

to certain classes of establishments.
[Placed in Library. See No. S-249/57].

Sir, I beg to lay on the Table under sub-section (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952, a copy of the Ministry of Labour and Employment Notification S.R.O. No. 2706, dated the 17th August, 1957, publishing an amendment in the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. S-250/57].

REPORT ON LABOUR-MANAGEMENT
RELATIONS IN THE TATA IRON AND STEEL
COMPANY

SHRI ABID ALI: Sir, I would also lay on the Table a copy of the Report on the study of Labour-Management relations in the Tata Iron and Steel Company, Jamshedpur. [Placed in Library. See No. S-256/57].

AMENDMENT IN TEA RULES, 1954

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI SATISH CHANDRA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 49, of the Tea Act, 1953, a copy of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Notification S.R.O. No. 2744 [No. 8(7) PLANT (A) /57], dated the 24th August, 1957, publishing an amendment in the Tea Rules, 1954. [Placed in Library, See No. S-257/557].

REPORT OF COMARMA OM LUEMXC
TURHAOB, STEEL FOUNDRIES IN STEEL RE-
ROLLING MILLS

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA: Sir, on behalf of Sardar Swaran Singh, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report (April, 1957) of the Committee on Electric Furnaces, Steel Foundries and Steel Re-rolling Mills. [Placed in Library. See No. S-252/57].

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE INTER-STATE CORPORATIONS BILL,
1957

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is a message from the Lok Sabha.

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

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Inter-State Corporation Bill, 1957, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th September, 1957."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE EXPENDITURE
TAX BILL, 1957

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform hon. Members that, under Rule 162(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, the Chairman has allotted seven hours for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return of the Expenditure Tax Bill, 1957, by the Rajya Sabha, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to the Bill.

MOTION REGARDING INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister. Motion on the international situation.

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

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

I have spoken on this subject, Sir, on many occasions in this House and elsewhere, and I feel a little unhappy to relate the same story again and again, to go through more or less the same ground and to confess that all the major problems of the world still remain unsolved problems. It is possible that progress is being made behind the scenes or in the hearts and minds of men, which will give results in future. But, for the present, the outlook is very far from bright.

I suppose that the basic issue which perhaps governs other matters is that of disarmament. During the last 18 months or perhaps a little more, an impression has been created, I think with some justification, that we were getting somewhere near to some form of disarmament. I have no doubt that all the great countries concerned—the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and Canada—have all worked hard towards the same goal and wanted to have some measure of disarmament. All kinds of proposals have been made, but the fact is that, at the present moment, again the Disarmament Commission faces a deadlock. It may well be that they will come out of that deadlock and start discussing again. But it is a somewhat frustrating experience to expect something to happen—something that you are eagerly and anxiously looking forward to—and he repeatedly disappointed. Meanwhile, while these great Powers discuss questions of limiting atomic, nuclear tests or limiting the use of these bombs or of the manufacture of them, the fact is that both the tests and the manufacture go on and in some measure vitiate world's atmosphere and make it more and more dangerous for human beings. The measure may be small at the present moment, that is, it does not actually affect

people, but nobody quite knows how it is affecting gradually not only children, but still unborn children, all kinds of genetic aspects. I do not know what part we in India can play in this matter. We have in the past made certain proposals in all humility for the consideration of the Big Powers and I believe, some consideration has been given to them by the Committee. But we seem to be where we were. It is obvious that this question cannot be solved by some majority voting. It has to be solved ultimately by the Big Powers who are dealing with these bombs, more particularly, the United States and the Soviet Union, and secondarily, by the other Powers that possess these weapons, like the United Kingdom; and some others may possess them soon.

Occasionally, it has been stated that India might play a greater part in the Disarmament Sub-Committee or elsewhere. Last year or earlier this year, we offered to appear before the Disarmament Sub-Committee in support of a memorandum that we had given. The Committee thanked us for that memorandum and said they would consider it carefully, but pointed out that it would be difficult for them to make an exception in favour of one country, as requests might be made from many other countries too. Well, there was some justification for that statement. Anyhow, it is not our decision or our desire to push ourselves in these Committees or Commissions, but naturally, we would like to help, we are prepared to do so.

The House knows that recently we had some of the latest developments in these weapons. On the one hand, there is the development of the nuclear bomb or the hydrogen bomb; on the other, of the ballistic weapon which carries it to some other place—there are two different types of developments—and thirdly, some method of guiding that weapon and by some means making it hit the target. Every day, we hear of more and more*

progress being made and I should imagine that perhaps this might shake up a little more than before, the conscience and the mind of mankind. I suppose it does so because, I believe, the people of every country are very much exercised over this possibility and in effect, all our problems—every problem in the world and every problem that we face in this country—become very secondary in the face of this major world problem. It is an extraordinary thing how the sphere of each other pervades in the world. An opportunity has come to me during the last few years of visiting many countries in Europe, in America, in Asia and some in Africa. Wherever I have gone, I have been welcomed not only officially but by the people, and welcomed not as an individual, but as some kind of a representative of India, and welcomed with affection that astonished me. Everywhere I noticed this tremendous desire for peace and friendship with other countries. Now what strikes me as very extraordinary is that here are these people in every country, decent, desiring peace, desiring living their lives without interference from others and desiring to better their prospects and their standards, and yet being driven by some uncontrollable fate in the direction of conflict, bitterness, hatred and violence. It may be that some hon. Members here might, in their judgment, criticise one country or the other. It is not for me to criticise other countries. We have enough of our own failings and our own errors and mistakes to account for, and it is not becoming of us to go about criticising and condemning other countries. Occasionally it becomes inevitable to express our opinion in regard to a matter, whether in the United Nations or elsewhere. Even so, we try to do it as far as possible without condemnation. There is plenty to condemn in the world today in our thinking as possibly there is a good deal to condemn in India today. I do not suppose we would like it very much if foreigners went about condemning things that happen in our country, even though they may have

some justification for it. And similarly, I do not suppose others would like it very much if we go about condemning what they do; and in any event, the atmosphere we seek to further, the atmosphere of, well, lesser tension, lesser fear and cooperation, is driven away by this match in mutual condemnation. We avoid that.

There has been an instance—there have been many instances, of course, but there has been one particular instance—which has given us much trouble and much thought, and which is still troubling us greatly. This has been the case of Hungary. Now, the House knows that a Committee* was appointed by the United Nations, and that Committee presented a report. The Committee consisted of able men, and I am quite sure that they tried their utmost with the material before them to arrive at some conclusion as to what had happened. Their material was not complete for no fault of theirs, but nevertheless, it was incomplete. Now this matter is coming up before the United Nations. There was a question answered here today about this matter, about India's attitude towards the consideration of this Report. Naturally, when a Committee has been appointed by the U.N., its Report has to be considered by the U.N. What we were concerned with was that it should be considered, as far as possible, in an atmosphere which would help the people of Hungary, and which would help in lessening tensions and fears in Hungary, and not merely to add to them. We were of opinion then—it is of no consequence now—that it might have been better for it to be considered in the regular way by the new session of the United Nations and not by re-convening the old session. It makes no great difference—perhaps a month or some weeks—but the old session has been reconvened. And if so, there is no particular difficulty about it, but the main thing is how this matter is to be dealt with there, and there is this great difficulty, because many things

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] have happened at Hungary which most of us have disapproved very strongly. It has been one of the biggest tragedies that have occurred in recent years, and yet the question is how we can help, not how we can condemn. I believe that India has played some effective part in helping the people of Hungary. During the past few months we tried to continue to play that part. Now, if in the United Nations we join, let us say, in some kind of repudiation of the Hungarian representation in the U.N.—I mention this because sometimes it has been suggested, although I do not know whether anybody is going to do it—and deny the right of the Hungarian representatives to come to the United Nations, what would be the result? How exactly do we help the Hungarian people by not recognising the present Government functioning there? I do not quite know by what standards we judge, because there are many Governments, at any rate, some Governments in the world which probably would not come up to any standard of judgment. We acknowledge them as a fact, and there the matter ends. And sometimes, some Governments which from every standard are justified are not acknowledged like the Government of the People's Republic of China. But whatever measure you may employ, if a proposal is made, as I said, to deny the present Government of Hungary from being represented or from their representatives being accepted, what is the significance of that? How does that help in dealing with the problem of Hungary? The Government of Hungary does not disappear by that act. It functions and it functions in hostility and it functions possibly with greater rigidity than it otherwise would. If we take some such step, it is to be followed by many other steps. Yet nobody is prepared to follow the step which leads to war, and rightly so. Therefore this kind of a step or any similar step of condemnation which cannot be followed by outright war, because nobody |

wants that, does not help in these circumstances. I am troubled not only about the past happenings, but also about the present happening:}, and I want to help in those present happenings.

