a lot of money to every country, bringing suffering to the mass of people and of course, generally aggravating the tension in the world situation today. That is the position and further it has already been announced that one of the plans is to equip all the NATO Powers, including West Germany which has been the seat of military aggression in Europe, with atomic and nuclear weapons. Planes are already carrying hydrogen and atom bombs in the United Kingdom and the plan today is to equip all the NATO countries with atomic weapons, to speed

up their armaments race and draw them into a still tigher military pact. This is their plan but you will find that even before the Council meeting has taken place, U.S. Admiral Jerauld Wright, NATO Atlantic Forces Commander, recently said, "All over war plans and programme are approved and are ready." This is what he openly says. Then again, U.S. General Thomas S. Power told pressmen in Paris that the Atomic Air Fleet was on the alert and was ready to move and that the pilots were sleeping by the planes. Then again, Sir, the slogan, "inter-dependence on the NATO" is being more and more emphasised and the object of it is, as I have stated earlier, to speed up the war effort. This is the position and so the NATO Council meeting should be taken note oi. It may be taking place in a distant country. But the point is that in that scheme of things comes the SEATO, the Baghdad Pact and there are efforts at bringing about a kind of cohesion and unity among all the aggressive Parts such as the SEATO, the Baghdad Pact and NATO. We are vitally concerned now because we know that NATO has come to our door-step through the Baghdad Pact. Pakistan is being armed by the NATO Powers' leader, the United States of America. Pakistan is a party to the Baghdad Pact and the Baghdad Pact is linked up with the NATO with the result that we fall in the line of attack. We are in the range of fire. This is what has happened and we should be concerned about it. What we can do is for the Government to consider, and discuss, but I think we should raise our voice here in this Parliament and tell the world that we in India view with great anxiety and alarm the recent meeting of the NATO Council which is an aggressive gathering, which intends to speed up the war effort instead of relaxing it, which wants to speed up the nuclear tests and the preparation of nuclear destructive weapons instead of getting rid of the threat of nuclear war and nuclear destruction. This Is what we see and we should raise our voice against it. We should take

strions note of what is going on and what is going to happen in the NATO Council.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should like to mention something in this connection that has been happening in Malaya. Malaya has become an independent nation and we are all happy that after long years of travail and struggle that country has at least achieved some kind of formal independence opening up new possibilities for the Malayan people to look forward to the complete emancipation of their country, to the achievement of their cherished aims. We are interested in that but there is again this point. There are attempts on the part of the U.K. to draw the Malayan Federation into the SEATO Pact. We should take note of it. Not only this; there is an agreement between the Malayan Federation and the British Government by which Britain is allowed to maintain armed forces on the soil of Malaya. That should also concern us. Sir, we are told that there is a war in Malaya. That war against Malaysians is being waged not because the Malaysians need it but because British Imperialism needs it. We are told that the Communist Party is responsible for this war. I have got before me the latest manifesto of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Malaya issued last September. It says, "End the war at once and realise peace in the country. To realise this objective, the Communist Party of Malaya once again declare, 'We are willing to cease our struggle, to pledge like every citizen in the country our loyalty to fatherland and to participate within the orbit of the constitution by democratic methods and not by means of armed struggle or violence in any activities for the independence and democracy and prosperity of Malaya.'" This is what the Communist Party has declared in the manifesto that they have issued.

(Time bell rings.)

Because time is short, I would like to deal finally with the statement made by the Finance Minister, Shri

Krishnamachari. I would not go into the economic aspect of it. I should only deal with the political aspect of it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, we are concerned with the international situation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that. As I said in the beginning, our foreign policy is faced with threats, and dangers at home. Our foreign policy is something which has to be defended not merely in the United Nations Organisation or somewhere else overseas: it has to be defended at home. I say, Sir, that the statement made by him goes directly against the foreign policy of the Government and the Prime Minister says that Ministers are free to make statements and that they are not a regimented lot. I am glad to hear, Sir, that the Ministers are not a regimented lot but when it comes to the Preventive Detention Act, there is competition between the three Ministers to support the Government position whereas when it comes to the question of the foreign policy, we find *faire*, freedom of speech prevailing and all kinds of statements are being made by the Ministers. Here is what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari said at the Palam Airport before he left the country:

"Politicians like Foreign Ministers make several speeches and if with every speech our barometer goes up and down according to the tone of the speech then I am afraid nothing stable can ever happen in the World because of the necessity of momentary changes in attitude."—*Statesman*, the 18th September.

Well, I am not concerned with the rise and fall of the barometer of Shri Krishnamachari. What I am concerned with is something different. What I would like to ask is this. Was this not an indirect hit against the statement the Prime Minister made in the Rajya Sabha about the Middle Eastern situation. Then, in Bonn, Shri Krishnamachari said:

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

"I can hardly prevent certain rise in prices and political consequences of great importance would be almost inevitable for, with the low living standards of my people, even small price rises have significant effect. The radical opposition is waiting just for that."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The extra time that you take will be taken out of your colleagues' time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is all right. I am finishing. This is what he said even after the controversy over *New York Times*. I do not know who is right and who is wrong. Mr. Krishnamachari said something, made an intermediate statement. But in Lok Sabha he said "I never said such a thing". Then when he saw the statement in the United States, he did not repudiate it at all.

Then again, the Prime Minister on his return from Japan was asked questions about it. He did not altogether deny, that Mr. Krishnamachari had made such a statement. I have got a Press cutting. It is an interesting thing. We are in the midst of a crisis of statements, created by Mr. Krishnamachari. I would like to know which one is telling the truth. (Interruption.) I can undei'stand the American correspondent not telling the truth. I have no particular fancy for him, however. The Finance Minister might like him and take him to give an interview. Now, I do not know up till this day who is telling the truth. But what is significant today is that there are other papers who are joining in the chorus against the foreign policy. There is the Birla's *Eastern Economist* which writes day in and day out against the foreign policy of the Government. And Birla is always favoured. The owner of that paper—I am not naming him—is favoured by the Government and he gets decorations. I know of one gentleman of the Praja Socialist Party who always attacks the foreign policy while (*Time bell*

rings.) Congress supports him in a by-election.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are concerned here with foreign policy. You close your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are concerned with foreign policy. Please hear me. There are people who are trying . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not relevant to the question. Your time is up. Please close.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Time goes on no matter what is the foreign policy. This is the position. These things have to be taken into account. It is no good hiding things. What is the guarantee that, when the Prime Minister is no longer there, this foreign policy would be maintained. I ask the Prime Minister this question: Can he say that everyone of his colleagues in the Cabinet believes sincerely in the foreign policy? Can he give the assurance that even after him the Congress, the Government that he leaves behind, will stick to this, foreign policy? We will be justified in asking this question. I have asked a straight question, and we would like a straight answer from the Prime Minister of our country.

Generally, we have supported the foreign policy. We have made our criticisms. I hope the criticisms should be taken in a friendly way. We make constructive criticisms. If we point to the dangers lurking behind, it is because we want to strenghten the foreign policy and not to weaken it. There lies the difference between us and some other critics.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. P. N. Sapru. Twenty minutes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I hope to finish in twenty minutes. I shall not be as exhaustive as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am in the fortunate position of the mover of an amendment which is going to be

accepted by Government. My task therefore is comparatively easy. I do not wish to bring into the discussion of these grave questions the cold-war atmosphere which has been brought into this debate by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to the Indonesian situation and he was critical of the Government's attitude towards it. Pie has assumed that what has appeared in a certain section of the Press is God's own truth-----

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I made it very clear, I never assumed it, I wanted to know.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU, and that diplomatic etiquette requires that Government should declare to all the countries in advance what its view in regard to a certain developing situation in Indonesia is. The Prime Minister made it perfectly clear where his sympathies in regard to this question lay. The Prime Minister's approach is not the approach of the cold war. The Prime Minister's approach is not the approach of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who wishes this country to be tied to the chariot wheel of the Soviet Union.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never said that. Do not put things into my mouth. I did not say the chariot wheel.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I hope he will give me credit for being fairly truthful in life. He has criticised the Finance Minister for making some supposed statements in New York. The Finance Minister has denied those statements. I am reminded of a story which I read in Viscount Simon's Retrospect. It is with reference to a certain incident which occurred in Lord Birkenhead's life. Birkenhead was a contemporary of Viscount Simon at Oxford in the last part of the 19th century. The Prince of Wales at that time—later King Edward VII—happened to visit Oxford. The students I

and the staff of the college assembled at the Town Hall to give him a big reception.. A riot took place between the students and the police, and Birkenhead was supposed to be leader of the riot. Birkenhead arrested and was taken to a new cell. He declared the cell open. Then he was placed before a Magistrate, and the Crown Prosecutor asked him this question: "Can you give any reason why this respectable constable should lie?" "Lie?" "Yes, Sir, lie". "Five reasons." "What are those five reasons?" "Either he is lying or I am lying; or either he is under an honest misapprehension or I am under an honest misapprehension; or there is a reconciliation possible between the two positions." Here obviously there has been some misapprehension in the mind of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta as to what the Finance Minister meant and what he did not mean. Therefore, there is no question of the Finance Minister or any Minister of this Government having said anything which goes against the foreign policy of this country. They fairly understand what the foreign policy of this country is. The foreign policy of this country is a policy of non-alignment. We have friendship for all the countries of the world. We are friends with all countries including even Pakistan. Whatever Pakistan might say, we are friends. But we have no military allies. We are against the system of military alliances, because in this nuclear age, in this age of rockets and Sputniks, these military alliances are full of danger for all the races of mankind, particularly so for the Asian and African peoples who are behind in the struggle for life by some two hundred years. Our approach is not the Soviet approach or the American approach, and we are pursuing in our international policies those moral principles which were taught to us by our great leader, the Father of the Nation. We are attempting in our own humble way to bridge the widening gulf between these two great giants, the

U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. We have no tradition or history of hostility against

[Shri P. N. Saprū.] the U.S.S.R. We can understand the point of view of the U.S.S.R. and we can understand the point" of view of Western nations. Our endeavour at the United Nations has always been to reduce tensions. The kind of speech which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has made or the policies which he advocated are not policies which would reduce tensions in the world. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would say that the most important question before the world today is that of disarmament. It is only in a disarmed world which includes China—for you cannot ignore six hundred million people from your calculations—that Germany can regain her unity, that Eastern Europe can become effectively independent, that foreign troops can walk out of Eastern Europe as also Western Europe and that the Asian and African countries can live in peace and harmony.

Sir, I will not refer to the question of Goa, because partly it is *sub judice* But I will say that Goa is ours by every moral right and I am rather glad that Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, Reader of the Labour Party, recognised that in an indirect manner the other day in a statement which he made here.

Here, I would like to refer to the question of Kashmir on which, naturally as an Indian, I feel strongly. It is amazing that the Security Council has not been able to appreciate our point of view. In the able and comprehensive speeches which Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, the distinguished representative of our country made at the United Nations, our point of view was made perfectly clear. It is not we who are the aggressors. We went there to complain against Pakistan. We are the aggrieved State. About the legality of the accession of Kashmir to the Indian Union, there cannot be the slightest doubt. We gave an understanding to the people of Kashmir that we would consult them in regard to their ultimate future. We have had two elections there, and no one can question the fairness of those elections. Foreign correspondents and

foreign newspapers have testified to the fairness of those elections. It is a great tragedy that the leader of the Kashmir National Conference, Sheikh, Abdullah, should be in prison, should be in detention, but we are hoping to see him released one of these days. We cannot keep him under detention indefinitely.

But, what I want to say is that we not only have a legally water-tight case in Kashmir, but also we have got a good moral case. Our moral case is that we have forty million Mussal-mans in our country. They are first class citizens of this country. They are entitled to hold the highest offices in this land. They are playing an important part in the public life of this country and I hope in ye~ars to ?ome, they will continue to take an ever-increasing part in the public life of this country. We have no second class citizens.

What does the Security Council want? Does it want the incidents of 1947 to be repeated on a tremendous scale in this country? Mr. Deputy Chairman, a word of thanks is due to the Soviet Union for the fairness which it brought to bear on this issue in the Security Council. Were it not for the threat of the Soviet veto, the resolution passed might have been different. The 'demilitarisation clause' might have been there. Dr. Graham would have been asked to continue his efforts forgetting that it was not we who made his efforts fruitless, but that it was Pakistan which, by its propaganda of hate, by its propaganda of *jehad* and by its refusal to vacate the country which legally belongs to us, made his efforts fruitless. Kashmir is not a 'No-man's land'. Legally, the sovereignty of Kashmir vests in us. It is Pakistan which has made the agreement of 1947 difficult or impossible of fulfilment.

Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, time and tide wait for no man. Ten years have elapsed since the Resolutions of 13th August, 1948 and 5th January and 17th January 1949 were passed. Life cannot be static and Kashmir has

progressed during these years. She has made wonderful progress in all directions. We have had two elections there. Contrast our administration of Kashmir—our part of Kashmir—with the so-called 'Azad Kashmir,'—Azad Kashmir which has no right to call itself as such. You will find that whereas we have a record of progress to show in Kashmir, they, in Pakistan, have no record to show at all. They are not able to manage—if I am just venture to say so with all humility— even their own affairs properly. They change their Prime Minister almost every alternate day. I do not know whether the new Prime Minister will have any lease of life and they seem just to think that they can do and say and act as they please because they have got the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO Powers at their beck and call.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Pakistan is supposed to be an Islamic State. Mir Jaffer betrayed the Mussalmans and Hindus of this country in Bengal and Mr. Suhrawardy and Mr. Chundrigar and Mr. Mohammad Ali and all of them are going to betray Asia. What has been Pakistan's attitude towards Kashmir? Of course, we want the freedom of the people of Kashmir. What has been her attitude towards Syria? What was her attitude towards the people of Egypt, towards the Suez Canal crisis? What is her attitude towards Indonesia? What is her attitude towards Goa or towards any Asian country? She is a stooge or she likes to be looked upon as a stooge of Western Powers. I am sorry for the people of Pakistan for the leadership of Pakistan has failed (hem). But I have faith in the common man. And I think the common man of Pakistan is just as good as the common man in this country. He wants bread; he wants clothing. He wants shelter; he wants to fight against poverty.

AN HON. MEMBER: He wants stability.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Well, I do not know, but too much stability tends to

be very conservative. We want certainly good governments.

I would say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that this issue can never be solved except by the parties to the dispute themselves. Either the Security Council should tell Pakistan to vacate its occupied territory or it should say, "Well, we are not going to take up this issue; we are not going to listen to the complaints from Pakistan." Had the Security Council acted with wisdom, the question would have been solved long ago. But instead of listening to our complaints of aggression—the issue in Kashmir was of aggression, of invasion—it began to put us in the dock. Well, that is not the way in which you can inspire respect for your impartiality amongst the people of India. I was rather glad to find that the Leader of the U.K. Labour Party mentioned that in India people did not look upon the attitude of the U. K. in the Security Council as impartial. That is not the way to hold' the Commonwealth together. We want to be friends with the West, we want to be friends with everybody in the world. Ours is not the Soviet approach. We value our own way of life and we are not going to act as stooges of any country, as camp-followers of any country. We want to bring to bear upon the world problems our own objectivity of attitude, which may be vastly different from the attitude of others. I very much sympathise with the Algerian people in their struggle for independence. I am speaking as a friend of France and I think France is pursuing a shortsighted policy in Algeria. Naturally, our sympathy must be with the Algerian people. I do not know what my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta wanted us to do that we have not done. Our approach is a peaceful approach and we supported the Algerian resolution in the United Nations because it visualised negotiations between Algeria and France.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, mankind is facing very grave issues. We are now in the rocket age, we are now in the thermo-nuclear age, we

[Shri P. N. Saprū.] are now in the age of Sputnik and this talk of negotiation from positions of strength does not lead to anywhere. You will build up your side today and the other side, as the Prime Minister said, will build up their strength tomorrow and this process will go on, and you cannot fight and they cannot fight and the world suffers. Now, if you do not control nuclear energy, the danger is that the small Powers too will be able to acquire knowledge of this nuclear energy and it would be then impossible to control this thermo-nuclear development. The small Powers might start a war and, as the Prime Minister said, the big Powers might come in. Therefore, it is right and wise for the statesmen of the world to listen to the noble message of our Prime Minister. We are not a boastful people, we are a very humble people and it is in a humble way that we have been advising these big giants to realise the dangers which face mankind, but the trouble, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is that while our knowledge has increased, our sense of moral values has not correspondingly increased and unless we develop moral strength, the future of mankind is dark indeed.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I take it as a privilege to support the amendment moved by the previous speaker, the hon. Shri P. N. Saprū. The amendment approves the foreign policy pursued by the Government of India. The same policy is beneficial in the first place to our country and then beneficial to the world at large. It is not only beneficial to the present generation but beneficial to the posterity for generations to come.