I believe that in Eastern Europe all kinds of forces have been at play, liberalising forces and democratising forces, and that some progress has been made, and indeed a great deal of progress has been made in some countries. Left to themselves and helped a little, they would go further, but if they are restricted and hindered and are upbraided and condemned, then you stop those forces from functioning properly and yielding results. That is our broad attitude in regard to Hungary. But I must confess that in a matter of this kind, whatever attitude one may take, it is not wholly satisfactory. It can be criticised. Every middle attitude of trying to seek peace when people are excited is not welcomed. Take the case of one of the most explosive parts of the world today, Western Asia or the Middle East, or whatever it is called, and more particularly Syria.

Now the story of these Middle East countries during the past year or a little more has been quite extraordinarily interesting, fascinating, and to some extent, tragic, how step by step conditions there have become worse, not better. We are told from time to time that the situation has improved there because of this military pact or that military alliance. But the fact is that the situation has become progressively worse. If the Western Powers have disliked any interference by the Soviet Union in the Middle Eastern countries, and if they have made these alliances to prevent that happening, well, the very thing they disliked and the very thing, they wanted to avoid by those alliances has taken place, and because of those alliances and because of that policy. It is an obvious thing. Apart from the fact, of course, that the Soviet Union

is a great country, if a country is sitting there geographically, you cannot wash it away, and it cannot be ignored in any settlement about the Middle East, or just you cannot ignore China in any settlement about the Far East, because geographically it is there, and it cannot be pushed out of its place on the surface of the earth. But as I said, it is interesting to see that during the course of the past two or three years, the situation in the Middle Eastern Region has progressively become worse. There was a measure of Arab unity there. That has been broken up and split and then these Arab countries, some of them, look at each other with extreme dislike, and possibly they even arm against each other. We read that Syria has been armed by the Soviet Union. We read further that Syria's neighbours all around are being supplied by arms by air lift from the United States. Tanks are going by air from all over the place, from some European places where they are stocked and from America itself. It is an extraordinary world where each country has to take steps to prevent the other country outstepping it in arms aid. How one wishes that this competition was in economic aid and not in arms aid. But it is an extraordinary thing that here, these countries, not big in size, not big in population, occupying a famous part of Asia where Asia joins Europe, with a tremendous history behind them, with great cities, with a common culture so far as Arab countries are concerned, with a common language and living in a state of high tension, spending all their substance on arming themselves and thereby, I have no doubt, restricting and limiting the freedom they possess. We cannot put ourselves under another country for the arms they supply, for the free arms they supply, without somehow affecting our own freedom. It is a grave situation in the Middle East, and especially in Syria. If a wrong step is taken, even if a small conflict somehow unfortunately begins there, the consequences may well be for a bigger conflict to occur and the bigger conflict may lead to a

still bigger one. Therefore it is a dangerous situation. These things affect us because they affect the world. We are not intimately connected with what happens in West Asia or let us say, in Germany. That is one of the bigger questions of the world in Europe. The two Germanies, whether they unite or don't unite, is a very big question and, if not at present, an explosive question. It is not our look-out but inevitably we are interested in it because it affects the world. In that sense we are interested in every major question, more especially disarmament which I mentioned. But really the issues of immediate importance to us are those which directly affect us. Our relations with Pakistan and more especially involving the Kashmir issue and Goa—these two are the questions which affect us directly and intimately. They affect the integrity of India and they affect the security of India. As I have said often, so far as Kashmir is concerned, a part of Kashmir territory has been invaded, aggression has been committed and is still in hostile possession.

So far as Goa is concerned, it is true that Goa has been under Portuguese possession for a considerable time, for hundreds of years but the freedom of India and the political revolution of India will not be complete however long it may take, till Goa is part of India. That is patent to anyone who sees it. If we disapprove, as we do, of colonialism in North Africa, in Algeria or in South East Asia or somewhere else in the wide world, would anyone expect us to permit colonialism in our very lap, sitting here in India, our own territory? It is an astounding idea and presumption that people seem to have. Nobody in India, I say, no party, no group, no individual in India can ever accept a foreign power sitting in any corner of India: because we have deliberately and with painful effort arrived at a conclusion that we must restrain ourselves and not allow any military effort in regard to Goa, perhaps some people imagine, perhaps

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] the Portuguese Government imagines that they have settled this problem or dealt with it to their own advantage. I think they are very much mistaken. Because a problem of this kind, as I said, can never be settled till it is settled in one way and that is till Portuguese domination ends there completely.

There is one small matter, not small but small only in the sense that it is whispered now, but very important and vital. I would like to mention this. It is sometimes said that Goa might be made some kind of a base for other Powers. Portugal is a Member of the NATO alliance and it seeks to preserve its colonies under cover of that NATO alliance. A year or two ago there was some reference to NATO in connection with Goa and we referred to the NATO countries. The replies we got were more or less satisfactory. I would not say, they were 100 per cent, satisfactory but they were more or less satisfactory. The replies broadly were that according to the NATO treaty, the Portuguese colonies did not come into it directly but under the Treaty they could discuss them. What they did afterwards, was another matter. So I said, they were not completely satisfactory, though that question and answer did serve as a warning to all these countries as to what we feel about Goa and what we feel about the application of any alliance to Goa. Now if Goa is made any kind of a base for larger purposes of any alliance, that would be a move of the most serious character. It would be an unfriendly act to India and every country that helps or supports that move would thereby be committing this unfriendly act towards India and India will not tolerate it whatever the consequences. We have shown enough patience in regard to Goa by tolerating in the sense of not taking any aggressive steps so far as Portuguese are concerned but if that concept is widened so as to make Goa the base of other Powers or alliances or make Goa as the agent of other Powers

functioning in that way then the situation is much worse and we cannot possibly admit that and accept it.

I referred to the - Kashmir issue which unfortunately has long been with us and is still with us, for no fault of ours. Sometimes you will find that the outside world and even the world of Pakistan rather forgets Kashmir. Sometimes you find all the newspapers and many leading personalities in Pakistan having Kashmir on their lips morning, noon and night, and shouting at the top of their voice. It is a kind of cyclical movement. Whenever anything happens, if the Security Council is meeting, then this propaganda goes up tremendously. During the past year or so, this propaganda has been at its highest pitch and I feel and I confess it with regret that it produced last year some considerable effect in the minds of other countries. Why it did so is another matter. There are many reasons, may be the effectiveness of repeating falsehoods with great force again and again, may be because the minds of some other countries were conditioned that way to begin with for various reasons. However, it did produce a certain effect and hon. Members will remember, when this matter came up before the Security Council last year, we had to face a very considerable opposition. It was an astonishing opposition, because it seemed to ignore some obvious, basic and patent facts. I hope I am not so blind to any view point that I cannot even understand an opposition viewpoint or an opposing viewpoint. I may not agree with it. But the kind of arguments that were raised then, the kind of speeches that were delivered and delivered by the representatives of great powers who are supposed to know about this matter, by the representative of England, by the representative of the United States of America and by other countries were so far out from facts from truth and from even a fair appraisal of the situation that we were astonished. My colleague, Shri Krishna Menon dealt with the situation there at very con-

4-iderable length. Then the argument was raised that India's case is weak and so it has to be argued at length, the idea being that if we admitted the weakness of the case then they would be generous with us and just put us on the back. I confess that during a long period of dealing with these matters, I have seldom come across something so astounding as the attitude last year in the Security Council of some of these great powers and other powers. They never dealt with this question. I don't mind then-having other opinions, but I do expect and I think it is reasonable to expect that a question should be faced and all the basic factors considered . nnd answers framed and enquiries made. But not a word of it. And they passed a resolution then about the accession of Kashmir not taking place and nothing being done with regard to it on the 26th January 1957. They were told repeatedly that the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India had taken place in October 1947, and nothing was happening in January 1957 except the winding up of the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir. They were told further that even though the Constituent *Assembly of* Kashmir drafted the Constitution, it had been finalised months before in the previous year. Nevertheless, they passed that resolution with all pomp and circumstance. Well, nothing happened on the 26th January. Nothing happened. We did nothing then. Parliament did nothing. After all, if there are any steps to be taken constitutionally, Parliament will take the step. A public parade was held there. We normally have it on the 26th January. In Kashmir all that happened was that on the 25th midnight, their Constituent Assembly met and they delivered some valedictory speeches and stopped functioning. Then these representatives of countries, their chanceries and newspapers started writing articles that India iiad disobeyed, had flouted the Security Council and Kashmir had acceded to India on the 26th January 1957. It is perfectly extraordinary how if a

lie is embedded in a person's mind, how difficult it is to uproot it and take it out.

They talk about plebiscite. Again and again we have pointed out that in terms of the Resolution passed by the United Nations Commission in the Security Council, the first thing to be done was for Pakistan to get out, that Pakistan was there by virtue of invasion, of aggression, and it has been practically admitted, and until it goes out nothing else is going to be done. Instead of going out, it has entrenched itself. Instead of going out, in the name of may be, fighting Communism or *whatever it may be*, it has got enormous aid from the United States of America; it may be getting it from the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO, I do not know. But what they get from the United States of America is very considerable. I make no vague or general statement, and I say so, because we have enough information in our possession to show that the military aid, the air aid and the other aid that is coming from the United States to Pakistan is very considerable, and is a menace to India unless we deal with it. And here, because of this menace we have had to do something which has hurt us and given us a tremendous deal of pain, tihat is, to spend more and more on armaments. The House knows that on the economic plane, especially on the foreign exchange plane, we are not very happily situated. Just at this moment, we have had to add to our burden of foreign exchange. It was a difficult decision; but in the final analysis where the security of India is concerned, there can be no two decisions on the matter. We took it. And I should like other countries, our friendly countries concerned, to realise how by some of their policies of military alliances, military aid, they have added to the Burdens of India, creating a feeling of insecurity and thereby coming in the way or some other thing, of our working out our Five Year Plan and our developmental schemes. We are very grateful for the help, financial, loans or credits or otherwise, that we have

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] received from other countries and—I speak in all honesty—I am grateful to them but it is an odd thing that while we are helped, other conditions are produced which wash out that help. We have to carry greater burdens. Now, therefore, so far as Kashmir is concerned, let there be no doubt in peoples' minds as to what our position is. We have not repudiated any direction or decision of the Security Council to which we agreed. We went to the Security Council ourselves complaining of a certain aggression of Pakistan. We went there under an article of the Charter which is a kind of mediatory article. The Security Council passed two main resolutions to which references are made one in 1948 and the other in January 1949. We accepted them; we stood by them and we stand by them but they have to be interpreted in terms of today. Apart from that, the question remains that the two things those Resolutions laid down were that Pakistan had brought its Army into Kashmir and that it must withdraw, it must go out of that territory. That should be the first thing but they have never done that. Their aggression, indeed their occupation of Jammu and Kashmir territory, continues still. While that continues, we are asked repeatedly by some of the Western Powers to make it up with Pakistan, to agree to what Pakistan says or for a plebiscite or for other things. Whatever may be the rights and wrongs in regard to some steps that we may have taken, I fail to understand how anybody in the wide world, including in Pakistan, can justify the presence of Pakistani armies, troops, civil personnel, in Jammu and Kashmir territory. There is no explanation, no justification, no pretext except that of armed invasion and aggression. Nothing more and, if they say, "Oh, we came here because Muslims are in a majority in Kashmir. The hearts of Muslims in Pakistan bled because they were suffering under foreign yoke and we came over to free them" then let that be put forward and no other argument. We shall answer

that. The more I think of it, the more surprising it becomes as to how these statesmen of the Western World cannot see the facts as they are and go on repeating something which has no basis and will have no basis. Now, we do not propose to forget facts as they are. Facts remain facts whether a person forgets them or not and the Kashmir issue is going to be treated on the basis of those facts and on none other. The House knows how constantly attempts are being made in Kashmir, attempts at sabotage. Members may have read this morning about bombs bursting and little children being killed. Of course, these bursting of bombs and crackers do not solve the question of Kashmir. It is absurd but this is the extent to which people in Pakistan are going. Having failed in their major efforts, now they are sending their emissaries with all kinds of bombs, etc., with money and so on. We have got the money and we have often got the material which was sent by Pakistan. We have often got the material which they sent, the pamphlets that they had sent. After all, it is not easy to guard a huge frontier, to see that nobody comes in. This kind of very unseemly activity is going on, of trying just to frighten and to unnerve the people of Kashmir and, in fact, training people to do this.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): This aggression is open and is increasing day by day. Could you do nothing about it?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not know what the hon. Member means. We certainly deal with them. We have captured many people who came and some people, I believe, are going to be tried in open court. It is being done but it is not exactly easy to guarantee that nobody will throw a cracker or a bomb especially when this apparatus is helped by a neighbouring Government which has great resources at its command.

I mentioned casually about Algeria. I do not think I need say much about it except that it is today one of the

major colonial issues in the world. It is a difficult issue. We have always recognised that difficulty for France because of the presence of a million and a half or a million and a quarter Frenchmen there. Because of this, it does become a little difficult issue but the fact of the presence of the Frenchmen there cannot possibly be made an excuse for continuation of this colonial regime as a colony. They have suffered very greatly and I do earnestly hope that they will gain their freedom with the co-operation of the French because this injury is harming both terribly.

I do not wish to say anything more at this stage because, I would like to honour Members here to help us in considering this problem in all its aspects. After all, this question of international affairs becomes more and more difficult and intricate because we cannot control the world. We cannot control our own country as we would like to much less the world and we cannot presume to control the world. We can only influence world events a little by our weight and by our influence do what we can. Ultimately, one comes to the conclusion that the only way wherein one can influence any event in the world is to increase one's own strength, the country's strength and unity and purpose. Then only it is that its voice counts; otherwise, it is just shouting in the wilderness. So, we try to do our best in our humble way in world affairs. It is really in our own country that we have to build up our position in the world.

I beg to move, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

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

There are eighteen amendments. Amendments numbers 9, 10, 13, 17 and 18 are out of order.

55 RSD—8

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to move:

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

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

SHRI 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, while generally supporting the fundamental principles of world peace and co-existence based on Panchsheel, regrets to note that in carrying out that policy, the said principles are not uniformly applied by the Government of India, ' in particular,—

(i) in continuing to be a member of the Commonwealth, when one of its principal member has interfered in the internal affairs of sovereign countries like Egypt and Oman,

(ii) in permitting Portugal to continue colonisation in the soil of India by the possession of Goa etc.,

(iii) in allowing Pakistan to occupy parts of the territories of India,

(iv) in permitting Pakistan to interfere with the free use by India of the water of Sutlej, Beas and Ravi,

(v) in not settling partition debts due to India by Pakistan, and

(vi) in not protesting strongly about the interference by Soviet troops in the affairs of Hungary.'"