The Government of India, and the people of India as a matter of fact, want to be friends with all the nations of the world and they have been doing whatever is possible for them under the present circumstances for maintaining peace in the world and for augmenting goodwill amongst the

nations of the world. I do not know, Sir, in our present condition what more can we do, can our country do, for maintaining peace and for increasing 'friendship amongst the nations of the world. In this connection I have to say a word, and only a word, with regard to the tour and the activities of the Finance Minister. Sir, certain of his alleged statements are being criticised but he has denied those statements that are being attributed to him. He is a gentleman and his denial must be taken, Sir, as correct and moreover if he has made those statements of what avail can they be when they are being denied now by the Finance Minister. We as a reasonable people must understand the import, the real implication, of the denials made by the Finance Minister. As a matter of fact, I should say that the Finance Minister during his tour has done his level best to clear misunderstandings about the position of India, wherever such misunderstandings were and he has done his best to pave the way for better relationship between our country and other countries of the world. Therefore, really our gratitude is due to the Finance Minister for what he has done during his tour, and the criticisms levelled against him are rather unkind.

Sir, the appeal made by India to the Great Powers to stop the nuclear weapons testing explosions in the first instance deserves great and deep consideration at the hands of the Powers concerned. Sir, in the first place, if they will stop these test explosions it will naturally and almost automatically lead to the next step and that again will contribute to the ultimate banning of these deadly weapons which can bring only devastation and destruction to humanity not only at present but to the generations, who are yet to be born. These weapons are being attacked by great thinkers of the world. Many countries have appealed to these great nations to cease making these weapons and it is not out of jealousy to these Powers that the great thinkers and countries are advocating ban on these weapons.

It is in the interest of the world as a whole, it is in the interest even of the nations who are manufacturing these weapons, that these appeals are being made. I do not know, Sir, when the people, who are now preoccupied with their ideological pursuits and with the consideration of their respective and relative strengths, will come to their senses in this matter.

Sir, another criticism leveled against the Government is against their continued link with the Commonwealth. I do not, for one, understand what handicap does this link place upon our country or any other country at all. What is the restraint or restriction that we have been placed under because of this association with the Commonwealth? On the other hand, we have got advantages. Those advantages may not be apparent or tangible today. But the meetings and the comings together of different nations from different parts of the world will surely create their own advantages in the near future. But anyway, Sir, I cannot understand the reason at the back of the critics of this Commonwealth link. That does not in any way place any restriction upon the independence or freedom of action of any member of the Commonwealth. There are certain associations, Sir, which place a restriction upon some members of those associations, that is to say, one small rule of almost every association is that if a member of that association absents himself consecutively for three meetings, he ceases to be a member. Even this restriction is not placed upon a member of the Commonwealth, and they are not even obliged to attend the meetings of the Commonwealth, much less to take any decisions or to accept any decisions that might be arrived at at the meetings of the Commonwealth. So, I for one do not understand the basis or the *raison d'être* of the criticism against the Commonwealth link.

Sir, one word about Goa. We support the policy and the methods adopted by the Government in pursuing this question. But only one thing I

want to say and that is that the people of Goa as well as the people of the mainland of India are becoming more and more impatient at the continued audacity of the other side in pursuing antediluvian and improper methods in this matter. The other side must give up this colonial possession of theirs, and the sooner they come to their senses, the better for them. But so far as we are concerned, the Government may take into consideration the possibility of taking a little more drastic step so as to relieve the tension under which the people of the country are being placed.

Now, Sir, a few words about Kashmir. It is deeply distressing, Sir, that the U.N. Security Council has once again failed *to do* justice on the Kashmir question. The exasperating manner in which this issue is being dealt with is not serving the cause of goodwill and peace among the nations of the world. India's case was and is that there was aggression in her territory. Over this simple question and issue the U.N. has taken ten long years and still it refuses to come to a decision on this matter which was referred to it. The question was one of aggression and this has not yet been faced squarely and justly by that august body. This is highly vexatious and is trying the patience of India too much. In the interest of justice and peace this issue must be settled at least without any more delay or prevarication, and the aggression on the Indian territory liquidated and vacated without taxing our patience any further. There can be no real doubt about the fact that Kashmir is part and parcel of India. When independence was attained, a certain procedure and basis for the accession of the then Princely States to one Dominion or the other was agreed to by all the parties concerned. Duly in accordance with this procedure Kashmir acceded to India in 1947. That accession is constitutional, legal, complete and final. There is nothing more to be done about it. This legal and proper accession cannot be circumvented by the talk of a plebiscite. It must be

[Janab M. Muhammad Ismail Saheb.] clearly borne in mind that the promise that the people of Kashmir would have another opportunity of expressing their mind was made to the people of Kashmir. It was not made to any other nation or in any international forum. It was a matter which was purely domestic. It was a domestic arrangement and it carried with it no international commitment. This question ought not therefore to be agitated in any international forum at all. The promise to the people of Kashmir that they would be given an opportunity to express their mind has duly been kept. The people of Kashmir elected a Constituent Assembly under democratic conditions, and the Constituent Assembly has unequivocally declared the wishes of the people by confirming and ratifying the accession of Kashmir to India. There is, therefore, nothing more to be done about it now again. In the matter of Kashmir, Sir, the name of the Muslim of India is at times being brought in by Pakistan and others. I say it is unwarranted, it is unfair and unjust. I say it is atrocious on the part of anybody to drag in the name of the Indian Muslims and try to make of them a pawn in their atrocious political game and to seek to make it appear that the Muslims are different from the rest of the people of India over this matter. In the nature of things, Sir, there may be difference of opinion in regard to certain matters between the people and their Government, but over the question of Kashmir and in the matter of foreign policy the Muslims of India are entirely, indisputably and solidly one with the Government and the rest of the people of India. Therefore, any tactics or guile by anybody cannot make even a scratch on this solidarity and identity of views. The Muslims also know their duties and responsibilities, and if it comes to action, they are ready for discharging their responsibilities in this matter. They will occupy the vanguard of any undertaking for the defence of the honour, integrity and security of India, their motherland. With these few words, Sir, I support the motion.

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश):
 उपसभापति महोदय, मैं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति पर बहस के प्रस्ताव में श्री सप्रू जी के संशोधन का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ और राष्ट्र नेता पं० जवाहरलाल जी ने आज वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में जो अपना महत्वपूर्ण भाषण दिया है उसके लिये उनके प्रति भी कृतज्ञता प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि अपने ऐसे भाषणों से वह हमारे देश का गौरव बढ़ाते हैं और विश्व की राजनीति में ऐसा मापदंड उपस्थित करते हैं जिससे मानवता को प्राण मिलता है और मानवता में मानवता को स्थान मिलता है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) in the Chair.]

मनुष्य अपने चोले में जिस तरह बर्बरता और पशुता में काम लेता है उसको रोकने के लिये उच्च आदर्शों को सामने रखना आवश्यक होता है। हम प्रतिशोध लेने की भावना में बोलते हैं और हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा विकास हो, दूसरों का अपहरण करके मनुष्य की स्वाभाविक प्रवृत्ति है कि वह आक्रमण करके अपने देश की सीमाओं को बढ़ाना चाहता है, दूसरों पर आक्रमण करके जहाँ प्रत्याक्रमण में अपनी रक्षा करना चाहता है वहाँ फिर उसके मन में सदा आँग भड़कती रहता है कि वह प्रतिकार ले, बदले में और प्रतिशोध में काम ले। इसी बुनियाद पर विश्व की राजनीति चलती आई है और विश्व के राष्ट्र काम करते आये हैं और इसी तरह से वे आगे करते रह सकते हैं। अगर इसी मनुष्य वर्ग में से समय-समय पर ऐसे लोग पैदा न हों कि जो उसको रास्ता दिखावें तो विश्व सर्वनाश की ओर बढ़ जाये। ऐसा रास्ता दिखाने वाले हमेशा आते रहे हैं और आते रहेंगे। महात्मा गांधी ने जिस बुनियाद पर हम देश को एक विदेशी सत्ता से मुक्त किया, उसके शासन से मुक्त किया, वह बुनियाद ऐसी है जो मानवता के लिये चिर आशीर्वाद है और उसके लिये चिर सान्त्वना।

उन्होंने शान्ति और अहिंसा का अस्त्र अपना कर इन देश की पराधीन जनता को दामना से मुक्त किया। आज उसी शान्ति के स्वर में जवाहरलाल जी बोलते हैं। समस्यायें कितनी ही जटिल हों, समस्यायें कितनी ही परेशानी की हों, उनको हल करने के लिये हमें धीरज नहीं खोना चाहिये। तो उनके द्वारा आज हमें साहम और हिम्मत के साथ मनुष्य का हृदय परिवर्तन करके अपनी समस्याओं को हल करने का सन्देश मिलता रहता है। मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि मानवता के लिये इसमें अन्धता कोई सन्देश हो सकता है।

गोआ नहीं सी चीज है। हम उसके ऊपर आक्रमण करके कब्जा कर सकते हैं। गोआ का जो हिस्सा अपने प्रयत्नों से मुक्त हो चुका है वह भारत से मिलना चाहता है। हम गोआ को कभी नहीं भूलते। कुछ भाइयों को ऐसा लगता है कि हम क्यों नहीं उभरते जाइ करके अपने में मिला लेते। उसको मिला लेना आसान है, लेकिन उसे मिला लेने के प्रयत्न में अगर हम आतुरता दिखाएँ तो वह नहीं सी चीज हमारे देश की एक बड़ी समस्या बनकर खड़ी हो सकती है। और उस नहीं सी समस्या का सामना करने में अगर कहीं हम कायर हो गये, हमने हिम्मत खो दी तो वह एक बुरी बात होगी। मैं नहीं कहता कि हम में हिम्मत नहीं है, हमारे पास साधन नहीं हैं। सब कुछ है। लेकिन यदि हम एकदम परिस्थिति बिना समझे आक्रमण कर देंगे तो वह जो हमारी विदेशी नीति है उसके मौलिक सिद्धांत के ऊपर ही आक्रमण 2 P.M. होगा। एक नहीं सी चीज को बढ़ाना हमारा उद्देश्य नहीं है। लेकिन नहीं सी कोमल भावनायें जो मानव मात्र को गाड़ देने के लिये हमने अपनायी, उनको रक्षण देने के लिये हमें अपने ऊपर कुछ जख्त भंग करना होता है। हम तथाकथित आजाद काश्मीर पर हमला कर सकते थे। हमारी फौज काश्मीर में हाथ पर हाथ रखे बैठी हुई है, हमारे सैनिक

चाहें कि हम लड़ जायें। पानीपत की तीसरी लड़ाई में पेशवा की फौजें बैठी रहीं, हमने आक्रमण नहीं किया, चाहे बाद में हम हार गये। इसलिये अगर हम किसी पर आक्रमण करते हैं तो फिर हम अपनी उदात्त भावनाओं के आगे समझौते के मार्ग को छोड़ देते हैं।

पाकिस्तान के प्रधान और मंत्री और दूसरे लोग जो उद्गार प्रकट करते रहते हैं, उनके प्रति रोष प्रकट करने के लिये हमारे भाई भूपेश गुप्त और उनके साथियों ने संशोधन रखा है और जवाब तब करने को कहा है। पाकिस्तान के इन उद्गारों का जवाब नहीं दिया जाता है इस बात का उनको अफसोस है। उद्गारों का जवाब दिया जा सकता है। वह जवाब है—“जवाबे जाहिलां बाशुद खमोशी।” ऐसा पुराने आदमियों ने कहा है। ऐसी चीजों का जवाब सिवाय जगड़े के और क्या हो सकता है? ऐसी चीजों का जवाब देने की स्थिति आज नहीं है। और क्या हो सकता है सिवाय इसके कि लड़ाई जगड़ा हो? अस्त्र-शस्त्र ले कर मैदान में कूरा जा सकता है। इसलिये इन सवालों का जवाब देना कोई जल्दारी चीज नहीं बल्कि मानवीय तरीकों से उनको मुलजाना चाहिये। उन्हीं तरीकों में यह देश पला हुआ है और यह संसार के लिये एक महान संदेश है।

संशोधनों में यह देख कर मुझ हैरानी हुई और मुझे अफसोस हुआ कि यह कहा गया कि संसार में हमारी आवाज कम होती जाती है। आज ही के समाचारपत्र में बुलगानिन साहब ने एक चिट्ठी पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी को लिखी है और इसी आशय का पत्र उन्होंने पेजीडेंट आइजनहावर को और ब्रिटेन के प्राइम मिनिस्टर को लिखा है। ये चिट्ठियाँ उसी स्वर में लिखी जाती हैं जिस स्वर में पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू अलापते हैं। वह स्वर मानवता को शांति का सन्देश है और उस स्वर का दुनिया भर में स्वागत होता है। विश्व के महान् राष्ट्र के नेता और नायक बुलगानिन जिस पत्र को विश्व

[पंडित अलशूराय शास्त्र]

के और नेताओं को लिखते हैं उनमें पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू की ही आवाज गूंजती है। यह एक आश्चर्य की बात है। अलजीरिया के सम्बन्ध में हमारा प्रस्ताव यू० एन० संसम्मति से पास हो जाता है केवल फ्रांस ने उसमें वोट नहीं दिया। तो क्या हमारी आवाज का कम महत्त्व इसमें प्रकट होता है। हमारी सेनायें, आन्ति की सेनायें, तीन तीन देशों में मध्यस्थता करने के लिये बैठी हैं, यह हमारी ही आवाज का काम है। उस जमाने में जब कि लोग बंदूक, तोप और एटम बम की आवाज को ही पहचानते हैं, उस जमाने में जब नक्कारखाने में नक्कारे बज रहे हैं, लड़ाई के साज-सामान बन रहे हैं, उस जमाने में हमारी शांति की आवाज तुली की आवाज मात्र हो कर भी अपनायी जा रही है। तब यह कहना कि मानवता और संसार में हमारी आवाज का मान कम हो रहा है, मैं समझना हूँ यह सत्य का गला घोटना है। सच बात तो यह है कि इस प्रकार शांति से, प्रेम से, सम्मान से और आदर से भारत की आवाज सदियों सदियों पहले सुनी गई और आज भी सुनी जाती है। उसी आवाज को आज हमारे देश की सीमाओं के बाहर पहुंचा देने के लिये हमको श्री जवाहरलाल जी का कृतज्ञ होना चाहिये कि उन्होंने आज की परिस्थिति में विवेक दृष्टि से काम लिया और हमको राष्ट्रपिता का स्मरण कराया जिनके नेतृत्व में हमें प्राचीन संस्कृति और परम्परा प्राप्त हुई।

मैं एक चीज में उनसे मतभेद रखता हूँ। भौगोलिक स्थिति के बारे में उन्होंने कहा और गान्धी जी के नेतृत्व की बात कही। किन्तु भारत की जो प्राचीनतम परम्परा है, उसमें से ही गान्धी जी का अन्मूदय हुआ। उसी परम्परा में पल कर वे रामायण, गीता, उपनिषद् आदि ग्रंथों को पढ़ा करते थे, वह परम्परा जो न जाने कब से किस प्रागैतिहासिक काल से इस देश में चली आ रही है और इस

देश की भावनाओं को संचित करती रही है। तो उन्हीं परम्परागत भावनाओं के प्रतीक थे महात्मा गान्धी। वह भावना गान्धी जी के कारण इस देश में प्रज्वलित हुई, जागृत हुई और वही भावना आज भी इस देश का गौरव सर्वत्र बढ़ा रही है। हमारे देश में जो थोड़े बहुत अलग विचारधारा के नगण्य लोग रहते हैं, वे हमारे इस देश को, शांति के महान् संदेश को, महान् वातावरण को, विचारों को और गौरव को नष्ट नहीं कर सकते हैं। यही कारण है कि आज जब भारत की आवाज बाहर जाती है तब वह उत्सुकता से सुनी जाती है। अगर हम भारत के इतिहास को देखें तो हमें विदित होता है कि वैदिक काल में, ब्राह्मण काल में, उपनिषद् काल में, गाथा-ग्रंथ काल में, अकबर काल में, महाराणा प्रताप काल में, जिस युग की भी विचारधारा को हम देखते हैं उसमें गान्धी जी की भावना के लिये प्रचुर सामग्री पाते हैं। गान्धी जी के रूप में भारत का वही महान् चित्र आज इस युग में हमारे सामने आया है। शायद जवाहर लाल जी मुझ से यह कहें कि मैं दकियानुशील बातें करता हूँ और मुझ पर नाराज हो जायें कि उन्हीं पुरानी बातों को दुहराता हूँ, लेकिन मैं इस बात को कहे बिना भी नहीं रह सकता कि :