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): 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 is of opinion that the appraisal of the international situation by the Government does not adequately take-into account some of the recent developments in the international arena and the implications thereof.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy that the Government is pursuing in regard to Goa has not only failed to secure the liberation of this colonial outpost on our soil, but has, in effect emboldened the Portuguese to resort to frequent firing into the territory of our Republic, thereby violating it.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the said policy is not one which can prevent the plans of western powers, particularly the United States of America and the United Kingdom, to develop Goa as one of the bases of SEATO.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government's understanding on the question of disarmament in general and the suspension of tests of nuclear weapons and their ultimate prohibition in particular suffers from some drawbacks inasmuch as it does not openly recognise that it is the United States of America and the United Kingdom which alone are responsible for the infructuous disarmament talks and for !

absence of any agreement to suspend the tests of nuclear weapons.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that there is no indication in Government's policy about the steps it may take, in consultation with other peace and freedom loving Powers, for meeting the challenge of aggressive imperialism in the Middle East.' "

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

and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government's attitude in not taking any initiative for convening a Second Bandung Conference in order to formulate concerted measures against the interference by Western Powers, particularly the United States of America and the United Kingdom, in the internal affairs of the Arab countries, as well as against the armed actions against some of them is not justified.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Prime Minister should not uphold India's links with the Commonwealth when Britain has been carrying on one aggression after another in the Near and Middle East and strengthening military alignments, such as SEATO and Baghdad pacts all of which are counter to the Bandung declarations and threaten peace and security of India and other Asian-African Countries and that such aggressive plots and actions stand in the way of India's economic development.' "

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

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government is not fully vigilant about the activities of the U.S. agencies against the interests of our country.' "

(Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 also stood in the "name of Shri Govindan Nair, Dr. R. B. Gour and Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.)

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

'and having considered the same, this House is firmly of opinion that after the complete integration of the State of Jammu and Kashmir with the Union of India as one of the fourteen States of our Republic, the United Nations Organisation has no jurisdiction in respect of any question that may be hitherto pending before the U.N. or otherwise raised relating to the State of Jammu and Kashmir or the Indian Union, except in so far as such question relates exclusively to the issue of vacating aggression in the territories of that State occupied by the forces of Pakistan.' "

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of Opinion that India's representative to the U.N.O. be directed to make it ar to the Security Council and all other UN. authorities concerned that India owes no obligation to the U.N. in respect of the State of Jammu and Kashmir which is an internal affair of India, and that any attempt to introduce a U.N. Force' into Kashmir or any resolution or discussion which may be permitted in disregard of the fact that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India would amount to an act of gross interference, contrary to the Charter and Purposes of the U.N*, in the internal affairs of India.' "

16. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be addefl, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House records its emphatic protest against the reported moves of the Pakistan Government and other interested parties to introduce a U.N. Force into Kashmir and calls upon the U.N. and all nations of the world not to give any quarter to such moves.

(Amendments Nos. 14, 15 and also E. stood in the name of Dr. R. Gour).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendments are now before the House

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, as we are participating in this debate at this moment I think the American planes are carrying armaments and to the countries in the Middle-East which has become, as the Prime Minister has said, an explosive point in the world situation. I shall come to the question of the Middle-East a little later, Sir, but let me begin my speech by making my position very clear.

It is well known in the country that we generally support the Prime Minister's foreign policy, that we are with him in whatever efforts he makes for the advancement of the cause of peace and for the defence of freedom. Yet, Sir, sometimes there are differences of emphasis, sometimes the points of view are not exactly the same from an analytical point of view. Therefore I participate in the debate in the spirit of comparing notes, so to say, as to the understanding the world situation. In the course of my speech it will be my endeavour to place before the House certain suggestions and submissions for the House to consider and for the Prime Minister to look into. After all, the ultimate decision rests with the Government and it lies above all with the Prime Minister of India.

Now, Sir, I would proceed and immediately I should like to express

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] our felicitations at the victory of the Peoples Progressive Party in British Guiana. As you know, Sir, it was here in 1953, that the British imperialism thought that by suspending the Constitution and by pursuing a policy of threat and intimidation they would be in a position to suppress the freedom urge of the people of British Guiana. Once again the spirit of liberation has triumphed over the forces of imperialism and colonial domination. There to-day has come into existence the Government headed by Dr. Jagan whom we, some years ago, had the honour of receiving in the Central Hall of this Parliament House. We wish them all luck in this journey and I think that British Guiana will stand as a milestone in the irresistible march of the freedom-loving people to their destiny of freedom.

At the same time, Sir, we express our best wishes for the people of Malaya who have got some freedom, limited though it is at the moment because, after all, what they have got has not come to them by Her Majesty's grace; it has come to them because of the indomitable spirit of the Malayan people, as a result of the fight they had been waging over the past nine years. Therefore we look upon it as a victory of the Malayan people, full of potentialities, full of promise and as pointing to the new glorious future that lies ahead of them. But the journey will be strenuous and there is a long way to travel. I only wish, Sir, that the Malayan Government do not allow the British and Australian forces to continue there. It is also reported in the Press, Sir, that Malaya will be a SEATO base. The other day the British Defence Minister, Mr. Duncan Sandys made a statement in Australia in which he had the gumption to say that the forces in Malaya would be equipped with nuclear warheads. We cannot take it as anything but a challenge not only to the people of Malaya but to the peace and security of the Asian continent.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, another problem that calls for some thought and thinking is this. It is the measures that are being taken by the Malayan authorities to-day against the communists. I think that if the war against the Communist Party of Malaya is continued in the manner it is sought to be continued, that will retard the progress of the Malayan people. That will keep the forces of freedom somewhat bound; that will, make it easier for the British to carry on their economic exploitation. After all, as you know, Sir, even after independence, in matters of foreign policy the Malays do not have full right. Defence is not fully in their hands. The British forces would be there and of course the economic interests will remain with the British, the vital interest on which Malaya lives to-day. I therefore hope that Malaya would find it necessary and will realise the importance of legalising the Communist Party and allow it to function as a lawful force in the country because, after all, the remaking of the nation requires the efforts of all to-day and if one section of the national movement is driven to the jungle and underground life, is hounded out, is bombarded and shelled, that will hit not only the communists but also hit the fabric of Malayan independence and put it in jeopardy. We in India can only express our earnest hope that good sense will prevail on them and they will see that the path of complete independence in Malaya and Malaya's liberation and happiness lies not in continuing war against the Communist Party but in allowing this Party to function legally. It is heartening to note that the Malayan Labour Party, the trade union organisations and others have made the demand that there be negotiation with the Communist Party on the basis of the recognition that this party has a right to function independently and to function lawfully in the national affairs of Malaya.

Now, Sir, I should like to say a few words about Goa. I entirely share

4215

the Prime Minister's sentiments about Goa. I do not wish to add any thing but I submit that we cannot see eye to eye with him in regard to his present policy—intention apart,

I think the Prime Minister feels the same way as I do, perhaps better, about the need for liberating that area. Let me make it clear that we would like to see that this last colonial outpost on our soil disappears during our lifetime, not only during our lifetime, during this tenure of the First Prime Minister of India; that is all that we demand. Therefore, Sir, we are interested in finding exactly what steps the Government is taking and I do not think, Sir, it is right to say that we should not do anything more than what we have done. From the international law we are entitled to take whatever action we like in defence of our freedom and in defence of the integrity of our country. Now take the case of national law. Well, Sir, Goa is an enclave here. It is an occupied territory, and any country, any people would be entitled to resort to any methods for the liberation of the territory under occupation of a foreign power. Have we been disqualified to-day, because we are free, that we cannot take whatever action we like? Therefore it is not a question of principle. There may be a question of expediency; it may be a question of wisdom; it may be a question of some other consideration, but principles do not come in the way, in our securing the liberation of Goa. I know that the Prime Minister is wedded to certain noble sentiments in this respect, but Dr. Salazar is the person where such sentiments are not properly understood. I think, to some extent, the Prime Minister has misplaced his sentiments if we take into account that tiny dictator, Dr. Salazar. Therefore let it be clear in the first place. Then secondly they are resorting to actions against our territory across the border. These are hostile acts, these are armed actions, this is how they should be viewed. The fact that nobody is hurt does not justify such action; it does not justify our inaction in this matter

If, Sir, somebody were to shoot from the street into my house and suppose I do not get hurt, would he be left to go scotfree or will he be hauled up for attempt to murder, I would like to know. There is another suggestion that these shooters escape; they cannot be caught. Well, we are supposed to have an intelligence organisation and it is possible to locate these gentlemen, these shooting soldiers and apprehend at least some of them. It will be within our right and international law to enter the territory across the border in order to apprehend those criminals who are shooting into our territory. I have known of many examples in international law when France, Britain and Germany took such action for causes which were not noble and which was not taken strictly under international law as is understood by us in such matters. Therefore, Sir, let us not bring in the question of international law either. Under the international law we will be justified to take action. I do not think our Indian Army has been administered any oath of non-violence and in-action, that they should not do anything when from Goa on the other side of our border the Portuguese start shooting into our territory, which is clear violation of Indian territory. We are entitled to take whatever action we like and let Salazar know that it is not for him only to shoot but it is for us also sometimes to take action and he should be prepared for the consequences. It is our policy that has emboldened him. It is useless to say something nice and fine to such a person. It is useless to talk in a language of philosophy with regard to people whose business it is to shoot into other people's territory, whose business it is to occupy other people's territory and slaughter democracy in their own territory, who do not know what morality, international code and human freedom mean. Therefore I say that the Government policy is not well conceived in regard to this matter.

Here is a paper, *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, and this is what this paper

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] writes: "So far as the Government of India is concerned its policy of achieving a peaceful settlement has no positive content though it is determined to liberate Goa." The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* is not a Communist paper, not a paper with extremist views. Generally it is a very watered down liberal paper and this is the criticism which appears in that paper. It says: "It amounts to nothing more than a sitting-on-the-fence policy." They say such things because the national sentiments in this respect are not with the Prime Minister except in so far as he wants the liberation of Goa. We want some positive action to be taken and some effective policy to be followed. This is what I would like to place before the House. Now, the Prime Minister might say that it will lead to complications. But I cannot understand that point. Complications where, in which country? Which will be the power which will say, 'No, India should not take any step.' Is it Britain? If they say so, we are prepared to take it. After all, they are aggrandising in other countries and but for the support of Britain and America this Tin God Dictator in Lisbon would never have dared to take this action and fire into Indian soil. Everybody knows that. Therefore it is these people who do not like it and they will raise a howl but we know how to silence them. Did we not silence them in the case of Egypt? Today the world opinion will have to be considered. Therefore it is possible that they may raise some howl but there will be people in the world to speak in support of India Governments representing majority* of the world's population would be with India if India took proper action against these invaders, against this occupier, against this act of aggression.

Now, I should like to say something about Kashmir. I do not like to add much to what the hon. the Prime Minister has said but

I

would like to remind the House that the Resolution of the Security Council

1 that was passed was prepared in consultation with Britain and the United States of America and the same people are today egging on Pakistan to get another Resolution ready. Sir, I am aware that an attempt is being made to introduce a U.N. Force into Kashmir; I know that the Soviet Union has rejected outright that kind of proposal and it would therefore not be possible to pass such a Resolution but this move portends something. We have seen such moves of these imperialist powers. They try to incite the relations between India and Pakistan so that they can go on with their intrigues and with their acts of aggression. That is their technique. Therefore let us be clear about it. Behind their move, one can see the hand of imperialism. I know Mr. Suhrawardy very well as everybody knows him. What is he? He is a strutting little politician living on stunts. This Kashmir issue, we know of course is a settled thing but we must remember that the United States of America and Britain have other ulterior designs in keeping this alive and we must be very cautious. Incidentally, it is the same Powers which the other day raised a howl over Kerala's Education Bill, which are egging on Pakistan against India and instigating Pakistan to sponsor a Resolution. One has only to read the *Manchester Guardian*, *Daily Telegraph*, *New York Times* and other Anglo-American papers to understand this thing.

Let me come to the situation in the Middle East. Here again one sees war clouds hanging but we must be clear as to how this situation has come about. It is not enough for us merely to feel indignant about it or to feel agitated over it. We must coolly, calmly, dispassionately and objectively analyse and find out what are the factors that have brought about this development in the Middle East. Syria today is a target of attack and the Americans are trying to enact another Guatemala in this area. Arms are being sent by air lift to Jordan, to Lebanon, to Turkey and to Iraq with

4219

a view to intimidating and threatening Syria. On the 7th of this month President Eisenhower, after consultation with Loy Henderson and Dulles, issued a statement which makes it clear that they are determined to interfere in the internal affairs of the Middle East., And they are threatening and brow-beating Syria. What is Syria's fault? Syria refused to be browbeaten; Syria wanted to retain its hard-won independence. As you know, there was an attempt to oust the Syrian Government, subvert it through a conspiracy. A conspiracy was hatched in the American Embassy in Damascus and it is well known today that when they failed they have become desperate and today they are trying to intimidate Syria, encircle Syria. That is the thing. The same thing happened in the case of Lebanon. After arms had been sent there on 7th June there took place, two days later. General Elections when clashes were provoked and Lebanese democracy was slaughtered in the streets of the cities of Lebanon with the help of American weapons. The opponents of the Eisenhower Doctrine were thrown into prison. The same thing happened in Jordan. The Jordanian Government was removed and a coup d'etat was carried out there which resulted not only in the subversion of the Constitution there—democratic or whatever Constitution it was—but in the installation of a downright military dictatorship. Thus you will find that the Americans are after the Middle East; today it is a part and parcel of their strategy. Sir, the New York Times estimates that the arms race today is costing the world 100,000 million dollars annually and the U.S. military budget for the current year alone accounts for 4,000 million dollars nearly. The other day President Eisenhower told the world that during the eight years the U.S. investment in military aid alone had totalled 17 billion dollars which according to him had brought about another 107 billion dollars worth of military preparations in the countries aided by the United States of America. Of these 17 billions, 25 billions had gone to the Middle East and Africa. 200

million dollars had been sanctioned under the Eisenhower Doctrine and over one million American military forces are today stationed in the seventy-nine countries where military aid and assistance are being sent. That is the policy and all that is in accord with the Eisenhower policy of aggression. Sir, what is happening in the Middle East today is the continuation of the policy of positions of strength, of the policy of power, policy of intimidation, policy of blackmail, policy of violence, policy of aggression. That is what we see there. The British are also carrying on their aggression in Oman and their bombers are raiding Yemen village after village is being wiped out by the British bombers in Yemen and there is full-dress aggression, aggression on all sides by the imperialist powers. A power vacuum, we were told, was there and they have entered there with military weapons to grab power and they want to expand their oil Empire. Today they want to enslave that area, develop it into a hinterland for limitless colonial exploitation and as a base for war against the Soviet Union. This is the situation today. This is how the Middle East situation should be viewed. The Soviet Union on the other hand had made proposals for a great power declaration for non-interference and for not using force in the Middle East and that declaration has been rejected twice by the Western Powers. Now, therefore, let us find out the culprit, the assassin. Otherwise, I think, he will get away. It is very essential today to analyse the international situation in order to find out who is threatening world peace, who is violating the Charter of the United Nations, whose policies are running counter to the purposes of the United Nations, whose policies threaten the peace and security of the Asian and African people? That is necessary with a view to understanding that situation so that our policy is clearly directed on the basis of an objective and correct understanding. That is how I view this matter.

Then, Sir, I would like to say that with regard to Oman, I wish the Gov-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] ernment's stand was a little more clear, firm and pategorical. Everybody knows that' the British is committing aggression in Oman. We should raise our voice strongly against this aggression. This is very,, very important. I know that we have disapproved of it. But .at the same time it is necessary to make our views felt on the counsels so that the aggressor knows that whenever they raise their hand—their hand dripping with the blood of colonial people—a million hands will be raised all over the world to stay the assassin from the commission of this crime. That should be done.

Reference has been made to the Baghdad Pact. It has become very obvious today, I tell you that it has become by now an instrument of American aggressive policy. It was started by the British. Americans have joined now the military council of the Baghdad Pact. Plans are being laid and we are told that on September 27th the Baghdad Pact Council is again meeting in London to discuss Syria. And as you know they had met in Karachi in June. There India was discussed in a closed door meeting and anti-subversion committees were set up in order to carry on activities in the Baghdad area—they call it Baghdad area—in countries like ours, anti-national activities. This is what is happening. I do not know whether the bombs that are exploding in Kashmir are not connected—I am not sure—with anti-national activities, the plans for which were laid in Karachi. I should like to know what kinds of bombs are these. I should like to get statements from these people because one is not sure whether some of the bombs and detonators that are being used have not come from somewhere else. It is essential especially in view of the Karachi meeting of the Baghdad Pact Council where plans were laid for the so-called anti-subversion activities which in other words mean activities against the countries that do not toe the American and Western line. This is what I

I would like to know from the hon. Ministers of the Government.