“एतद्देशप्रभूतस्य सकाशादधर्जनमनः।

स्वं स्वं चरित्रं शिखेरन् पृथिव्यां सर्वमानवाः॥”

के मनुस्मृति वचन के अनुसार हम महान् देश ने विश्व को सदा संदेश दिया है। इस श्लोक से हमें यह शिक्षा मिलती है कि हमारे इतिहास से और हमारी परम्परागत भावनाओं से हमें जो गौरव प्रदान हुआ है उसी गौरव के आधार पर और उन आदर्शों पर चलकर जिससे मनुष्य मनुष्य कहलाता है, आज भारत विश्व का नेतृत्व कर रहा है। मनुष्य कभी पशुता का काम करके मनुष्य नहीं बन सकता है। मनुष्य के अन्दर उदार भावनायें होनी चाहियें, सहनशीलता होनी चाहिये और दूसरे की भावनाओं को समझने की शक्ति और क्षमता होनी चाहिये।

मैं अपने भाई किशन चन्द जी के व्याख्यानों को, उनके विचारों को और उनके संशोधनों को इसी भावना से बड़ी श्रद्धा और प्रेम से पढ़ता हूँ। वे एक विवेकी आदमी हैं, शिक्षिक और माहिर हैं और उनमें संतुलन भी है। तो इस दृष्टि में मैं उनकी बातों को देखता हूँ और जितना सम्मान देना चाहिये उससे अधिक देने की चेष्टा करता हूँ। उनके संशोधनों को मैंने देखा। बड़े ही सुन्दर ढंग से और अच्छे ढंग से उन्होंने अपने संशोधन पेश किये हैं। लेकिन पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने जैसा कहा, सभू साहब के संशोधन के अतिरिक्त किसी संशोधन को वे स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते। मेरे पास समय हो तो मैं सकारण यह बता सकता हूँ कि कोई संशोधन स्वीकार करने के लायक नहीं है। पहला ही संशोधन देखिये। मेरे भाई ने कहा है कि सीक्योरिटी कौंसिल में फिर से प्रस्ताव पास हो गया, आहम मिशन आयेगा। आप यह देखिये कि किस तरह से हम अपनी वृद्धिमत्ता के कारण रूस जैसे राष्ट्र को वहाँ अपना मित्र बनाये हुए हैं जो आड़े बक्त पर हमारे काम आता है। हमारी राजनैतिक कुशलता, हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की कुशलता इस बात पर निर्भर है कि प्रस्ताव पास हो जाते हैं और आगे कुछ नहीं होता है। हम पहले ही कह चुके हैं कि काश्मीर समस्या एक मुलझी हुई समस्या है। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने यह समझ रखा है कि काश्मीर समस्या का चैप्टर क्लोज हो चुका है। प्रस्ताव बनते हैं और पास होते हैं, लोग आते हैं और चले जाते हैं, लेकिन काश्मीर जहाँ है, वहीं है क्योंकि उसकी कोई समस्या है ही नहीं। इस प्रकार प्रस्ताव पास और फल होने से कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़ता है। फिर भी जो अनर्थ वहाँ हो सकता है, जो कूटनीतिज्ञ वहाँ ब्रंटे हैं, जो राष्ट्र हिन्दुस्तान के हित में बाधा डालने के लिये वहाँ अपने स्वार्थ को लेकर बैठे हैं, उनकी दृष्टि से यदि आप देखें तो जो हमारी वैदेशिक नीति है और वहाँ बोलने वाले जो हमारे प्रतिनिधि हैं उनके कारण

90 R.S.D.—4.

एक निर्दोष सा प्रस्ताव ही पास हुआ है। आहम साहब तशरीफ लायेंगे तो उनका स्वागत होगा, उनका खैरमकदम होगा। वे क्या करेंगे, क्या नहीं करेंगे यह मैं नहीं जानता लेकिन उसके बाद देखियेगा कि यह आना जाना ही लगा रहेगा।

इसी प्रकार जब मैं दूसरे संशोधन को देखता हूँ तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि किस तरह से भारत के गौरव में कमी हुई है या भारत के गौरव को क्षति पहुँची है। भारत की जो मौलिक विदेश नीति है उसका आधार कांग्रेस के प्रस्तावों में मौजूद है, लेकिन मैं उन प्रस्तावों को पढ़ कर सदन का समय लेना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि बहुत से भाई इस पर भाषण देना चाहेंगे और जितना समय मैं ले लूंगा उतना ही समय उन मित्रों का चला जायेगा। यह एक ऐसा विषय है जिस पर विभिन्न मित्र अपने विचार प्रकट करना चाहेंगे। जैसे हर आदमी गंगा में स्नान करने के लिये आतुर होता है और यदि एक आदमी घाट को घेर कर बैठ जाये तो वह दूसरों को रोक देता है, उस तरह मैं दूसरों को रोकना नहीं चाहता। आज सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता यह है कि हम दूसरे देशों के साथ किस तरह का सम्बन्ध रखना चाहते हैं, क्या करना चाहते हैं, इसके बारे में अच्छी तरह से यहाँ विचार-विमर्श हो और हम एक सही नतीजे पर पहुँचे।

मैं इस अवसर पर एक बात निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हर सत्र में हम विदेश नीति पर बहस मुबाहिसा करते हैं, लेकिन आज मैं यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह हम वैदेशिक नीति के सब अंगों पर यहाँ विचार करने के लिये एक आध दिन नियत करते हैं, हमें यह भी चाहिये कि हम गृह नीति पर एक आध दिन विचार किया करें। वैसे गृह नीति के प्रमुख प्रश्नों पर हम विचार कर लेते हैं। जैसे फूड समस्या या ऐसी ही कोई दूसरी चीज हमारे सामने आई

[पंडित अलग राय शास्त्री]

तो हमने उस पर विचार कर लिया, मगर होता यह चाहिये कि जैसे हम वैदेशिक नीति के अंग प्रत्यंग पर विचार-विमर्श करते हैं, उसी प्रकार जो हमारे देश की समस्याएँ हैं, जैसे आज पंजाब में हिन्दी आन्दोलन चल रहा है, दक्षिण में संविधान जलाया जा रहा है, कहीं कोई उपद्रव हो रहा है, कहीं स्टूडेंट्स का स्ट्राइक चल रहा है, या ऐसी ही तरह-तर्ह की अराजकता और तरह-तरह की समस्याएँ जो हमारे सामने आती रहती हैं, उन सब समस्याओं को एक इंडिपेंडेंट तरीके पर लेकर उन पर विचार करें ; उन पर विचार करने के लिये भी एक दिन होना चाहिये। इस बहस में हिस्सा लेने वक्त में यह गुंजाव देना चाहता हूँ। यह ठीक है कि हम अलग-अलग समस्याओं पर विचार कर लेते हैं, प्रश्नों के द्वारा उन समस्याओं को सुलझा लेते हैं, लेकिन इनके बड़े देश को बहुत सी समस्याओं का जिस तरह मुकाबिला करना पड़ता है, उनके लिये यह आवश्यक है कि एक मंत्र में एक दिन इस विषय पर विचार किया जाये। यह एक मुंजाव मैं अपने भाषण के मिलमिले में देना चाहता था।

कामनवेल्थ की मंथरी में हिन्दुस्तान अभी तक चालू है। क्यों चालू है, इस सम्बन्ध में हमारे राष्ट्र-नायक, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के कितने ही भाषण हुए हैं और उन भाषणों के साथ हम सबकी महानुभूति है और हम समझते हैं कि जो कुछ वे कहते हैं उसमें सार है। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू १९५० के मार्च में लोक सभा में इस सम्बन्ध में बोल चुके हैं। मैं उन शब्दों को पढ़कर जो कि यहाँ मेरे पास कोटेशन हैं और प्रीमीडियम के अंग हैं, समय देना आवश्यक नहीं समझता। मध्य बात यह है कि जब पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी, इंडिपेंडेंट फार इंडिया लीग के कथन थे तब यह समझा जाता था कि कामन वेल्थ या अंग्रेजों के साथ स्वाम तौर पर मिल कर रहना आवश्यक नहीं होगा।

लेकिन स्वतन्त्रता मिलने के बाद उन्हें यह बात लगी कि ऐसा होना आवश्यक है क्योंकि इसमें हमारे लिये लाभदायक रास्ते निकलते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें उनके साथ एक ही भावना काम करती है और वह यह है कि वे विश्व में एक इंडिपेंडेंट, एक मिन्-जुल कर काम करने की प्रणाली लाना चाहते हैं और उस मिलजुल कर काम करने की प्रणाली के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि हम एक साथ रहने का तरीका अस्तिपार करें। अगर पूरी स्वतन्त्रता के साथ, पूरी समानता के साथ हम एक विशाल परिवार के सदस्य बनें तो उसमें मिलजुल कर काम करने की भावना का प्रेरणा मिलती है। इस दृष्टि से मैं समझता हूँ कि यह आज कामनवेल्थ का जो हमारा सम्बन्ध है वह मुनासिब है। बावजूद इसके कि कभी काश्मीर के मामले पर, कभी किसी मामले पर हमें अटका लगता रहता है, मगर हमें मदद भी मिलती रहती है। दोनों बातें हैं, हमारी नीति का समर्थन भी होता है और कहीं अटका भी लगता है, मगर जब आपस में मिल कर रहना हो तो यह चलता रहता है। जब तक हमारे विकास में, जब तक हमारी स्वतन्त्रता में किसी प्रकार की बाधा न हो, यह चीज बाधक नहीं मानी जा सकती।

एक शब्द और कह कर मैं बंद जाऊंगा। हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक बयान दे दिया था, इसलिये उन पर बड़ा आशेप होता है। भारतवर्ष एक डेमोक्रेटिक देश है, प्रजातन्त्र की भावनाओं की रक्षा करने वाला एक देश है, इसलिये प्रजातन्त्र की रक्षा करने के लिये अगर हम कोई संदेश देने हैं, कोई बात करते हैं, तो यह कोई अपराध नहीं है। इसके अतिरिक्त यह समझना गलत है कि वे दूसरे देशों में भिक्षा मांगने गये। कोई किसी को इस प्रकार भीख नहीं देता है। वास्तव में आज विश्व एक है।

डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ : हम भी यहाँ कहते हैं कि वे भीख नहीं देने वाले हैं। अमेरिका वाले आपसे आपकी गर्दन लेने वाले हैं।

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री: हमसे कुछ नहीं लेने वाले हैं ।

डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ : गर्दन ।

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री : गर्दन क्या, बाल भी कोई हमसे जबरदस्ती नहीं पा सकता है । वैसे प्रेम के लिये सबके पैरों पर हमारा सिर है :

सर रख दिया हमने दरे जानाना समझकर, काफ़िर है जो सिजदा करे बुतखाना समझकर ।

रूस के सामने भी गर्दन नहीं झुका सकते ।

डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ : मत झुकाइये ।

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री : जबरदस्ती कोई हमारा गर्दन नहीं भुका सकता है ।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह : पाकिस्तान के सामने झुकना पड़ता है ।

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री : पाकिस्तान के सामने भी कतई नहीं झुकना पड़ता है । वैसे जैसा मैंने पहले कहा कि यदि उनमें प्रोवोकेशन में आ कर आप तलवार ले कर उतरना चाहें तो उतर जायें, लेकिन इस तरह आप अपनी नीति के बाहर भी जायेंगे और अपने दुश्मनों के इशारों पर भी खेलने लग जायेंगे । इसलिये हमारी जो विदेश नीति है उसको हमें आशीर्वाद देना चाहिये और स्वीकार करना चाहिये । किसी अंश में वह विरोध का पात्र नहीं है ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I heard the speech of the Prime Minister regarding the policy of our Government on foreign affairs with the attention it deserves, but I must say that apart from certain features, the speech was thoroughly disappointing. We have to consider, in the light of present day set-up of our economic situation, what our rela-

tionship with other countries must be. If we are really a welfare State and if we have in view the idea of developing and successfully implementing a Plan which we have drafted for the economic betterment of this country, then the idea of a foreign policy must be of a fundamentally different character. Now, before we think of our foreign policy, it is necessary that we must peep into the history of our country for at least two decades. What happened in this country? This country was possessed, owned, mutilated and destroyed economically and politically by a powerful ruling class, namely, the British ruling class. On the stage arose a mighty power and that power was in the body of Mahatma Gandhi. He gave hope and cheer to the suppressed Indian nationalists of our country. He said, "Arise, awake and stop not till the goal is reached and that is the goal of India." It was complete national independence. When I tell you something of the Indian National Congress Resolution at Calcutta and subsequently under the very same Presidentship of Pandit Jawaharlal at Lahore, you will wonder what has happened to this effeminate class of today, I mean the ruling class, the Congress class of today. In Calcutta there was a hard debate about our acceptance of the Nehru Report. That report was the present Prime Minister's father's report. When the question was discussed there the delegates of the Indian National Congress were equally divided on the question of whether to accept the Nehru Report or demand complete independence for the country. This issue was very much debated and Mahatma Gandhi at last stepped in and he said, "We will give a time-limit of one year to the British and if they do not accept the Nehru Report *in toto*, then we will be ready for the declaration of complete independence for our country." He said. "I would request the younger generation to bear with me and follow me and I will not betray the nation." And we accepted

[Shri H. D. Rajah.] it. We said that the youth of the country would marshal around you and give the last drop of their blood in order to see that this country is released from British imperialism. Then at Lahore, under the distinguished presidentship of the present Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, we passed the resolution that the objective of the Congress was one of complete national independence. And in order to implement that resolution, we took to Salt Satyagraha and the famous Dandi March was one of the methods.

Sir, being an old-timer, I am not prepared and I do not feel inclined to accept the present position of our membership in the Commonwealth, with a pinch of salt as these people do. Sir, what is this Commonwealth? What is there in this Commonwealth which must attract these people to stick to it? I see there is nothing in the Commonwealth. Ours is a sovereign democratic republic and it cannot in the fitness of things, remain in the Commonwealth. Can there be a republic within an empire? Or an empire within a commonwealth? And a commonwealth where there is nothing in common and there is no wealth either? You cannot even get a loan from Britain, which our T. T. Krishnamachari and his type of men are anxious to get. There is already in this country Rs. 700 crores of British capital, so-called British capital, because it represents the blood, sweat and tears of our own countrymen. They have looted to the extent of Rs. 1,750 crores in the course of the last fifty years from this country. They have taken away from this country economically almost all that was worth taking. Today's poverty and squalor and unemployment and our miseries are directly attributable to the British regime and not to the Congress regime. Poor fellows, they came into power only about ten years back and they want to metamorphose and change the face of the entire structure of Indian society overnight. I sympathise with them. But I can-

not feel enthusiastic about their basic approach to the problems of life. First of all you have to go to the background of this independence. When the Britishers found that the political struggle in this country was going on a very large scale, that the mass movement had taken place and their business stability was assailed, that their exploitation and swindlings were not going on as they were going on before, they wanted to seek a compromise and they approached the Congress and they said: You run the Government, we shall continue to loot the country. That is the basis of their acceptance of the Commonwealth concept. I can understand a commonwealth organisation where there are no British colonies, a commonwealth organisation where there are other independent countries—countries which were not formerly subject to British rule. In that there is some sense and I could have appreciated the position. But here it is not so. Here the position is that the former colonies of a vast empire are in this Commonwealth and I concede or rather I believe that there is a great conspiracy between the ruling party and the British vested interests for allowing them to continue to remain in this country and carry on their loot. Therefore, they agree to remain in the Commonwealth. There is no other basis that I can think of as to how these people should remain in the Commonwealth.

Let me analyse in what way we have benefited by remaining in the Commonwealth. Have we benefited in regard to solving the problem of Kashmir? Have we benefited in the matter of releasing Goa from Portuguese imperialism? Have we benefited in the direction of the economic betterment of our country by these British vested interests in this country repatriating capital to their country? Read today's newspapers. You find there is a tussle going on in the Government of India with regard to the loot of the B.O.C. who are not prepared even to reduce the price of petrol to any appreciable extent.