Now, with regard to the Baghdad Pact, here Twining, Chief of the Air Staff, came all the way to attend the i Karachi meeting of the Baghdad Pact Council and it was said in the Times i of Karachi that before the planning j period of the Baghdad Pact Council ; was over, the period of action had i started. We see this action now. Perhaps the inkling we have got. More will follow no doubt. I wonder how it came about that a letter purported to have been written by the rebel Naga leader, Phizo, was splashed in the American New York Times. Most Americans perhaps have not heard about the Naga land and its leader. Nobody knows whether this fabrication or forgery was planned in America itself. These are actions to be taken note of. Therefore, the Baghdad Pact Council is the cause. Today the American strategy in the Middle East, with the NATO, Baghdad Pact, SEATO all are in the same line of aggression. You cannot isolate one from the other and I am told that already there is in the press a report that Jordan has been pressurised into submitting to join the Baghdad Pact. This is what we see in the press. The official news probably may come later. The reports in the press sometimes prove false, but very often such reports they prove to be right. This is the position. Therefore, today what is happening in Kashmir is this. They are trying to move the Security Council and their moves are not isolated diplomatic moves. They are a part and parcel of the move of the aggressive powers to put pressure on India, to create difficulties in our way, to divide the people and to inflame the situation, so that under a smokescreen, imperialism can get away with their activities and crimes in the Middle East. Our defence line today has shifted from the soil of India to the soil of the Middle East. It is there that we must defend our freedom; it is there that we must defend our security today. If imperialism is allowed to get away there, I do not know how long it will take before

America is on the door steps of India. We are already within their range because of the Baghdad Pact.

Next, Sir, is about nuclear weapons and disarmament. We are all disappointed that the conference talks in London did not produce the result that was expected; but at the same time it is essential that we must understand as to why the talks have failed. The talks have failed because the Anglo-American powers would not abandon their policy of war, their policy of positions of strength, they would not abandon even the tests they are carrying through time and again. I mean the nuclear tests. The Soviet Union made a proposal for suspension of tests for two or three years, separating that question from other questions. They connected it with all other questions, political questions, with a view to evading the issue. They have been following there the stalling tactics. When the question of reduction in the forces' level, that is to say, conventional arms, when the question of disarmament came, they again linked it up with that question of reunification of Germany, thereby leaving it to Dr. Adenaur to veto it whenever he liked. That is how the tactics have been followed with a view to frustrating the efforts of other countries for arriving at some kind of an agreement, at least with regard to the suspension of tests. This is clear today. Now, let us be clear because after all the Soviet Union asked seventeen times in that committee meeting, in the London talks, that India should be heard. The Western powers refused to hear India on that committee. Why? Because they know that once India's voice is heard on the committee, the case would be stronger for disarmament, and the voice of Asian-African people would be heard with logic, force and reasonableness, which it would be difficult even for imperialists to face upto. That is why they are fighting shy of India's representation personally of our case before the London Disarmament Sub-committee. Now, I mention

this thing with a view to stressing the point that we must realise why the talks have failed. (*Time bell rings.*) Let me finish, Sir. The Prime Minister has made an appeal that let these powers suspend their tests. The Soviet Union has made an appeal even today, with the inter-continental ballistic missile in their hands, that they are prepared to suspend tests and ban these weapons any time. And even then the imperialist powers would not pay any heed to the appeal. They know their policy of the position of strength, after the development of the ballistic weapons, has suffered a great blow. Some of them have become desperate. Others are perhaps re-thinking. I do not know, but it is clear that this position remains because of the intransigence of the Western Powers because of their reliance on the policy of position of strength.

Finally, I would like to say only one word for want of time. I have given an amendment with regard to a statement made by the hon. Minister, Shri Patil in Singapore...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has been disallowed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The amendment may be disallowed. Our External Affairs Ministry should be more careful in instructing members or delegations when it sends them abroad. I wish proper instructions were given to Shri S. K. Patil. Communists have not been hurt, because they are accustomed to such kind of insinuations and attacks on the part of Shri S. K. Patil. He has hurt the prestige of India. He has hurt the prestige of our foreign policy. His statement is not in line with the manner in which the Prime Minister behaves when he goes abroad. That is my complaint. I am sorry for the Government. Only I think that Mr. Patil perhaps thought that his assignment in Malaya was the same as his assignment on the Choupati sands when he gets up there to speak as a Congress leader.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They should not suffer from such an illusion. I would ask the Prime Minister—I beg of him—to teach his emissaries like Mr. Patil some manners when they go abroad to represent India. You are representing not the Congress Party; not the Kerala Congress. You are representing our country. And he should not have made a statement which is highly controversial, about our internal affairs, domestic policies and issues, which is not in line with the manner in which the Prime Minister would like to see others behave abroad. Therefore, I say these things with a heavy heart. I do not know if Mr. Patil will make amends for it. But I do make amends for it, because one of the representatives of India had made such a statement which might create a wrong impression abroad. Whatever may be our internal differences in this country, when we go abroad, we are at one: we are abroad to represent all that is best, all that is greatest, all that is common, in India, avoiding controversies. Permit me to quote a small example. The General Secretary of our Party and I were in England in the middle of last year. We were asked all kinds of questions about the domestic problems and the pressmen tried to drag us into a controversy over our domestic mailers. We refused to answer such questions and we told them that we were not going to be drawn into a discussion of domestic issues and controversies. This is how we behaved.

(Time bell rings.)

And, today, a member of the Government goes out taking the country's money in the name of representing India. He goes there, represents narrow, political ideas, brings discredit not only upon him, upon the Government, upon the Prime Minister and his foreign policy, but also, to some extent, upon our political system. Sir, I am extremely sorry for it.

! Sir, I have said all that I wanted to ; say in the course of the discussion. I hope that all these issues will be considered. As for the Commonwealth, only I would say this. As long as the Prime Minister defends the Commonwealth, we shall demand of him that either he explains how that Commonwealth is of help to our purposes, or he stops upholding it. I think, after Egypt, Oman, Yemen and the tests of the nuclear weapons, there is not an iota of justification for him to continue in the Commonwealth.

As for the report on Hungary, it is a fabrication; it is a falsehood. All this should not be given any credit, just because it has been well-documented and prepared. How would you like it if any report on Kashmir of j 1947 were to be prepared on the basis ■ of the materials supplied by the I Pakistan Government and the Azad j Kashmir Forces and the refugees who have gone to the other side of the I cease-fire line and now are under the protection of the Pakistan Government. The issue is not one of forensic ability? It is one of falsehood? The show is something' different. This port is being sought to be discussed, with a view to creating a tension, with a view to diverting world's attention from Cyprus, from Algeria, from U.T. men, from Oman and from Syria, creating a kind of smoke-screen for clouding the issues before the world. These diversionist tactics have got to be nailed to the counter and India would do a jolly good thing by not coming into the discussion. I hope the Indian representative will not participate in the discussion that they may have later on. (Time bell rings.) This Report, we know, stands exposed on all hands. There should not be any support to that kind of a report. We may have our views about the Hungarian development. But the tissue of lies, falsehood and fabrication should not become something about which all of us should bother so much. Therefore, Sir, I say here and again, that the Government should think about this. I wish, Sir, ¹ that such matters are taken in that

line. That is not to say that we want to enter into controversies, as to what happened in Hungary in that atmosphere. At the moment, the report is there and they want to take it up for discussion tomorrow.