Rs. 5 crores are being looted by one institution in this country. That is what is going on. So, when I say that I am against the Commonwealth concept, I go to the root of the problem. I want the British interests in this country to remember that these friends may be in power for some time. But even among these friends there will be disruptions and when the masses come to paramount power and interests differ there will be disruption taking place and when people genuinely representing the masses of the people of this country take charge of the government of this country, I warn them, they will go the way the Dutch are going from Indonesia, they will go the way in which the Indians went away from Burma and the way in which in the rest of the world all exploiters, swindlers and looters go away from the respective countries. That is the warning I would like to give to the British. I do not believe in the theory of their bringing in any capital in order to strengthen our economic position. I have always held and I have always said so in this House that the blood, tears and sweat of this country alone can improve the fate of our masses in this country. No foreign capital can do anything. More and more you believe in foreign capital being brought into this country, more and more politically you will have to compromise your position and ultimately it will challenge the very independence and freedom of our country. That danger must be borne in mind. That idea must be there in the back of your mind before you betray or pawn the country's interests or its independence to any other power. I give you this warning. If you continue to remain in the Commonwealth, there is no chance of the economic growth and development of this country. Fundamentally if you don't concede this basic truth, then all your attempts to give relief to the masses, to give succour to them will be futile and impossible. On the one side, you go on allowing a foreign Power in this country to loot to the extent of Rs. 150 crores every year.

At the same time you are trying to get loan from another country so as to develop your resources. But by that time half of your own resources would have gone outside your purview. What will then be left? You will talk only of an imaginary paper plan. You cannot successfully implement it. That is my main objection to India remaining in the Commonwealth. In this Commonwealth you see what is happening even today. This position you should understand in its proper perspective and allow the nation to develop on its own inherent strength.

Whenever the question of the Commonwealth is raised in this House the Prime Minister or his spokesmen have been telling us that after all what wrong is in it. There is nothing in it. It is only a symbolic association. I agree it is a symbolic association. Then why not get out of it symbolically? It is an easy solution by which you will put me out completely and there will be no need for my making myself vociferous about that particular issue. It will be over.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: What harm is there in remaining in the Commonwealth?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Why not wriggle out of it?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: That I have been explaining for the past five minutes and still my hon. friend cannot understand. I am afraid I cannot explain it further. We should be alive to the present position. Sir, in another ten minutes you will ring the bell and I do not want to offend you by continuing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI): No, I will not allow any interruption. I will not allow you to go on.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Therefore, the point at issue with regard to this matter is that it is a matter in which we have to think in terms of universal combination. There is a United

[Shri H. D. Rajah.] Nations Organisation and that organisation consists of independent nations of the world which are admitted by certain rules and procedure. When we are already a member of that important organisation, when we play our part properly, there is no need for us to be again in another "small well consisting of a few gallons of water which is derived from the same source, the same spring. Therefore, the main issue is that by your being in the Commonwealth, you* get yourselves disreputed by others. An American lady, I think a responsible lady, came to India a few months ago and she made a lecture here. In that lecture you read the viewpoint of the big financiers or the industrialists of America. She said, "We, the Americans, thought that India when it became free will get out of this Commonwealth and will have its own policy, programme and courses of development and we were thoroughly disappointed". These are the very words which I read in the newspaper. I do not know the lady but the concept of it was that the country had not really become independent but was only having a bogus independence. The present set-up was a hotchpotch arrangement between the British rulers and the Indian Congress elements with a view to seeing that the latter are put in power thus enabling the former to enjoy the benefits of this power. In order to fulfil their profit motive they wanted peace and tranquillity in the country and if peace and tran-quillity are to be there, then there must be a Government by the Indians run for the benefit of the British. That is what we find today. This concept must be entirely changed. When you want to become really and decently national, you will think in terms of you masses and of improving their lot and, at the same time, not allowing a big leakage to be kept open. Therefore, in the interests of the nation, in the interests of the country and in the interests of the masses we must immediately get out the Commonwealth.

(Time bell rings.)

You must give me five minutes, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) : There are so many other speakers also. I cannot allow that.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: That is therefore, the position with regard to the Commonwealth. I will now take you to the question of Kashmir. What is the issue there? Just like any other State, this State has acceded to India. After accession, there was aggression by another country and we went in to defend the State. The Government's stand is that Kashmir is part of India.. I concede that but when it is part of India, you do not talk about plebiscite. Ramaswami Naicker in the South is talking about plebiscite. He wants a plebiscite to separate Madras from the rest of the Union. If my stand is correct, I ask you today to think again *de novo* about Kashmir. If my stand that Kashmir is part of India is correct, how can it come in the discussion on' foreign affairs at every stage? It is part of India and when it is part of India, you do not speak of a plebiscite to separate it. Therefore, if I were the Prime Minister of Pakistan, I would immediately accede to the request of the Government of India by vacating the portion that I have occupied and asking for a plebiscite. I know what happened in . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) : You are unfortunate.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: ... the North West Frontier ' Province when you agreed for a plebiscite. With the Congress ruling there that Province went lock, stock and barrel to Pakistan. I say, therefore, it is not your intention to allow a plebiscite if it is part of our country and you consistently maintain that position. If you do that, it will give us a position which will be honourable to us and there will be no Graham Mission. Why does he come back? It is because of power politics again. Power politics are eating into our

very vitals and we are not able to assert ourselves and we must see that our position is strengthened by the stand that we take, namely, Kashmir is part of India. What I suggest, therefore, with regard to Kashmir is that the position must be reversed and the Graham Mission must be given the reception which Hungary and Russia gave to Prince Wan when he was sent out there.

Lastly, Sir, I have to say only one sentence. Man's dearest possession is life and since it is given to him to live but once, he must so live as not to be scared with the shame of a cowardly and trivial past, so live as not to be tortured for years without purpose, so live that dying he can say, "All my life and my strength were given to the first cause, the cause of India to liberate from the British tentacles and exploitations".

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Mr. Vice-chairman, much has been said both in favour and against, the foreign policy of our Government.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Nothing was said against the foreign policy.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: To those critics who have criticised our foreign policy, let me say that it is the foreign policy of India that has raised the status of India in the eyes of the world. It is the policy of non-intervention pursued by our Prime Minister, of not aligning ourselves either with this bloc or that, that has won for us laurels and today, Sir, whenever we visit foreign countries, we are received with great honour and we are welcomed everywhere. It is not because we happen to be Indians but because our foreign policy is liked by others. Today our Prime Minister, whichever country he visits, whether it is a country in the Soviet bloc or in the American bloc, is received with open arms and with laurels not because he is Jawaharlal Nehru but because he, as the Prime Minister of India, has

pursued a policy of non-alignment which is appreciated by the other nations in the world.

The other thing that I have to say is this. Because of the non-alignment policy followed by us, whenever there is a crisis brewing, it is to India that the other nations look to come to their rescue and to avert a crisis. Take, for instance, what happened in Egypt when there was the Anglo-French aggression. It was India that went to the rescue of Egypt and averted a crisis there. The same thing happened in Korea and today, because of this foreign policy of India, Holland looks to India to come to its succour.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It is not a credit that Holland books to India.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: At the critical hour, India is looked upon by every nation.

DR. R. B. GOUR: By the imperialists.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Imperialism? Where is it? It is dead and gone and it is buried five fathoms deep.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: This is in a different form.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: It is our proud privilege that our foreign policy is guided by a prophet of peace who is called the Rasu-ul-Salam. The other, nation, a Muslim fanatic nation called him Rasu-ul-Salam, a prophet of peace and today he is painted as the modern Buddha and Ashoka. The destinies of millions of our Muslims are in the hands of our Prime Minister.

Sir, it is rather sickening that certain hon. colleagues of mine always talk of leaving the Commonwealth. At every conceivable opportunity, whenever there is a debate on foreign affairs, some hon. Members of Parliament, always advocate the exit of our country from the Commonwealth. If it is felt that Great Britain has not treated us as fairly as it should have

[Shri D. A. Mirza.] on the Kashmir issue, then we have to move in this matter through our Foreign Office or at the time of any non-official conferences. By raising this issue in this Parliament it has only resulted in the issue losing its importance and I think in no Parliament do people discuss such subjects as we do today here. These representations will have great weight and also create a sense of fear in the reactionary elements in the political life of Britain which are having a shortsighted view on major questions that face the Commonwealth today.

About Goa, it has been made clear by Portugal that we must regard them as neighbour's or we must push them out with force. In the present set-up, as we are pursuing a policy of *ahimsa* or *dharma*, of non-alignment, I think it is not advisable to resort to force. If it is a question of force, it is only a question of a few hours. Goa is a small fry. What is Goa when compared to the vast sub-continent, India? Goa can be wiped out in a few hours.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: We do not want to wipe Goa out.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We do not want Goa to be wiped out.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: I mean those elements which are ruling Goa today should be wiped out.

It is against our creed to resort to violence. So long as non-violence pays, so long as we are able to succeed by pursuing the policy of non-violence, we will adopt nonviolent methods.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What has the policy of non-violence paid in relation to Portugal and Goa?

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Non-violence is a creed which has got us freedom. The mighty British Empire had to tumble down before us. With nonviolence we have achieved freedom.

We can conquer the world by means of non-violence. Because of nonviolence Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was honoured in the Soviet Union.

Now, the question of Kashmir. It has been the subject in season and out of season. Whenever a foreign affairs debate takes place, we talk of Kashmir. The other day I made it clear on the floor of the House that Kashmir is a part and parcel of India. It is one of the fourteen States of India.

SHRI J AS WANT SINGH: How? It had a separate Constituent Assembly. It has a separate Constitution.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: It has acceded to India in 1947. It was integrated with India, and if you have any doubt, I really pity your understanding.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Every State has acceded except the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: I congratulate the Government on their decision to reject the resolution of the Security Council. Let us tell Dr. Graham that he is welcome as a man, he is welcome as a guest. But if he comes here as a representative of the Security Council, that Council which is dominated by Americans and Britishers, we are not going to welcome him. He is welcome as a guest, but as a mediator he is not welcome. We are not going to co-operate with him.

Sir, it was ten years ago that we went to the Security Council to get justice. For ten long years we are struggling, for ten long years we are knocking at every door. But what do we get? We ask for justice, we get injustice. On the other hand, what are the Anglo-Americans doing? They are dumping ammunition in Pakistan. They want to create another military base in Pakistan which is a serious danger to India's freedom. When we go there to get justice done what do we get? They

say, "We are going to help you'!. How? By dumping ammunition, by giving all sorts of arms to Pakistan.

Sir, on this occasion let me express my thanks to the Soviet Union, with all our differences. With my differences with the opposite side, I am not an ungrateful man. I am not unreasonable. I am thankful to the Soviet Union for the unstinted support it has given to our cause. Sir, Pakistan committed aggression. The result is, today they are aggressors. They want a plebiscite. How can there be a plebiscite when the aggression is not vacated? They call themselves an Islamic State, an Islamic State which professes Islamic principles. God curses those who are aggressors. And Pakistan which calls itself an Islamic State has committed aggression on India. How can such a country prosper? Because of that, you find there every now and then, every other year, Governments falling.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, these remarks about a neighbouring country should not go in our records.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Certainly, I have every right to make these remarks because they are aggressors. I have to make such statements.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M B. JOSHI) : Order, order. You are going beyond the purview of the discussion. You should not make any suggestions about the constitution or the administration of a foreign country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Kt is offering a solution to the whole problem.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): Sir, on a point of order. If you stop speaking about Pakistan, if there is a mere suggestion regarding that, can there be the same argument with regard to Goa and can you ask Members not to speak because that is a foreign State?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) : That is not the thing. You cannot criticise the administration of a foreign State or the constitution of a foreign State. As regards Goa, we talk about the foreign policy uis-a-vis Goa.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do criticise foreign Governments when it involves questions of foreign policy. Whether the hon. Member is on firm ground is another matter.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: He is talking like a man in the moon.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) : Order, order.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Sir, legally and morally Kashmir belongs to India, and if any aggression is made on Kashmir, it is aggression made on India. We may pursue a non-violent policy of *ahimsa* or *dharma*, but if people mistake this policy for our weakness, I am sure that we will set aside this *dharma*, we will set aside the non-violent policy, and we have to do that which is our birthright.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) : Your time is over.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Sir, every Muslim who is in India is with the Government of India as far as Kashmir is concerned. When the time comes, Muslims as one naan will rise and defend the country to the last drop of their blood. I want to make it clear to Pakistan that the Muslims of India have no sympathy for Pakistan as far as Kashmir is concerned. To have Kashmir is our birthright, and we will die for it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister in moving the motion very eloquently outlined the foreign policy of our Government. With most of it I am in full concurrence and if I have sent these amendments, they have been sent after very great care and

[Shri Kishen Chand.] scrutiny and I shall try to point out in my speech why I have sent these amendments.

There are three parts for -these amendments. The first part is the wrong handling of our foreign policy and second the incorrect understanding of the international situation. So, I shall, first of all, begin where I beg to disagree with the hon. Prime Minister, about the understanding of the foreign policy of our country and the reading of the international situation.

He began by saying that advance in modern technology and science has thrown up into this world big giants— two giants representing two different ideologies—and that they have got such weapons of destruction at their command that, God forbid, if there is a third world war, the human race may be exterminated. During the last eight or ten years, these two giants have been indulging in a sort of cold war, each giant extending its own sphere of influence in the countries round about it. The hon. Prime Minister said that the entire world is mortally afraid that at any moment a conflagration may take place.

First of all, my point of disagreement begins here. A statement like that might have been right about* five or six years ago when the world situation was very delicate. But today, when all leaders and men have realised that a third catastrophe may mean the doom of humanity, there is a growing tendency between these two giants to come nearer to each other and I think a very happy word was used by the hon. Prime Minister i.e., 'disengagement.' He said that when two giants were about to start a wrestling competition, some methods could be found to keep them apart. My contention is that our foreign policy has failed in that we have not been able to utilise our humble and small voice in the separation of these two giants from a possible struggle.

. Sir, in spite of democracy, nations are ruled and governed and directed by big personalities. We are very fortunate in having the personality of our Prime Minister whom we all admire and love. We believe that he is a great dreamer and an idealist and because he is a dreamer and an idealist, in' many things where a realistic outlook is needed, he goes astray.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): How?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: In the few minutes allotted to me, I shall try to prove how he has gone astray and why I have been forced to send in these five items of amendments. *(Interruptions)*. The hon. Member can continue the running commentary, but if he makes a speech and point out certain things, I will certainly be able to answer him. It is difficult to answer a running commentary.

Sif, I was saying that we wanted to lessen the world tension. He said that wherever there were sore points, festering evils, they had to be removed. I would submit, if there is in the human body a sore, would you like the doctor to go on arguing for years and years till that sore leads to the death of the patient or would you think that a quick operation would be most essential so that the festering sore is removed? Remember the words of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel when he described Hyderabad as a sore in the stomach of India. He took immediate action and he removed that sore, so that India might become healthy. *(Interruptions)*

Similarly, my two amendments relate to the Portuguese possessions in India and the long-drawn out discussion on Kashmir. The hon. Prime Minister paid a tribute—a handsome tribute—to our advocate there, that his advocacy is very good and what can we do? In spite of his very good advocacy, our case is not successful. I submit that, in both these things, our policy has been a wavering one.

Regarding Kashmir much has been said. In every session, we have a debate on foreign affairs and the question of Kashmir comes up. I do not want to go into -greater details, but there is always a limitation in every thing. When the resolution was passed in the Security Council in 1949 regarding demilitarisation, our Government should have fixed a limit, say, of two or three years and if the demilitarisation was not completed within that period, we should not have taken any further part in any resolution or in any discussion in the Security Council. When the claim becomes time-barred and we continue to accept the claim, it becomes *sub-jttdice*. We should have maintained that, as soon as the three years were over, we would have nothing further to do with it. From 1952 onwards, once in every few months, the Security Council has been considering again and again the same resolution worded slightly differently and we have continued to participate in it. My first charge is this. The foreign Minister of any great country, if he is a realist, would have said, "We will give you a time-limit of three years and we will not go on indefinitely discussing the matter."

Then, take the affair of Goa. The citizens of a small place, like Nagar Haveli, liberated themselves and if an opportunity had been given to other small places under the domination of Portugal, they would have also liberated themselves. They are unarmed people. Without recourse to any weapons, we got our freedom; it was an unarmed revolution, a bloodless revolution. It is a question of permission, not of support, not of help. If we had permitted the people of the territories which are under the domination of the Portugal to liberate themselves, they could have easily done so, as was the case of Nagar Haveli. We referred the matter to a judicial tribunal, the Hague Court. Our case is a just case and want to win. But suppose the judgment goes against us, will it be right for

the Indian Government to permit an army of a Foreign nation to cross the Indian territory and inflict punishment on the people who have liberated themselves?

So, we have these two problems dragging on year after year. Very rightly, the Prime Minister said, we are not a great nation as a military power. But geographically we are well situated. If you include the population of the neighbouring countries like Pakistan, China and Indonesia with that of India, you will find that they constitute half the population of the world. Just now, as a military power, we may not possess half the world's power, but in numbers, in geographical position, in strategic position, we have a voice. But our voice is weakened because of these two problems. If the question

of Goa and the question of 3 P.M.

Kashmir were not there. I

maintain, Sir, that our voice would have gone a long way. It is not necessary for a voice to be declared from the house-tops in a loud note. It is not that. The hon. Prime Minister probably thought that it will be the way of expressing our opinions. It is on account of our geographical position and on account of the number of the people who reside in India and the two or three neighbouring countries adjacent to us that we have a voice in the affairs of the world, in particular, being neutral and being non-aligned. I entirely agree and fully support the policy of non-alignment followed by our Government. That is the basis of our strength but we have not been able to fully utilise it on account of certain weaknesses in our foreign policy.

Then, Sir, I have sent in another amendment. You see our Govern-' ment speaks in different voices. If you depend entirely upon your strength, financial and economic, you can have prestige in the world. But if you go about begging from all nations, how can you have any prestige? Normally, the beggar uses a humble voice but here we threaten

[Shri Kishen Chand.] we go for begging and yet we threaten. We say that if support is not given to the Second Five Year Plan we will become Communists, our country will become totalitarian and we play upon the sentiment of one nation, one big Power against another big Power. I ask you, Sir, whether it is a right policy or a fair policy. Let us consider very carefully whether our Finance Minister should go to a foreign country and in order to obtain economic aid, criticise another great Power, or our relationship with the other great Power or offer the excuse that we might become totalitarian. Therefore, I am trying to show that on account of our varying policy and on account of these two festering sores, our voice is not heard effectively in the world. It to some extent, disposes of parts (ii) and (iii) of my amendment. Then, Sir, We have got to complete our Second Five Year Plan if we want to improve the standard of living and for the completion of the Second Five Year Plan, money is needed very urgently. On account of our wrong policy, we have permitted a neighbouring country to be supplied with arms and we have brought the area of cold war between the Eastern and the Western Blocks right near our border. The result is that partially we have to enter into an arms race. The hon. Prime Minister said about disarmament that he had written a letter to Mr. Khrushchev and that a reply had been received as mentioned in this morning's paper. It is a very welcome reply that from the 1st of January atomic tests should be stopped.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Provided other great Powers also agree to it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Of course, provided the other great Powers agree to the proposal. Another thing to be remembered is that nowadays you can carry on atomic tests very high up, so that no instrument can record it on earth. There should be goodwill from each side and it is only

with goodwill that you can build up the atmosphere of peace.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Sir, the cold war was a few thousand miles away from us but on account of our wrong policy the cold war has come right to our border and we are being forced to divert a large part of our funds for the purchase of war equipment and in spite of our Defence our defences are not very strong.

Therefore, Sir, I am led to the conclusion that a wrong understanding of the international situation and too much reliance on the idealism of our Prime Minister and Foreign Minister has led to a situation in which we are forced to continue discussion about a part of India, namely, Kashmir and we are forced to permit a foreign power to have a foothold in our country. We have permitted our Finance Minister to go on a begging mission and lower our prestige before the eyes of the world and we have been forced to divert large amount of money for the purchase of armaments, without securing the defence of India.

Therefore, I submit, Sir, that our foreign policy has been an incorrect appreciation of the world situation.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister rightly drew our attention at the commencement of his speech to the importance of disarmament and the policy followed by India in connection with international affairs. If I may say a word, Sir, about the second point first, there was a great deal of discussion in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference which ended on the 10th December regarding foreign affairs and international affairs, and defence, I think that there was little disposition in the conference to criticise India's policy of non-alignment and the Leader of the Opposition in the United Kingdom acknowledged the services rendered by India to the cause of international peace and the

correctness of the policy she had adopted in her own special circumstances. He, however, said in the course of his remarks that a policy of non-alignment was very difficult to follow. It must, he said, appear to be impartial which is not always so though he did not dwell on this point, I think he intended to say to us that while the theoretical basis of our foreign policy was correct, the way we put it in practice we had not succeeded in proving but impartiality.

Well, Sir, we may in the past have given rise to misunderstandings on this point and some of us even in this House criticised our foreign policy on that ground. But I think that it will be acknowledged that during the last few months India has been careful in the expression of its views and that it has given no ground for the belief that while it professed to follow a policy of non-alignment in dealing with the specific questions it inclined more to one side or to the other. The unfortunate impression that was created in the past cannot be expected to be removed entirely from the minds of some of the bigger nations so soon. And I have no doubt that if we exercise as much care in the expression of our views as we have done during the last few months. It will be recognised by every nation that we are following really a policy of non-alignment both in theory and practice.

Coming to disarmament. Sir, there is no doubt that it is the biggest question that we have to deal with. It is the one question which, if solved, would change the entire face of the world. It will create a new atmosphere in which we all can work for the advancement of human knowledge and welfare. I am glad, Sir, that Russia has made an offer that it is prepared to stop all nuclear tests if other parties who know the secret of the manufacture of atom and hydrogen bombs would be prepared to do the same. I know, Sir, that this question has been discussed in the past and that no agreement has

been arrived on it among the bigger Powers. But I am personally inclined to think that whatever the other points at issue between them may be, this offer ought to be accepted as early as possible, provided international inspection is agreed to on all sides. I believe that international inspection was agreed to by Russia some time ago . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): I do not think so, Sir. On ' that point it broke.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Well, on a point like this some international inspection will be necessary, but it is a question really for scientists to determine. If we can be reasonably certain that no atomic explosion and no nuclear explosion can take place in one country without its coming to be known by other countries, then I think it can hardly be claimed that there is any danger of any nation, while professing to be entirely peaceful, secretly carrying on tests which would enable it to have a big stride over the other nations. I hope that the offer made by Russia will be seriously considered, though today's papers seem to report that some spokesman of the State Department in America said that Prime Minister Bulganin's letter was only a criticism of the United States and that in substance it represented no advance on the offer previously made by it. I do not remember all the details in connection with this question. But I do think that if the scientists of the bigger nations agree that no nuclear explosion can take place in their countries without being detected at once by the delicate instruments possessed by all the advanced countries, then Russia's offer ought to be accepted, even though on the question of international inspection there may be differences of opinion. In my opinion, really it would be a great step forward if the nations concerned agree on international inspection also, but even as it is, I think the offer is worthy of serious consideration.

rShri H. N. Kunzru.] Sir, I am very glad that the Algerian problem was one of the problems referred to by the Prime Minister in his speech. I understand from the cutting of *The Hindustan Times* which the Prime Minister was good enough to send me this morning that the resolution unanimously passed by the General Assembly takes note of the mediation offer made by Morocco and Tunisia—rejected by France. And this is within inverted commas—"and expresses the wish that in a spirit of effective co-operation *pourparlers* will be entered into and every appropriate means utilised with a view to a solution in conformity with the purpose and principles of the U.N. Charter." Sir, having had an opportunity of visiting Algeria very recently, I should like to say a few words on this important question, which is one of those that may disturb the peace of the world. Its solution is by no means easy. In the first place, the real difficulty lies in the weakness of the French Governments, not in the weakness of any particular Government, but in the weakness of Governments in France which depend for support not merely on their own followers, but on the followers of a number of parties. In this state of things, Sir, even a Socialist Prime Minister has to agree to compromises demanded by the least progressive sections of the coalition, however distasteful they may be to him. I am sure, Sir, that had a different pattern of party system prevailed in France, this question would have been brought nearer to a solution much earlier. Even as it is, Sir, strong Prime Ministers can give a direction to their foreign policy or to their handling of certain questions which can hasten their solution. For example, I refer to the action taken by Mendes France, when he was the Prime Minister of France, in regard to the Indo-Chinese question and the Tunisian question. The agreement between him and Tunisia did not confer independence on Tunisia. But it was the first step on the road to independence. Tunisia wisely utilised it, and within a short

time succeeded peacefully in securing the acceptance of its independence by France. The other difficulty in the way of France is the strength of the European settlers in Algeria. They form about one-eighth of the population, and their number is about 1,200 thousand. We know that difficulties have been created in the settlement of questions relating to the colonies of other Powers also by the presence of the settler elements there. In Kenya, the main difficulty in the way of rapid advance lies not merely in the backwardness of education in that colony but also in the fact that there are about 45,000 Europeans settled there. Things being as they are, we need not hastily condemn France in regard to what is happening in Algeria, but on the other hand we cannot fail to recognise the right of the people of Algeria to freedom. What has happened during the last three years is the result of the people having been driven to despair by the French Government, the more advanced and more politically conscious Algerians feeling that nothing would be done to enable the Algerians to govern their own affairs unless they took up arms in order to assert their rights. The belief among the French authorities seems to be, at any rate among the French officials seems to be, that when the elections take place, the result of the elections will show that the people of Algeria are mostly on the side of the French Government. I fear that this is a delusion and that the nationalist elements will be found to be in a majority when free elections take place.

Another point that I wanted to dwell upon is that the Algerian insurgents have the sympathy of every Arab country, not merely Tunisia and Morocco, which make no secret of their sympathy with the Algerians who are fighting for their independence but every other Arab Government. Obviously, in this position, if France is unable to move forward speedily, it will only be adding to its own difficulties. I have had opportunities of talking to people both on the

Algerian side and on the Tunisian side who are concerned with the question of Algerian independence, and I have found that there is a determination among the leaders of the insurgents not to accept any imposed solution. They are determined that negotiations must be entered into before any solution will be accepted by them. From this point of view, the offer which was made by Tunisia and Morocco is worthy of serious consideration of the French Government. Though these countries are independent, I have good reason to believe that they are friends of France and that they would like to arrive at a rapid settlement of the Algerian question in a peaceful manner, in such a manner as to serve the best interests both of France and Algeria, and I trust that our Government will, in its consideration of this question, take this line and use its influence unobtrusively to secure a solution which will remove a threat to the peace of the world in an important part of the globe.

I should like to say a word about Kashmir. We are all aware of the resolution passed by the Security Council with regard to Kashmir. Our position is now well-known, I only wish that the attitude now taken up by the Government of India had been taken up some years back. Had it been done, I think that there would have been no misunderstandings about our position and no one could have dreamt of openly or secretly charging India with trying to go back on its past commitments. However, even as it is, our position is stronger. Mr. Gaitskell in the course of a press interview, while not wishing to criticise the British Government outside Great Britain, expressed the view that it was unfortunate that the British Government should have given the impression of not being impartial in connection with this question, and he further said that it was undoubtedly important that the British Government should not only be impartial but also appear to be impartial.

The last thing that I wish to mention is Indonesia. We all know the importance attached to the future position of West New Guinea, which is known as West Irian. There has been a controversy going on between it and the Netherlands for some years. But I confess that I was not prepared for the action taken by the Indonesian Government. The Government of India has supported the Indonesian demand for West Irian. Our Government thinks that Indonesia has put forward a just demand for the control of this territory, but the action that it has taken seems to me to be sudden and unfortunate. I regret it as much as I regretted the action taken by Egypt without consultation with other countries in connection with the Suez Canal. I hope that countries friendly to Indonesia will use their influence with it to persuade it to go slow and not to adopt measures which would make reconciliation between it and the Netherlands needlessly more difficult than it is at the present time.

With these words, I heartily support the Resolution moved by the Prime Minister. It is customary every year for a Congressman to move an amendment to it and then it is passed. The amendment moved this year also will be passed as the amendments in the past years but let not the passing of these amendments make the Government oblivious of the weak points in its policy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the next speaker. I have to convey to the House the regret of the Prime Minister that he had to go away to address the Governors' Conference. He means no discourtesy to the House.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: (Rajasthan): Sir, we are grateful to the Prime Minister for giving us the benefit of his views on foreign affairs. The sheet-anchor of our foreign policy is non-alignment, peace and non-involvement in the international feuds. As it was just quoted by the hon Pandit Kunzru, in the words of Mr.

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.] Gaitskell, it is a difficult policy to pursue but I can tell you that such a policy is being appreciated by almost all nations of the world and in the words of the Prime Minister—this morning he said—what India says is of some importance in the minds of other people and the proof of it is that wherever the Prime Minister goes, he gets welcome everywhere. For instance, he went to Japan and a spontaneous welcome that he got not only from Government but from the people—and that also without prompting by that Government—was something which was unique. So, this is really a very heartening sign. This is an indication also how the people of the world react to the policy of peace. At the moment there are very few politicians who are so forthright and sincere in their preaching of peace. The weaker nations at present are under the shadow of the bigger nations and cannot afford to speak out. The nations in* the opposite camps speak at each other and not with each other. Here also the Prime Minister said this morning that we want to play an independent part. However, it is not my intention to speak on the theories and ethics of the international relations. I am only too happy to find that there is a goodwill for India in all countries of the world, except of course in one country and that is Pakistan.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: And Portugal.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Yes, of course. But we can take consolation in the fact that every Prophet or a leader who had to fight for any righteous cause invariably has an opponent. God himself had to fight with the dark forces in the world. Christ had Judas. So, there is nothing surprising if our Prime Minister has to fight against those who want to grab Kashmir or retain Goa, though to my mind, they have no business to do so and they have no right to do so and sooner or later

we are bound to succeed. My only regret is that in the World Assembly our good cause does not get as much hearing as it should because in bitterness sometimes wrong words are used. The world situation is changing day by day and is in a fluid state. The Prime Minister himself said that this morning, 'Who is a friend and of whom and who is an enemy and of whom it is very difficult to answer such questions. The world is divided into two camps and both sides are trying to draw the uncommitted nations of the world—not only uncommitted but needy people of the world too. This is done on both sides, by doing propaganda, by offering arms, money or both and the rivalry of these two sides have provided a bargaining counter to many countries. They first think, who will give them the most. Pakistan will be on that side who will give her arms and money in order to fight India.' The Mid-cast countries will be taking sides with those who will give them arms and money. There are no permanent friendships and loyalties in politics. The under-developed countries want to develop faster in order to catch up with the most advanced countries. They were purposely kept backward during the present and the last century for the purpose of exploitation, but now Asia has become resurgent. The people of Asia have found out that subjugation can only be enforced if they submit to it,

The fight between the forces of darkness and light is not only going on in the world at large but here at home too. For instance, the agitation about language and • the linguistic groups, the agitation by Dravida Kazhagam etc. are making the country weak in many ways. There is agitation on various labour fronts, agitation among youth, agitation about food; besides there are incessant discussions about the Plan, on the border incidents, agitation in regard to Goa, vigilance on Kashmir Front and necessity to fight UNO and in many other spheres. All these do not allow Government any respite. For instance, I see in the amendments moved this

morning that in spite of the Efforts made by the Prime Minister, it is suggested that India's prestige is lowered because she has asked for foreign aid and loans from countries of the Western Bloc, because Government is devoting large sums of money for the purchase of war equipments, for continuing to remain a Member of Commonwealth, for not calling a Second Conference of Asian and African Powers; and there are amendments in regard to Kashmir matters and for not interfering in some other country's affairs—that is, for not calling an Asian and African Conference. I am really surprised at these amendments. Is it really seriously suggested that the Government should not defend its frontier and not spend any money on the purchase of equipments? By remaining a Member of the Commonwealth, have we gained or have we lost anything? Is Government not doing everything to fight out the case for Kashmir? I do not know the motive behind tabling these amendments. Besides, the calling of any such conference is not a proposition about which India alone can take steps. The proper climate for calling together any such conference is necessary not in India alone but also in the countries who are expected to participate in it. Sir, the time at my disposal is short and I do not want to go into a review of all these aspects. I will only say this much, that if all Indians in spite of their party affiliations or creed put their shoulders to the wheel and help the Prime Minister in building up the nation, in the efforts that he is so valiantly making, our country can attain prosperity and stability in a very short time. And the Government too will have more time to attend to the proper co-ordination of their policy, say, for instance the land reform, the community projects and many other nation-building works which are required to be attended to for the prosperity of this country. The energy of almost all our leaders is frittered away in combating futile agitations, not only agitations led by other people but sometimes by Congressmen themselves. It is really a wonder how in spite of all these

90 RS.D.—5.

fronts to fight, the Prime Minister has been able to do so much, not only in the foreign affairs, but in the other Government Departments *too*, specially for women, for children, for culture, for encouraging the construction of architectural buildings and put through so much work through legislation and the legislatures. I cannot imagine any other person amongst the world politicians who could be so energetic, who could travel so much, who could read so much and keep himself always alert and ready, in spite of the stresses and strains he has to undergo.