We hope that Goa will be liberated and that the Prime Minister shall change the present policy for one of action and effective measure in order to stop not only the firing but also to free that land from Portuguese yoke.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, since the pitch has gone high up, I would rather choose to speak in a lower key. It is indeed a privilege to be allowed to move an amendment in full-throated support of the policy of our Government in respect of our actions; reactions and responses to the various plague spots of the very troubled and frustrated world of today. Whatever small differences one may or may not have in respect of the details of our programme or policy or in that of the measure of success we have been able to achieve, there is no denying, I believe, that our Government has been able, slowly but surely, to evolve a policy that has conn- to enjoy a sort of total national support, despite a few lonely but very aggressive voices from both sides and from quite opposite camps, and also perhaps a large measure of international understanding, if not of active support. It may be claimed without hesitation that we have at last been able to extend the arena of international understanding and more than once, in the course of the last one year, to contribute towards the maintenance of that international equilibrium, if not of positive peace. It is the most one can do and expect in this troubled circumstance in which we find ourselves today.

We are indeed immensely grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for the most frank, forthright and admirable resume of the Government's policy. Some of the items that he has chosen to discuss interest and affect us direct-

ly, some indirectly, some nationally, some globally. Some of these are vital to us and are likely to come up before the next session of the U.N.—in what form, it is very difficult to say at the moment. And judging from the amendments that have been tabled, the Prime Minister will have an occasion here and today to tell us more. But, already the other day in the other House—more today, I believe, much more effectively and frankly—he gave us a comprehensive summary of our Government's policy in respect of the major centres of conflict on the international map today. We, on this side of the House at any rate—and I believe the nation at large—are indeed very grateful that our Government has been steadily and patiently pursuing an independent policy of its own—a policy of peace, a policy of understanding and to my mind, a policy that is creative and one that affords time and opportunity to put our own house into order.

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

It is altogether unnecessary therefore to say anything in support of the Prime Minister's speech. One does not try to add frills to a Kashmiri shawl. The broad principles of the policy and the methods that are employed to put them into operation are very well known. But at the same time our Government realises fully and squarely that whatever our general principles and methods, they do not originate in and cannot be operated in a vacuum. Indeed we have to function in given contexts, and these contexts today are not very simple. They are not such as to enable one to distinguish, say, between white and black. Often the picture is not clear, and it takes a little time and a great deal of thinking—and shall I say, dispassionate thinking—to understand any situation. We are not committed to any particular camp—we must realise—which makes it all the more incumbent on us to see that we do not worsen a given situation or become much too involved. We

[Dr. Nihar Rajan Ray.] must also realise at the same time that our power and strength are limited. We are circumscribed by facts and situations that are not under our control, and also that we are not out to preach a new gospel to the world or even create a power bloc in between other blocs, nor do we always come up to our own expectations for more reasons than one can recount. Realising all this, I for one do believe that that our Government has been behaving most responsibly and admirably in the most difficult world context of today. Impatience and irritation, passions and prejudices that afflict us at times have to be kept in control and channelised in a less delicate direction.

I would not refer in any great detail to the various issues that have been raised, but I would just make one or two submissions in respect of the two vital issues that affect us, Kashmir and Pakistan on the one side and Goa on the other. I need not discuss or even refer to the question in respect of Hungary, since our attitude has been explained fully and admirably by the hon. Prime Minister. India's policy lies not in taking sides in any critical situation but in trying to find ways and means by which a difficult crisis can at least be eased, if not resolved altogether. For the realisation of such a policy one has to be patient with both sides and persevere on with one's own way of thought and action. As it is, there is enough passion in the international world of today, and we have decided not to add to it. This is the policy that has determined our general attitude not only towards Hungary, but even in respect of Pakistan and Kashmir. It has sometimes been authoritatively stated, I believe, that our policy is to follow a course that would help in removing some of the tensions that afflict Hungary, for instance, some of the burdens that those people have been suffering from, and not to condemn one party or the other, since nothing is gained by such condemnations. Even in respect of Kashmir

and our overall relations with Pakistan, both of which affect us more directly and more vitally, our policy has been the same. Despite unspeakable provocations, we have all along refused to be provoked, which I believe is a sign of national and international maturity. We have been trying to avoid as much as possible the language of war, even avoid angry words so far as possible. It looks to many of us, I doubt not, as though we have failed in our policy in respect of Pakistan and Kashmir. Many of us interpret such a policy as *one* of weakness and impotence since for the last one decade the crisis has been rolling on. Some of us have even argued that the case may be withdrawn from the Security Council. This is a very funny thing to say. A mature nation like India cannot behave as children do in the school playground. When it does not like any decision given by the referee or the course in which the play has been going on, it just chooses to quit. A mature nation in the international field cannot and does not behave in this way. We have also been asked to come out of the Commonwealth. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, should have known well that this is not simply done in the international arena. The Commonwealth or maybe the Government of Great Britain may be doing things which we may not at times like. But that does not mean that because certain things here and there we do not like, we should just quit. One does not behave in that manner, and a mature nation has to behave responsibly. I would not therefore say anything more in respect of the Government of India's international policy, but in respect of Goa which is more a national question than international, I would like to say a few words.

There is no doubt as to our right on Goa, on this point—and as the Prime Minister has said—there is no party, no group and no individual who has got any doubt. Goa is certainly ours on all counts, moral, cultural,

historical and geographical and so on and so forth. We can have it any day, there is no doubt about it, if we choose the way of armed conflict. But it is very well known that we have chosen a different path. But even so, I would like to say a few words in respect of Goa, because I believe that we have not been doing what little more we could do about this unfortunate area. The other day, here in this House and also in the other House, the Ministry of External Affairs was questioned in respect of alleged violations of our air space and our boundaries by the Portuguese Government of Goa. Our Government knows best what violations were made or not, but certainly, I for one appreciated very much the Deputy Minister's rejoinder that it was not our Government's policy to reply shot by shot. But at the same time, I do believe that we have been slow to do, short of replying shot by shot or even of rousing passions, what we should have done. My feeling is that we have not been able to place our case in respect of Goa fully and squarely before the international forum—I do not mean only the U.N., but also before the democratic and progressive elements of the world—and create a climate of opinion in our favour. In the meanwhile, on the other side, the Pakistan Prime Minister continues his intimate alliance with the Portuguese and the Pakistan President goes on goodwill visits, of all places, to Portugal and Spain. The case of Cyprus and what the Government of Greece did to place the case before the world and create public opinion in her favour, comes readily to mind. The results achieved are known to all, the least being the release of Cardinal Makarios. There is hardly any doubt that the colonial authority of the British, will ultimately have to yield at a not very distant time. I have a feeling that we have not done even half of what Greece did in respect of Cyprus, an island more than 600 miles out in the sea from the Greek coast line. Or, how is it that Portuguese Government has been able to get the ears of the world that

the majority of the population of Goa is Indo-Portuguese by extraction, while the fact is that by far the largest majority is composed of Hindus and of Saraswat Brahmins converted to Catholicism in the course of the last 400 years or so. The world has not been told by our Government that between the year 1782 and 1913, there have been as many as 10 popular revolts in which the large majority of the participants were Indian Catholics of Goa. It is a great pity that even a person of the status and standing of Professor Toynbee did choose to lend his support, the support of vast historical erudition, to the Portuguese case in respect of Goa. Toynbee's aggressive Catholicism explains much of his support for and loyalty to Portugal. But, my regret is, that we have not done anything to point out the obvious flaws in Toynbee's logic and interpretation of facts.

Much of Portugal's support comes from the Latin countries of South America, where I am afraid our case is but ill known. I shall, for instance, mention the case of Brazil, where President Kuibeitshek enjoys the heavy support of Latin American communists. You have heard my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta say something about the Indian Communist Party's attitude towards the Goa problem but look at the attitude of the Communists of Brazil to the Goa problem. They are lending their heavy support to President Kuibeitshek who has pronounced himself against India's case in respect of Goa. If you ask me how the Brazilian Government manages to enjoy the support of both the U.S. and the local Communists at one and the same time, I should not be able to answer. Communist behaviour defies rational explanation; it is somewhat unpredictable but what I.....

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR
(Kerala): May I know from which report he is re-ading?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: The i
Communist support to Kuibeitshek's

Government in Brazil—the Brazilian Communists

AN HON. MEMBER: Not Indian Communists.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: May I know from which report he is reading so that..