This, Sir, is the Sputnik age and there is so much destruction in the air. The other day I said somewhere else that peace kites are flown in order to make one's own weapons perfect. The present politicians and policies, however, are getting outmoded and ours is the only country which has kept abreast of events and moulded them to a certain extent. I hope that the world will soon realise and appreciate very soon the stand taken by the Prime Minister of India. Thank you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we all heard this morning with very great attention the speech of the Prime Minister. Not only on this occasion, but whatever the occasion, when the Prime Minister speaks, he is listened to with great attention. The Prime Minister, while dealing with the international situation and India's foreign policy relating thereto, dealt with both the factors which should determine the foreign policy of a country, namely, its national interests and international objectives. He spoke at length of our national interests. Every aspect of the question was dealt with by him. But we heard from the Prime Minister that he was helpless in giving us any hope of our national interests being properly safeguarded by the policy that his Government is following with regard to foreign affairs. It

[Shri Jaswant Singh.] appears, as many of us in this House both in the Congress ranks as well as in the opposite and outside feel, that whatever steps we take, or our country takes, we first of all see what the others will think of it. We say that our policy is one of non-alignment and we examine each issue on its merit. But whenever a problem comes up in front of us, we first see round to find out what others would think. The step we take is governed or determined by our thought as to what the others will think of us. This is the opinion which is held in this House by us and outside also and that feeling, as far as I can see, was confirmed today from the speech that I heard from the Prime Minister, Sir, it appears that an "international fobia" has set in the mind of our Government and we all along think of what others will think of us. This is not the characteristic of a virile nation and of leaders who are responsive to the public feelings. What has happened elsewhere? we attach very great importance to international matters and of course, to the United Nations. In a way we are allied with the United Nations and all its aims. But so are the other big nations, the big Powers. But when their national interests clash with other parties, what do they do? Take the case of the Suez canal. Two big Powers, Britain and France, they took the risk. They failed, but that is another matter. They did not wait to find out what the United Nations would think if they took a certain action. Egypt seized the Suez Canal and fought two big Powers. She did not wait for consulting what others would think, because she felt that it was in her own national interest. So also in Indonesia too just now. There the burning question is that of West Irian. They have taken possession of it. That is so not only in democratic countries. Take the case of the Soviet Bloc. When they felt that the imperialists or other Powers were instigating in Hungary a counter-revolution, they did not go to the United Nations, because they are a virile nation and they feel that

their national interests will be harmed if they waited and allowed events to take their own course. They crushed the revolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You mean the counter-revolution.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Revolution or counter-revolution, it is the same thing. They crushed it. So did the Hungarians. They did not wait for anybody. They took certain steps which were to their own interests. They take certain steps which are in their interest and today nobody accuses them. They are as good Members of the U. N. as India is. India is in no way superior in the U. N. to the other nations, to either the Soviet Bloc or the Western Democracies. Whenever their national interests demand, they do not consult any other nation but take all the necessary steps. The U. S. A. did not consult others as to what she should do and with what country she should enter into a pact or an alliance because, the point is, wherever the national interest comes in it should be supreme and that is the characteristic of a virile nation but, as far as our own foreign policy is concerned, we surrender at every issue. Take the case of Tibet. We have ignominiously surrendered our interests because we had no guts to stand up. Take the case of Pakistan which insults us day in and day out. Sometimes we protest and probably the Deputy Minister of External Affairs will in future not send any protests to Pakistan. Here is Portugal. How they insult us day in and day out is known to everybody. What happens? Nothing. We just pocket them and say, "We are a great nation and, therefore, it does not affect us*".

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Was Tibet part and parcel of India at any time?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am talking about the historical ties and sphere of influence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good. Leave Tibet alone and come to India.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: As far as the international situation is concerned, I feel very sorry to see the helplessness of our Prime Minister in all matters where our national interests are concerned because, cowards die many times before their death and the valiant never die but once. The other nations give preference to their national interest than to the other interests and our position is just the contrary. It is a very great pity.

Now, coming to the amendments that I have given notice of, I would first of all refer to the one pertaining to Kashmir. Here again, Sir, I have to say that this issue has been discussed threadbare but I have also to say that whatever is happening is, to our misfortune, something that we deserve. We have ourselves complicated the Kashmir issue. Even today, we do not consider Kashmir as our own. In all the laws that we make, we say that this will apply to the whole of India excepting Jammu and Kashmir. Why "excepting Jammu and Kashmir"? Why should this State have its own constitution? Why should it have a Sadr-i-Riyasat of its own? Not only that, Sir, our writ does not run in Kashmir in regard to many matters. Now, then, if it has become an international issue, who is to be blamed? We ourselves are to be blamed. This morning, the Prime Minister paid a great compliment to the advocacy which our representative, the Leader of our Delegation, Mr. Krishna Menon, was putting forth in the Security Council. Well, Sir, it is an admitted fact that our case in regard to Kashmir is very strong and I put a question to the Prime Minister this morning that if the advocacy was so great why was the case going against us? He turned tack and said that even when the case is good, even when the advocacy is good, he is unable to convince Members opposite. That is not the point at all. The point is, if the case is strong, if the advocacy is good and even then if the case goes

against us, where should the blame lie? The blame would lie with the advocates. Moreover, Sir.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Advocacy was good but the manners were bad.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: He said.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Some of the judges were worse still.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: In regard to Kashmir, we feel the discourtesy which our representative showed to Great Britain was a bad taste. We had to eat the humble pie and our own words had to be withdrawn. It is unforgiveable that a seasoned statesman of the calibre of Mr. Krishna Menon should make such lapses. Excepting for the fact that he made long speeches and tried to surpass the length of the speeches made by other Members in the United Nations, we feel that as far as the Kashmir question is concerned he has not served the country well. His advocacy has been faulty and if he is continued because of some qualities which the Prime Minister likes in him, he can make him the Deputy Prime Minister or entrust him with other important work or portfolio. So far as his advocacy is concerned, he has been wrongly advising the Prime Minister and for those wrong advices the country is suffering. Not only that, Sir. We blame the Pacts also. We say that because Pakistan is a member of the Baghdad Pact, SEATO and other Pacts, she is receiving support. My friend, Mr. Mirza, was thundering as usual on the Islamic principles of non-aggression. Even Turkey and Iraq, two Muslim countries, are openly supporting Pakistan and if Great Britain and the Western Allies are supporting Pakistan, we can't say anything. Have we got any friend in the world? In regard to the original Resolution in the Security Council on the Kashmir issue, Soviet Russia threatened a veto and that Resolution had to be whittled down and modified. Russia did not do it for the

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]
 love of us; she did it because she thought that that would give a base in Pakistan to the Western Powers. By our policy of non-alignment, we did not spare Russia and we had put her in many embarrassing situations. So, in her own interest, she used that veto but, in regard to the revised Resolution, when she felt that her national interests were not affected, she did not use the veto. I am glad, Sir, that the Prime Minister did not refer to these Pacts. The United Nations is ineffective in stopping aggression. It has become quite ineffective and, therefore, local alliances and pacts are necessary to order to safeguard the interests of friends. In addition to that, Sir, there is one.....

DR. R. B. GOUR: Do you mean to say that the Baghdad Pact is a good alliance?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I do not say it is good but it is inevitable. You cannot get away from that. You have given the power to the United Nations to stop aggression but the U. N. is imbecile and it cannot use all that power. Nobody would listen to that body and it is defied by every nation which so wants with impunity. In such circumstances, it is inevitable for these Pacts to come in, whether we like them or not. That is my point. The matter does not end there, Sir. To my utter regret, I find that even in the U. N, Secretariat we have not got any proper friend or representation, let alone the power politics and other factors. In yesterday's paper, I read that the U. N. Department of Information has brought out a world map in which Kashmir had been shown as a disputed territory leaving out other disputed territories like West Irian and others. While other definitely disputed territories have not been so shown, Jammu and Kashmir has been shown like that and there is a further remark on the map itself that the final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been determined. Could we congratulate ourselves or our representatives there, I

our Permanent Representative there or our Leader of the Delegation who is a great man according to the Prime Minister.....

DR. R. B. GOUR: . . . or, our Finance Minister who went there.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: . . . or our other Ministers and senior officers who, every year, spend about six months and spend millions of rupees in the U. N. Headquarters?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But, what can she do? She does not draw maps..

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The U. N. is bringing out this map and we do nothing at all.

(Time bell rings.)

Lastly, Sir, I want to speak about the financial arrangements and the Amendment that I have moved in respect of this thing. We go out and want millions and millions of rupees by way of help from others. We feel that there should be no strings attached, that the other party which gives should not even see as to whether she would get any benefit out of this, help or not. We feel that if somebody has to be our friends, he should not give us any advice. All these things cannot remain together. Now, coming to the question of outside help, we get so much of help from the U. S.. A. Rightly or wrongly, that is the only nation which gives help to that extreme extent that we want in order to help fulfil the Second Five Year Plan. She gives arms to Pakistan because Pakistan is friendly with her and she is in a pact along with her. The Prime Minister, in the last Session stated that because the U. S. A. had helped Pakistan with arms, the help given to us had been washed out absolutely. I do not agree with this argument because we have also received so much of help from the U.S.A. ?Sven if we had not received that help, because Pakistan is arming itself to the teeth by this help-or by other foreign help, we compul-sorily, our relations with Pakistan

being what they are, have to spend all that money. Therefore, to say that the help is washed out shows a grain of ingratitude towards those who are helping us.

4 P.M.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, since we last discussed foreign affairs, we witnessed a very astonishing event which has really turned the world upside down in more than one sense, and is even now profoundly exercising the minds of men all over the world. On October 4th, the Russians launched the first Sputnik of about 183 pounds over a height of 560 miles, which is still circling the earth. Exactly a month later the second Sputnik was launched of about 500 pounds over a height of 1000 miles. That also is circling the globe. As a scientific achievement as the Prime Minister has said, it surpasses man's all previous knowledge. It has ushered in a new age—the space age. I would even like to call it the Apocalyptic age, making man fearful of the consequences that may be revealed hereafter.

There is a joke current in West Germany quoted by the American newspapers—I repeat, American newspapers—about the difference between the American Sputniks and the Russian Sputniks. This is said to be

DR. R. B. GOUR: One goes up, the other does not.

SHRI M., H. SAMUEL: The American Sputnik does not go up, and the Russian Sputnik will not come down. Of course, it is only a light joke, as my friend Dr. Gour has got it.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: In the case of America it is Satellite. In the case of Russia it is Sputnik.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Sputnik is the Russian word for Satellite. Even taking the joke literally, we should all be very happy about the Sputnik as a scientific achievement, because one day it may make possible travel between the several planets of the

universe. What is, however, profoundly disturbing for the peace of the world, perhaps the very existence of man, is its military consequences, and I want to say a few words on the military consequences. As everybody knows, military alliances have played decisive roles in history so far. They have yielded the theory of balance of power which has determined the fate of nations and peoples.

The military significance of the Sputniks lies in what they prove about rocket capacity. If rockets can hurl a thousand, pound satellite into an orbit around the earth, they can shoot ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads over great distances. The Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile (the I. C. B. M.) is now regarded as the "ultimate weapon", superseding all other existing weapons. Its possession by any country establishes its absolute superiority over any other. Against such a weapon any military power with ground or air forces, any logistical support for them, or air bases, has only doubtful value. Even sea power, aircraft carriers, battleships, cruisers, destroyers, perhaps even submarines have become out of date. Russia possesses this Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile. It was exploded some time in August this year, but nobody believed it until the Sputniks went up. The Americans have, what is called the Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile (IRBM) which can go up to only 1500 miles. But the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile can go up to about 5000 miles. The Russians have also achieved precision in launching them and in dropping them. Many more such missiles are under preparation so that both the two super-Powers are now trying to achieve, what may be called, "balance of terror" in place of "balance of power".

Militarily, therefore, the Sputniks have enabled Russia to seize the "position of strength" from the United States, making nonsense of Mr. Dulles's theory of "massive retaliation". They have ended the nuclear stalemate but, in another sense the

[Shri M. H. Samuel.] nuclear stalemate exists completely today.

As a result, the Sputniks have entered the diplomatic field. What is called "Sputnik diplomacy" is now current coin in the United Nations. The enlargement of the Disarmament Commission as a result of the Russians' threat to withdraw from it is regarded as the first victory of the Sputnik diplomacy. So, the Sputniks have definitely entered into international affairs as inexorable giants affecting or changing the foreign policies of nations. Any number of NATOS, SEATOS or Baghdad Pacts have no meaning now. Military blocs remain now as mere primitive instincts..

In this context, Sir, I want this House to re-discover the wisdom of our own foreign policy. It is a foreign policy, for the wisdom of which, many people, many nations are casting longing, envying looks at us. It is a policy for the wisdom of which, many nations are trying to adopt and cherish it; because it is a policy enfolding us with goodwill, wrapping us perhaps with a warm blanket of peace.

At this time when the minds of men are going through a process of change in policy and attitude, it was appropriate for our Prime Minister to have issued the appeal to the leaders of the two super-Powers for peaceful coexistence. It is an appeal that must be read and re-read. It is almost an Apocalyptic message.

At this time also, Russia stands the supreme test of statesmanship for world peace. With the possession of the rockets and the I.C.B.M., it is the No. 1 Power in the world today. It is riding triumphantly on the wave of the future. Anybody, whether he is a Hottentot in the jungle, or whether he is a schoolboy, or a Bedouins in the desert, now identifies Russia with the wave of the future. The world almost lies prostrate before her military power.

Therefore, at this hour of her triumph, I believe, humility and

goodwill towards others become a great nation. The U. S. A. missed her hour of opportunity when for ten years she held the monopoly of the atom bomb, until Russia discovered it in 1949. We should appeal to Russia, magnanimously, voluntarily,, unconditionally, to renounce the use of nuclear weapons or rockets. Peaceful co-existence is the only way to avoid the terrible impending catastrophe and save the peace for the world.

Now, I want to refer to another matter which the Leader of the Opposition has referred to. (^t course, his amendment Was disallowed. I have reason to refer to it because of my profession., It is about the Finance Minister's visit to the United States of America, Canada, Britain and West Germany. The criticism against him or against his visit seems to involve two points—(1) whether his mission has met with any success or not, and (2) whether he has soiled the reputation of this country abroad. With the second question is linked up nis reported interview with *The New York Times*. Perhaps, as a newspaperman, I may be permitted to say a few words on the subject.

First of all, I deeply regret that that interview should have been given so much prominence in this country and abroad. Particularly, I regret that our national papers played it up in that manner, because as a news item, it did not deserve such an importance, and secondly, it did not serve any useful purpose in the national interest. Let me deal first with his visits. I believe the significance of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari's visits abroad has not been realised sufficiently in this country. In times to come, perhaps sooner than later, that significance will be felt in the economic reconstruction of the country, in the industrial development . . . J

AN HON. MEMBER: You intensify slavery.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Well, I believe that the Opposition will not agree to anything that side-tracks

their views. But if only they can suspend their judgment for a little while, we should all reap the fruits of his efforts very soon.

Some Members in this House as well as in the other House felt constrained to think that his visits have soiled our reputation abroad. I have read and re-read the speeches of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari abroad. I find nothing to sustain that point of view and, nowhere do I get that impression in his speeches. Nowhere did he say anything derogatory to the prestige of this country or anything supplicatory. They do not at all sound like the speeches of Mr. Suhrawardy in the United States of America nor like those of Mr. Firoz Khan Noon in his adulatory reference to the Western Powers in the United Nations.

It is time we realised that the greatness and prosperity of this country is not built on foreign policy or utterances on foreign policy. (*Time bell rings.*) No amount of goodwill visits will do any good to us. The greatness and prosperity of our country is built on the proper husbanding of our economic resources and their utilisation for the growth of this country.

Now, I come to the interview with *The New York Times*. (*Interruptions*) As a journalist, I am only too familiar with such episodes. When a reporter goes to interview an important personality, there are two strong personalities facing each other, each with his own point of view, each with his own angle of inquiry and presentation. So, naturally, there can always be differences of opinion.

I was involved in such an affair some time ago when a Government of India spokesman held a Press conference on the accession of States and their integration. When a question was put to him whether the Khan of Kalat had asked the Government of India for accession, because he did not want to accede to Pakistan, he replied that he would have nothing to do with it, as it was not worth the candle.

Now, these were his exact words and I and three or four other correspondents reported them accordingly. When the statement was published, the palace of the Khan of Kalat in Quetta was surrounded by Pakistani troops and he sent a telegram to Lord Mountbatten protesting against this statement. But the Government of India spokesman denied that he ever made that statement. The Government of India accepted his denial with the result that I and the other three or four correspondents were left high and dry.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it suggested that the Finance Minister had followed these tactics?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I only mean that such things will happen to you also if you are an important person or if you are a reporter.

Later, the Government of India spokesman said, that what he referred to was the recognition of the sovereignty of the Khan of Kalat, as he did not want to accede to Pakistan. But there was no mention of recognition of sovereignty nor was any question put to him on the subject.

I mention this only to prove that there can be misunderstandings between a reporter and the important personality interviewed because both of them have got different viewpoints.

(*Interruptions.*)

Well, both of us were correct or both of us were wrong. After all, even the Prime Minister had to contradict two of his statements in Japan, as published—one about the American troops in Japan and the other about the words 'international gangsterism.' It is a pity that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari was not here when the controversy developed; otherwise, he would have effectively answered that criticism.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I want to intervene at this stage of the debate

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.] to deal with certain points raised by our great Opposition leader, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, and other Members like Mr. Kishen Chand, Mr. Jaswant Singh, Mr. H. D. Rajah and others. Sir, although Shri Bhupesh Gupta is as usual irrelevant and loud, this time he has also shown a great lack of understanding and perspective. Sir, the difference between him and us is that, while we are really non-aligned, he is aligned in certain respects and non-aligned in certain other respects. For instance, he will criticise military pacts if those pacts are participated by some countries, but there may be other military pacts also, but . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not say.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: No, you do not, and there is no reason why. . . .

DR. R., B. GOUR: The other is a consequent Pact.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Whatever it is, as far as I am concerned, I find that he is in favour of some pacts, but not against. . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sometimes, an operation is needed to remove a disease.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I could not follow what he said. It is unfortunate. Sir, he also said that we had not been loud in our condemnation of colonialism, and that we had not stated in categorical terms that the Indian nation supported the claim of Indonesia to West Irian etc.. Sir, everybody knows and the point has been made clear by two very distinguished speakers, Dr. Kunzru and Shri Sapru, that India had taken the initiative for the cause of Indonesia and she had consistently supported Indonesia on the question of West Irian, and to say that on the basis of some newspaper reports that we have not supported Indonesia or condemned the Dutch colonialism is utterly false.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I read out a particular report, the hon. member can read it in *The Statesman* and other papers and it has created some misgivings. So, I want only to know where exactly we stand.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: The Leader of the Opposition should not have any misgivings on the subject because he has been listening to the debate, participating in the debate and reading newspapers, not one but many, regularly. All that I want him to do is to read some of the statements made by our Prime Minister.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We have not read any statements so far positively supporting the cause of Indonesia-

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: You will hear them a little later.

Sir, the only gratifying thing here is that we do not have that complex that our Leader of the Opposition has. Indonesia is quite satisfied with our support to the claim to West Irian and they will continue to have faith in us, which the Leader of the Opposition seems to me has not.

I now proceed to reply to some of the points raised by subsequent speakers. Sir, we were told that our foreign policy has been effeminate, cowardly and calculated to please the international world and completely ignorant of our domestic interests. It is rather sad that notwithstanding the repeated statements made by the Prime Minister, the chief architect of our foreign policy which has the support not only of the Opposition groups but of the entire country, the hon. member should have used these words with reference to our foreign policy. I really do not know what he means when he says that our foreign policy is effeminate.

DR. R. B., GOUR: It is because a female is the Deputy Minister.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Joking apart, if he means that we should get tough every time something

happens or we should use force in order to enforce our claims, then I have no objection to their saying these things because these are not our policy as far as our foreign relations are concerned. This is also nothing new. It has been explained on the floor of this House as well as from other platforms by none other than the Prime Minister. Sir, I can well understand why Shri Kishen Chand is so very critical about our foreign policy especially with regard to the loans.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: This is the party stand of the P.S.P.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I do not care what the Party stand is. I am concerned with what has been said here.

a

Sir, the utilisation of foreign loans for the development of internal economy is nothing new.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I spoke about begging.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: A loan is not begging. Then you should condemn China for getting loans and technical help from the Soviet Union. You must condemn also the Soviet Union because during the early days after the revolution she had been depending upon Western technical experts for the development of her economy, you must also condemn the U. S. A. because immediately after she became free, she was entirely dependent upon the European nations, especially the British, for the development of her economy. You should also condemn many other countries which had been hit badly by the war—I may mention specially Austria, France and Japan, how the economy of these countries had been built up with foreign aid. The fact that we want foreign loans does not lower our prestige. Our prestige is lowered when there is no internal peace, when there is no solidarity. If those people who criticise us for seeking foreign loans will co-operate with

Government wholeheartedly, for the development of our economy, for the stability of our economy, certainly we will not be required to go about begging, what you say, for foreign loans.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, . . .

(Interruptions.)

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I listened to you very patiently, and I think you can also spare a few minutes for me.

Sir, now we have got an annual fare, which comes from Shri Rajah. He has got only one theme and that theme is very well-known to the House. I think he comes to Delhi only to explain that theme because during every session, during the foreign policy debate, he tells us that we should get out of the Commonwealth and then he forgets all about it till there is another foreign policy debate, when he comes and tells us the same thing.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: You must read the proceedings for other things.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I am a regular attendant to the House and it is not necessary for me to read the proceedings.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Proceedings of Shri Rajah and not of other members.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Sir, he also regretted that he was not so fortunate as to be the Prime Minister of Pakistan. I must point out that there is a chance for him yet because they are forming a new Ministry in Pakistan.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: You cannot twist events.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: True, we cannot.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Not even here, what to talk of Pakistan.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Sir, while we discuss the foreign policy it is necessary to discuss it in the correct perspective and also the limitations under which any country has to work these days. Our hon. friends want us to be loud in protesting. They want us to take the leadership of the world. They want us to advise Indonesia what she should do. They want us to advise Egypt as to what she should do forgetting all the while that they also are sovereign States. More than all that they want us to advise the United Nations what she should do, for getting all the time that we constantly had been advising her as a member of United Nations as to what the United Nations should do. Some Members say that the United Nations is ineffective. Perhaps, they are right but if the United Nations is ineffective, it is not the fault of India or any other country—an international organisation will be ineffective as long as it is an organisation like the United Nations, which is an amorphous body, representing different cultures, different standards of development, different political systems and different social and other attitudes. Naturally, as long as the nations of the world are not willing to surrender their sovereignty and think in terms of international co-operation and a world community, it will not be possible to have a more effective international organisation, and if we think that the money we spend in supporting the United Nations is ill-spent I have only to say and remind the speakers what the world would have been without the United Nations. Sir, some years ago I happened to meet a Russian representative who had to work on the same Committee as I did. It was my first year in the United Nations and I pointed out to him how futile the whole discussions in the United Nations looked to me. He said: "Madam, you don't know what a war is. We have lived through the war. It is much better for people to speak rather than to fight". Therefore, I hope we will all remember this. We only

knew war through the reports. We have only read about war. Those countries which have been through the ordeal of war, great tragedy of war, they know that the United Nations should be maintained, even if it means that it does not produce immediate political and other results, at least in order to see that international peace is maintained, and, as has been pointed out time and again in this House, in order to maintain international peace. We also want to create a climate of peace and that can be maintained only when you have nations like India and other countries which are not committed in any way to any kind of ideology but pursuing the path of peace by bringing about reconciliation when international conflicts assume frightening shapes. Therefore, Sir, to say that because we do not arm ourselves or go about fighting and trying to rectify the wrongs of the world, therefore we are weak or effeminate or even cowardly, I think it is being very harsh and unkind to the Government and its policies. Of course, Mr. Jaswant Singh tried to define what 'cowardice' meant. After all if our policies are effeminate and cowardly, then our people are also effeminate and cowardly.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We have to look to the Government for help.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: What is a Government? Government is an elected Government, and when the majority of the people represents the Government and its policies, it is a reflection on the whole country. After all he said, 'We get what we deserve'. Certainly, we do get what we deserve. The policies that the Opposition gets from the Government are just what they deserve and nothing more.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: What is the leadership then for?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: The leadership is to lead.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: In a cowardly way?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: What are you doing? If you can produce other policies or other leadership, then why don't you do it? But the fact is that you are helpless, and perhaps more helpless than even the Prime Minister is, because you are more cowardly and you are more effeminate.

Sir, the question of Kashmir has been reopened here. I must say that it is not the Government which has reopened the Kashmir question. It is the Opposition which in its various amendments mentioned Kashmir as part of the international relations. It is included in the 'Foreign Affairs' debate because a foreign country is involved in it. In the settlement of the Kashmir dispute we have to negotiate with Pakistan, and since Pakistan is an independent sovereign country . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then why are you getting Mr. Graham?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: We are not getting Mr. Graham. I wish Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to read the newspapers a little more carefully. But probably he has had no time to do so, because he had been out of the country for a long time, and in Russia and China they do not get these newspapers regularly. And there he could neither read Russian nor Chinese. If he goes through the newspapers a little more carefully, he will find that we have never supported this Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then why do you allow him to come here?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: For the same reason why we allow you to go out of this country. We allow foreigners to come in and at the same time allow our people to go out, because ours is not a dictatorship, nor a totalitarian regime. This is a democracy and we want our people to go out and other people to come in.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Madam, we take it that you will not discuss with him the Kashmir question when he comes here.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: You will know it at the proper time whether we are going to discuss this question or not. Then, Sir, the question was raised about Portugal. Various allegations were made saying that Nagar Haveli and Dadra were liberated and other Portuguese pockets also would have been liberated if the Government had taken a helpful attitude. This is absolutely wrong. The Indian Government had never stood in the way of liberation of any pockets within India or outside India. But we did say that we would not go about liberating people. If there is a Goan movement for liberation, certainly it will have all the sympathy of the Government of India, and the Prime Minister had explained in very clear and unequivocal terms why we were not regularising the procedure with regard to Dadra and Nagar Haveli and why it had not been integrated with India. The reasons were quite clear, and if they had listened to the Prime Minister properly, certainly, they would have known why these things are left as they are.

Then, Sir, Dr. Kunzru enlightened us about the Algerian question. He also pointed out how the presence of a large number of white settlers in Algeria had complicated the problem. Sir, everybody knows that we have always supported the Algerians in their fight for independence, and we had done a good deal of negotiation before the present resolution was adopted by the United Nations. Sir, it has taken weeks and weeks of negotiations because they were very touchy about their colonies, and it took so much time to have a resolution passed perhaps for the first time in the history of the United Nations, barring, of course, the human rights. Eighty members of the United Nations voted and France did not participate.

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon] in the voting. She neither voted for nor against. She simply did not participate. That shows that our interest in bringing about reconciliation between conflicting interests in the world is not to attract international opinion, but because we really and sincerely desire that we must have international peace, and if as a non-committed nation we could bring our influence to bear on other countries, we would certainly do so, as we have done in the past, so that the tensions may be reduced to the minimum.

Finally, Sir, I do not want to take more time of the House. But I would like to say to Mr. BhuDesh Gupta, "Please temper your sharpness"; and to Shri Kishen Chand, "Please disentangle your ideas; your ideas are all confused"; and to Mr. H. D. Rajah, "Please moderate your brilliance". He tries to be brilliant. A little moderation would be greatly helpful. And to all of us I would like to say that we should really live in harmony by co-operating with our Prime Minister, and therefore with the Government, and therefore with the country. . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And therefore not with some others in the Cabinet.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Therefore, with the entire Government, so that we may have greater and greater prosperity.

Sir, I think Mr. Bhupesh' Gupta raised the question whether the opinions of individual Members, when they were different from those of the Prime Minister, showed that there was absence of collective responsibility. As far as the expression of opinions is concerned. . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: It is a democratic Cabinet.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: It is a democratic Cabinet based on collective responsibility, if you know what that is.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That we know.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Sir, for anybody to say that what a Minister says or what the Prime Minister says is an opinion having no backing by the Cabinet and therefore no backing by the country is to misrepresent the whole case. Sir, everybody knows that our Cabinet is based on collective responsibility, and whatever the Government says represents the opinion not only of the Cabinet Ministers

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Washington creates discord sometimes in the collective responsibility.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: . . . but also of the people of India, because it is a majority rule. Therefore, it represents not only our opinion but also the policies of the Opposition as the Opposition Members have already said that they are in general agreement with the foreign policy of our country. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we are today having a periodical review of the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto. We are living in a dynamic and vastly changing world, a world with changes so quick and revolutionary that it is always a problem to keep pace with them. Simultaneous with the fact that vast parts of the world are waking out of a long slumber of backwardness and subjugation, and the torrent and the crescendo of the freedom movement both from colonialism and economic want is rolling forward in an unprecedented manner, man is already on his way to the conquest of space. Such a state of affairs is bound to create vast stresses and strains in the international situation and international relations and as such constir tutes a big challenge to man, all nations and the peoples, to keep abreast of the cataclysmic changes, to keep balance, to remain level-headed

in man's own interests, lest he should be blown off along with his achievements lock, stock and barrel.

Happily India has a foreign policy which meets four-square the requirements of the ever-fluid international situation. It is a policy of peace and understanding, 'of non-involvement in Power Blocs, a policy of objectivity which looks upon the problems arising in the world situation without preconceived notions, without a dogmatic approach. If there is any angle, it is that of help and understanding and broadening the areas of trust and understanding. This policy has been a success and that is why any critical appreciation of this policy, whether it be in the Parliament or any other forum outside, is in the end a favourable estimate of it.

By and large, the whole country agrees on the fundamentals and the broad principles of our foreign policy. There does appear a difference of opinion, as we have seen today, on the application of this policy to concrete individual international problems, but that is a different matter. One would need hours to review, appraise and state the international situation and the happenings and the changes that have taken place since we last had a discussion on the matter in this House. To enumerate only the most important of them, there is the vacation of aggression from Egypt, the easing of the ugly situation that developed between Turkey and Syria, although the general situation in the Middle East remains troubled and dangerous. Algeria has been referred to by many Members in this House. The people there continue to suffer. In the neighbouring country, the so-called Spanish Morocco, the people have risen to throw off the imperialist yoke. There is a spate of resentment in Indonesia against Holland on the question of West Irian. India is undoubtedly sympathetic to Indonesia, but it looks as if India even enjoys the confidence of the Netherlands, because we learn from the reports in the press that

Holland has appealed to India to exercise its influence with Indonesia in the direction of moderation. Malaya has emerged as an independent country. But the matters of the utmost importance which impinge vitally on the international situation are the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles, the Russian Sputniks, and the so far fruitless discussion on disarmament and the stoppage of all tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. In this regard we have the happy news in today's papers that Mr. Bulganin has written a letter to our Prime Minister in reply to the latter's appeal to the Soviet and American Governments on the cessation of atomic weapon tests and the armaments race. The Soviet Government is ready to declare solemnly that from January 1958 the Soviet Union would not carry out any nuclear weapon explosions if the USA and the U.K. would also state their agreement to cease these tests as from January 1958. Then we also read from today's papers that Mr. Bulganin has also sent letters to the Western Powers for a meeting to put a stop to the drift to war. I hope that these efforts would succeed and the Government of India would try all its diplomatic skill to bring these efforts to fruition so that the world heaves a sigh of relief and the scientific advancement of man for the good of man continues uninterrupted.

Coming nearer home, the most important problems that continue to face us are Goa and Kashmir. I am directly concerned with the latter since I belong to Jammu and Kashmir. I am happy that many other Members from this House have evinced a keen interest in the affairs of Kashmir and have shown a tendency to understand the changes that have occurred in the Kashmir situation recently.

I do not know whether to feel exasperated or have pity on those who vainly question the fact of the State of Jammu and Kashmir being an integral part of India being an inalienable part of India just like Mysore, Baroda or Rajasthan. Long historical

[Shri Trilochan Dutta] and cultural ties and within living memory a common struggle for freedom and strong sentiment form the basis of our unity, apart from the incontrovertible fact of a perfectly legal and constitutional accession. One fails to understand on what political, legal, constitutional, moral or any other grounds this fact can be called in question. No amount of diplomatic cunning or Machiavellianism can succeed in confusing the issue. World opinion has got eventually to accept facts. I do not have time at my disposal to go into all the facts of the Kashmir situation. Last time I submitted to the House some of those facts. A narration of all these facts require time which I do not have at my disposal

The facts in brief are that Kashmir is part of India as a political, sovereign entity; Pakistan is an aggressor in Kashmir and that aggression is a continuing aggression. Pakistan has no right to be in Kashmir and India's right to be there is implicit even in the UNCIP resolutions. There is no room for talks unless Pakistan vacated its aggression which is the only and the central fact of the whole situation. The Security Council has recently decided to send Frank Graham again to India in spite of our pleadings that it must first pronounce its judgment on India's complaint that Pakistan is an aggressor in Kashmir. We know we can hardly expect justice from the Security Council constituted as it is. Four permanent Members of the Security Council support Pakistan for political reasons, while Columbia, Cuba, the Philippines and Iraq are politically in the pocket of either the USA or the U.K. But we wish to proclaim to the world that India would defend its rights as a sovereign country whose integrity cannot be left to the whims of Machiavellianism, inflated vanity or pressure tactics.

The Graham Mission is an effort to rake up a controversy, to unsettle a settled fact, and as such, we are determined to see that it is a failure

Rather, I should say that the facts of the situation are bound to make it a failure. The conditions which led to the failure of the Graham Mission in 1953 still exist. The only change that has taken place in the situation in the meanwhile is that the people of Jammu and Kashmir have through a duly constituted Constituent Assembly and in a free and impartial manner ratified the already legal accession of the State to India.

Now, as you must have noticed, the recent discussion in the Security Council, strangely enough, revolved round Parts I and II of the UNCIP Resolution of August 13, 1948. This is a Key Resolution—said to be so— along with that of 5th January 1949. Now, the Pakistan case is that so far as Part I of August 13, 1948 Resolution is concerned, it has been implemented and we should go over to Part II of the Resolution. Our case is that Pakistan, despite our request in this behalf, despite the efforts of the U.N. in this behalf, and the efforts of the mediators appointed by the Security Council in this behalf, has failed to carry out its side of the commitments, its side of the obligations, that were imposed on it by the Resolution.

This Resolution of August 13, 1948 has three parts. First one is the Ceasefire Order. Second is the Truce Agreement, and third is the question of Plebiscite, etc. Now, we find that Part I B of the Resolution says:

"The High Commands of the Indian and Pakistani forces agree to refrain from taking any measures that might augment the military potential of the forces under their control in the State of Jammu and Kashmir."

What are the facts? The facts are these.. Not only this but the *Aides-Memoir* of the UNCIP also stated that Pakistan undertook to withdraw all its forces and all those persons who did not generally belong to that area and who had entered that area only for aggressive purposes. Not only

that. So far as the northern zones were concerned, as soon as Pakistan vacated its forces, certain strategic points were to be taken over by Indian forces for the maintenance of law and order. It must be clearly understood that so far as the sovereignty of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir over the whole State is concerned, it has never been called into question. Rather it has been affirmed by the UNCIP Resolutions and as Kashmir legally acceded to India, that the responsibility for maintaining law and order and for the defence of the State devolved on India. Pakistan, instead of withdrawing the forces, strengthened the so-called Azad Kashmir forces there and the number of battalions now there is 42 or so. In addition to that, Pakistan entered into a Mutual-Aid pact with U.S.A. and we find that today Pakistan has armed itself to its teeth. Then, further more, Part I of the Resolution says:

"The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan agree to appeal to their respective peoples to assist in creating and maintaining an atmosphere favourable to the promotion of further negotiations."

As, you will find, Pakistan has never abided by this commitment too. Pakistan, time and again, has carried on propaganda, has carried on a campaign of hate, of *Jehad*, against India and the requirements of this part of the Resolution have never been faithfully carried out by Pakistan. As such we find that Part I of the Resolution has been openly violated by Pakistan. There is no question therefore of implementing the other part of the Resolution till Pakistan has vacated its aggression. Pakistan is not vacating its aggression and by this and other methods wants to generate a state of uncertainty and instability in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This is the point that I would particularly like to impress, on this august House.

Pakistan seeks to do this by having *ad nauseum* on plebiscite. 'What

is this species called plebiscite? If it means the expression of the will of the people, this has been expressed repeatedly by them. They did so in 1947 when they fought to a man against Pakistan aggression. They ratified it through their Constituent Assembly. Self-determination in the present context has no more significance than a domestic election and this has been held twice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. You have already taken more time.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA: So far as the people of Jammu and Kashmir are concerned, Pakistan is absolutely in no doubt as to what their feelings on the question are. This is reflected not only in the general public but also in the Legislative Assembly there. So far as the Government is concerned, it stands for the unbreakable ties existing between India and Kashmir. So far as the Opposition Parties are concerned, they have exactly the same stand on the question of accession. The people of Jammu and Kashmir, as a whole, are united in their opposition to Pakistan. If we are opposed to the Pakistan brand of self-determination, it is because it is not only an impracticable proposition but it has dangerous potentialities not only for India and Pakistan but for the whole of South East Asia, rather the whole world.

Let us not, however, minimise the capacity of Pakistan authorities to create mischief in Kashmir. In desperation they are having recourse to bomb explosions and sabotage and efforts to fan religious fanaticism are being made. In these circumstances, it becomes essential that the people in Kashmir have a good, efficient and honest Government. It would be essential anywhere but it would naturally be more so there than elsewhere. This would eliminate any possibility of the people of Kashmir lending their ear at any time to the siren song of Pakistan.

[Shri Trilochan Dutta.]

With these words, I support the motion along with the amendment tabled by Shri P. N. Saprú.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Deputy Minister has been vehement, of course, in her own good-humoured way, in defending the Government's policy. She has assured the House that the sympathies of the Indian Government are fully with Indonesian Government and the Indonesian people in their struggle for liberating West Irian, not that we on this side doubted it as to where the sympathies of the Indian Government lay. Our point is, that what is happening in Indonesia, what is happening in Algeria and what is happening in the various parts throughout the Asian and African continents—these have to be viewed in a broader background. In fact, we feel that one of the most relieving features in the world situation today in an otherwise dismal world situation is that a new outlook of life is coming to the fore, is projecting itself on the world scene. Millions of people of the world, more particularly in Asia and Africa—their minds are being opened to new realities of life. They are coming out strongly and firmly against colonialism and it is to our interest that we seek to mobilise this will of millions

of people as a bulwark 5 P.M. against attempts to wage war.

The whole postwar upsurge was there throughout Asia and we witnessed magnificent things when Egypt was attacked, when the sovereignty of Syria was threatened, and today thousands and thousands of patriots think on these lines in Algeria, in Indonesia, in Malaya and they are standing up as they have never done before throughout these vast countries. There is a new life in all these countries which is for creating new values of life. As the Prime Minister the other day pointed out, the European outlook of life has dominated the world scene for some 200 years and that is receding and our point is that the Government

of India should take a more positive-attitude and make use of this relieving feature to the best interest of world peace and to fight against colonialism. We know that the Government of India played a very real role to give form and content to that upsurge of vast masses of people in these regions when the country called together the Bundung Conference. That was the principle enunciated there and there was the concrete application of the Panchsheel principles to the problems that existed then. That served as a beacon light to vast millions of people to give a new turn to world politics. Now, in the light of the existing situation, we say that the climate is ripe for convening a second Bandung Conference. We are told that unanimity might not be possible. We are told that just loud protests will not do. But it is not for just voicing loud protest that we suggest it. It is necessary in the interest of world peace. It is necessary to mobilise this will of the millions of people for world peace, for creating for themselves a new life which we want to establish in this world. I am not saying all this and we are not pressing this point just from the academic point of view. We say it because the danger to our security is very real. Now, within two or three days the NATO Powers are meeting. What for? It is for rushing missiles and atomic weapons to Turkey, to West Germany, to Pakistan and Formosa, all aimed at Asian people. That is true. President Iskander Mirza goes to Lisbon and Madrid and other places and sees people and they say there is so much common identity of purpose. Here on our very doors these things are happening. And against this brandishing of the sword we have here this will of millions of people and as the Government of India once took the lead to mobilise that will, it has to be done again. We are asked: Suppose some people do not cooperate? Pakistan may not cooperate. But let the world know who stands against this new upsurge of the people of Asia. It is all for the better if they get isolated. All

these attempts to sow confusion, to sow the seeds of disruption among Asian countries we have to fight and in our opinion, this climate is quite right and we should make use of this very relieving feature and give a lead to the people in the light of the Panch Sheel principles.

There is another redeeming feature and it is this. I am now not referring to the Soviet approach or the Soviet attitude. But we will be failing in our duty if we did not take note of or take into account a certain Soviet action. I am not here referring to what they did in Egypt when she was attacked. I am not referring to what they did when Syria's sovereignty was threatened, not even to the attitude that they took on the Kashmir issue when that issue came up before the U.N. But today Bulganin, the Soviet Prime Minister has come out with a very straight offer that the Soviet Union is prepared to abandon all nuclear tests and to suspend nuclear tests for two years, provided the other Powers agree. Again we know that the Soviet Union has agreed to withdraw their forces from East Germany, the only condition being that the foreign troops in West Germany must be withdrawn. These are the things and our Prime Minister took the initiative and appealed to the world Powers. The response has been from the Soviet Union. I say that the Government of India and our Prime Minister must go a step further. These mighty Powers with their mighty weapons and their potentialities for destruction, these Powers must get together. Our Prime Minister and our Government have already taken a certain lead and now, I submit, the time is ripe, especially as in the matter of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles and other things the Americans, the U.S.A. and the Western Powers see that they cannot have it all their own way. Now, the time is ripe when a summit conference must be organised. Not a summit conference of the type which the NATO Powers are contemplating and which will be held on the 16th of this

90 R.S.D.—6.

month. That summit conference is just to concert measures to rush destructive weapons, atomic weapons and aim them at other countries. While we are quite alive to the fact that some initiative and action have been taken by the Government, we think it is time to go a step further.

So much has been said about Kashmir here and many said whether it was discourtesy or the lack of courtesy and all such things which I have no time now to go into. But with regard to this Kashmir issue, especially with regard to the Graham Mission, we have to adopt a very clear attitude. After all, there is a little improvement made in the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly by the Swedish amendment. Mr. Graham is coming to examine the whole thing *de-novo*. That is all right. But then he comes with the old approach, the old outlook, the approach of the imperialists. In Kashmir they see certain strategic points and throughout the discussions in the U.N. and elsewhere we have been made aware of the real attitude of the Western Powers, and he comes as a representative of the Western Powers. We do not suggest that we should be discourteous to him. Nothing of that sort. We must be courteous to him. But we must make it clear to him that this sort of a mission is not going to serve any useful purpose. It will only cloud the issues and it will also bring in delay in reaching a solution, and we cannot be a party to any such thing, courtesy or no courtesy. In the most courteous terms we must tell him that we will have nothing to do with it.

Certain very nice things have been said about the Commonwealth Conference which has been meeting in Delhi, how they sat across the table and discussed things coolly, how everybody was able to understand each other, how each party was able to understand the view of the other best. All that may be there and I am quite aware of the innate virtue of these things. But there are certain

(Shri Perath Narayanan Nair). very disturbing aspects of these things also. Take for instance a simple thing. Let alone the British attitude towards major issues or problems like that of Kashmir and the other issues. Even in a small matter like the India House Library, which is a treasure house of oriental literature for writing our history or other things, we have not been able to do much. Over this small thing, for the last ten years we have been discussing round the table. Our Education Minister had been to London and then Earl Home the then Commonwealth Secretary came to India. I am told some 15 months back our Prime Minister sent a note to the British Government with regard to this comparatively small item, but of very great interest to us. After all this library has been built from out of the revenues of India and we require it. Of course, it belongs to undivided India, but it will not be impossible for us to come to an agreement on that. But even in that small thing we have not been able to get any positive results. I am not saying that sitting round the table is not good. But more positive action is necessary, such as is being witnessed in Indonesia today, in Algeria today and in Malaya today for the mass of the people who have been waiting indefinitely for years and years.. They are standing up and there is such a new upsurge and this new outlook has come to the forefront of the world today and the Government of India must encourage it and our view is that the Government of India must take a more positive aspect of this issue. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I fully associate myself with the amendment proposed by the hon. Mr. Sapru and I think, Sir, not only in this House but in the whole country, so far as the foreign policy is concerned, there is substantial agreement and the whole country is behind the policy that is being followed by our beloved Prime Minister. It is a very happy thing, Sir. My learnt friends on the Opposite could

be divided into two categories, one represented by the Communist Party and others. So far as the Communists are concerned, I can understand their position because they do not want our policy of non-alignment and want us to come in one bloc.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Who says so?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: So far as the others are concerned, they simply want, as the hon. Prime Minister said today, to be chivalrous like the Rajputs or the Pathan warriors without having any consideration for the realities of the situation. That is the whole trouble. For instance, take the question of the Commonwealth. I wish my learned friends could have taken part in the deliberations that went on here for the last eight or ten days. I do not say we agreed on all points but I think such meetings and the Commonwealth Association are helpful to diminish and reduce the differences and create a better atmosphere for mutual understanding and service to the humanity in the greater sense.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Such meetings can be held even without the Commonwealth.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: They give more strength.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: What kind of strength?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I wish I had time in which case I would have answered all the points. If I do so now, the bell will start ringing.

The other point that I am very happy about—and I am sure everyone of us is happy too—is the statement of Mr. Bulganin I read in the newspapers of today in response to the appeal of our Prime Minister. I do hope, Sir, that the Western Powers, when they meet on the 16th of December, 1957, in Paris, will also consider this matter seriously and will respond to the appeal of our leader.

DR. R. B. GOUR: They would respond by sending an Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I do hope, Sir, that Russia will also agree to international inspection and the differences that have arisen regarding the stopping of these nuclear tests would all be obviated. The world is anxious to see that there is less of fear and less of suspicion and the first step in this direction is to drop these atomic tests and to go ahead with disarmament.

Now, Sir, regarding the other point, I will say a few words. I entirely agree that in regard to Kashmir there is no occasion to unsettle a settled fact. It would be to the grave detriment not only of the people of Kashmir but, Sir, as I have repeatedly said, to the Muslims that live in this great continent with full dignity and full security. When Mr. Graham comes, I would suggest that he should first be sent to that part that is kept unlawfully occupied by Pakistan and then to the Kashmir which is integrated to us. I am sure, Sir, that any honest man who will go and see the conditions in the two parts cannot but come to the conclusion that it is in the best interests of the Kashmiris, socially, politically and economically to be finally, and once and for all, integrated with India. I do hope the attempts of the Western Powers; to create another Korea or further difficulties would be absolutely nullified by the full efforts of not only India but the world public opinion.

As regards the Hague proceedings, Sir, I have to give a definite suggestion. I quite appreciate, Sir, that this matter is *sub-judice* and therefore we cannot go into the merits of it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Why?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: At least I would not like to go into it but the thing I could say and it is this. I have had the pleasure of reading the judg-

ment given in the Hague Court regarding the preliminary objection in regard to jurisdiction that was taken up by India. I can say, Sir, that if the division would have been purely on legal basis, I can understand because Judges differ, the High Court differs from the Supreme Court but, Sir, what pained me was; that it was absolutely on the same lines as things were determined in the Security Council. That point, Sir, should awaken us to the gravity of the situation. Dadra and Nagar Haveli were separated and were separate from Portugal for one and a half years— after this lapse of time, a declaration —December, 1956—is made by the Portuguese authorities and within three days of this declaration, an application is made to the Court. As Justice Chagla said, the ink on the declaration was not dry when the application came to the Court. It was taken up whereas it should not have been done unless it had also come to the notice of India because, the Hague Court's jurisdiction is fundamentally based on contractual obligations; unless both the parties consent to it, they do not get jurisdiction. My advice to the Government is to be beware. Let us not be put in the same position as we find ourselves in the Security Council. Let us see and put all the legal heads together and then decide the issue. My suggestion will be, "Hands off. We do not want to go the Hague Court because justice will not be meted out".

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: You must have better material in your administration.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: This is a matter to which, I hope, the hon. Prime Minister will give his-keen consideration.

Regarding Indonesia, today we find that an appeal has come from the Netherlands. I would humbly suggest to the Government, Sir, that unless Indonesia also accepts us, accepts our intervention in the matter, it is not our job to go there. We should

[Shri Akbar AH Khan] not mediate in this matter unless both the parties request us. However, I certainly agree with what Dr. Kcnzru has said that we, as friends and as a country which has always helped and stood in the forefront in getting freedom for Indonesia, should certainly advise Indonesia to go slow, that it would not be in their best interest to proceed as they are doing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Go slow in what way?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: In surrendering their freedom.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Regarding the question of Algeria, I would not say much because I am glad certain Resolution had been passed on the efforts of India in the United Nations Assembly. It was India which brought to the forefront in the international gathering this question and that is why India is respected on all hands. What is our approach? Our approach in regard to these matters is the humanitarian approach. It is an international approach and keeping in view that approach and maintaining that approach, how can we, in the matter of Goa or in any other matter, adopt a policy different from ours which my friend and the other friends want us to adopt? It would be a negation of that policy. In view of these things, I do feel, Sir, that the

foreign policy that is being adopted is the best policy in the present circumstances of the case and this will not only improve the dignity and the status of India in the affairs of the world but I am sure it will not be long when both the blocs will come to India and would like to have our help and guidance. It is not always the atomic powers or the nuclear powers or rockets that count. It is the approach and the moral stamina and the way in which a country wants to tackle a problem that counts and that is important and I do hope, maintaining that position, we will take part more actively in the deliberations of the world affairs and guide them in our own humble way, we should see that humanity has peace and freedom.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no non-official business before the House tomorrow. The House will meet to transact official business. The Prime Minister will reply at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 13th December, 1957.