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: I would only refer him to the New York Times. It will be seen that the Brazilian Communists lend their support to President Kuibetshek. But what I wanted to suggest is that there is quite a good number of other liberal and democratic elements not only in Brazil but also in other Latin American States as well as in the United Kingdom, France and the U.S.A. We don't seem to have been doing enough to place our case before these elements, especially in the two Americas. Personally I consider this very important, and one argument that would go a long way in this direction is the argument of flagrant disregard by the Portuguese Government of the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights, of the U.N. Fundamental Rights, a crime against humanity for which South Africa has rightly been condemned by the Congress of Nations.

(Time bell rings.)

May I have just three minutes more?

Our hon. Prime Minister says that each step he and his Government take in respect of our foreign policy, they do on the merits and demerits of the particular case. Indeed our Prime Minister insists that our decisions in this respect are arrived at pragmatically. I am not raising a philosophical discussion. Perhaps he does so. After all contemporary pragmatism is not what it used to be in the 19th century when pragmatists used to keep value-judgments in respect of the means employed for achieving their objectives, immediate or remote, outside the orbit of their consideration. At any rate I would love to imagine that there are many among us who would think our Prime Minister's pragmatism

I rests ultimately on questions of value- judgment, that is on certain human I values he, along with millions of his countrymen, has inherited and evolved and to which we have all, more or less, been conditioned by our near and distant past.

In a nation's history there are often i many tendencies at work, tendencies that are often conflicting and contradictory. In our history of the last two thousand and five hundred years or more there have been tendencies that were violent and aggressive, that were based on hatred, greed, jealousy, malice, competition, exclusiveness, isolationism, obscurantism and so on and so forth. At the same time, there were also tendencies that were nonviolent and co-operative, friendly tolerant and accommodating, and were based on compromise and understanding, patience and perseverance and so on and so forth.

In times of stress and storm, in ! times of crisis, it becomes the duty of a nation to determine which aspects and tendencies of the national tradition it would choose and adopt for the progressive development of the people. It is our great luck asmuch as our great pride that since India became renescent, at any rate since the ; beginning of our active national struggle for fredeom, our great leaders, the founders of our national ideology, had the wisdom to choose as the basis of our national and international thought and. action, ideals that are tolerant and non-violent, friendly and co-operative, that are based on I patience, perseverance and understanding, on compromise and co-existence.

(Time bell rings.)

These are values that are considered creative and progressive for the ¹ growth of the human society. Per-j sonally, I do look upon this policy and programme of ours as a new norm, j a new pattern, and shall I say, a new I grammar in contemporary inter-| national politics.

It has been his destiny that our Prime Minister should be the spokesman of this aspect of our national ideology. It is for us to assure him that he has all our support which is sincere and enthusiastic, and howsoever some of us may at times feel impatient with what has been happening in Hungary or Kashmir or Goa or Pakistan, we know, our affairs and our values are also human values, and who would deny that our Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru stands at a corner of the turbulent world of today as a Great Sentinel of Human Values?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): I have heard with great interest this morning the speech delivered by the Prime Minister. It is very difficult for me in the limited time to make my observations on all the points that he covered. Therefore I will confine myself to only one or two aspects of the question that he has dealt with.

I was a bit pained and surprised at the manner in which he brushed aside the Hungarian question. It was not surprising to me when he received the unequivocal support on this question from my esteemed friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta. It has fallen to our lot, the Praja Socialists, to fight for the cause of freedom wherever it has been threatened, whether it is Egypt, Mid-East, West Asia or Eastern Europe. Our approach has been always judicious and neutral. We are not biassed by the propaganda of either bloc. We think that wherever freedom is assailed—by which party or which bloc is no concern of ours— if it is our duty, it is our privilege, to speak for the under-dog. Sir, if you look at the history of this Hungarian affair, you will find that it is our Party -which roused the conscience even of the Prime Minister. I am happy that although the Prime Minister and the Government of India started in a different manner, because of our criticisms, because of the statement made

by my esteemed leader, Shri Jay Prakash Narayan on this issue, the Government of India to a large extent corrected their policy, and I am happy to note that ultimately the Prime Minister had to agree and he categorically stated that the uprising in Hungary was a national uprising and it was put down with a heavy hand, by foreign intervention, by foreign troops. I am glad the Prime Minister stated these facts in a categorical manner, though it may be a little late.

But I cannot possibly reconcile myself to his approach or attitude towards this question when he said that 'it will not be possible for the Government of India to side with any resolution if it came up before the United Nations Assembly, condemning the present government or as he put it, for not recognising this government. Sir. I would not like to commit my Party on this important issue, as to whether we should recognise this government or not.

Obviously, the Prime Minister is better placed in this matter in getting information. But I would like to remind him that this Government in Hungary was placed in power by the bayonets of Soviet Russia, by the tanks of Soviet Russia, and the Prime Minister has himself said that this government was installed after suppressing the national uprising. He himself gave us figures of the killing and of the people who were bombed and machine-gunned before this government could be installed and this government was installed at the instigation and with the help of a foreign power. Now, it is for us to consider if such a government is installed in some other country, whether that is in keeping with our Panch-sheel approach. I know that Soviet Russia is a co-signatory to the Panch-sheel. Therefore, it is a matter for us to decide, if a nation in utter disregard of the principles of Panchsheel interferes in the affairs of other countries, contrary to the principles laid down

4

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] in Panch-sheel which that country had accepted, what should be our attitude in that respect. This is a question which bristles with difficulties, I do agree. But this is a question which needs to be answered if we want to preserve our Panch-sheel, if we do not want Panch-sheel to become the laughing stock of the world. A nation signs a document today and in violation of that document if it puts up a Government in another country, by armed intervention, shall we recognise that government? That is a very major and very important issue that has to be considered in all its aspects. Therefore, I would request the hon. Prime Minister to give his thought to this question in that perspective before rushing to give an answer whether this government should be recognised or should not be recognised. However, the recognition or no recognition of that government is a side-issue. The most important issue that is facing us today is what is still happening and what is still going on in Hungary. The Prime Minister merely brushed this question aside by saying that he was troubled and pained by what was going on in Hungary. Then he added that he was not satisfied with this report of the special committee on Hungary set up by the United Nations. And so does my hon. friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta. But, Sir, anyone who has gone through this report will be convinced that this is a full report. It is not a one-sided report. This is a report which has been written after a full and thorough examination of all the facts that were available outside Hungary and Soviet Russia.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): May I as the hon. Member what the Prime Minister said about this report?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Well, he said that this report was not complete' and was one-sided. But we know who were the members of this Commission. Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia, and Uruguay were on the Commission. These nations can

by no means be called big powers, engaged in any cold war. We have Tunisia, a country which has just regained its independence. Then Denmark is a small country, a neutral country. Ceylon, as we know, is like ourselves, a country which has got its independence recently. All these countries, through their representatives, sat on this Commission and examined all that was available to them. They wanted to go to Hungary and also the Soviet Union, but they were not allowed to do so. They examined all the materials that were available to them. Here, I would like to find out from the Prime Minister whether whatever reports were in the possession of the Government of India were made available to this Commission. The Government of India had their representative there. Mr. Menon, our Ambassador in Russia went there and examined the situation there immediately after the uprising was crushed and he reported to our Prime Minister. Was all that material placed before this Commission? That is another point.

2 P.M.

Probably the Committee would have been better informed if these materials in the possession of the Government of India had been made available to them and the Committee were given all assistance to find the truth. Sir, I find that the figures given by the Prime Minister, figures of casualties, of deaths, are much higher than the figures given here. I do not think it is correct to say that this Report is biased or incomplete.

I would also like to draw your attention to the Report on the Hungarian Situation by the International Commission of Jurists. They have made an exhaustive survey of all the material that was available to them and they have come to this conclusion:

"Is (the Commission) of the opinion that the laws and decrees of the authorities in Hungary violate human rights in failing to provide

the minimum safeguards of justice in criminal trials which are recognised by civilized nations particularly for offences punishable with death, in that they—

1. fail to provide in every case for an impartial tribunal;
2. define offences in vague terms open to abuse in interpretation;
3. give the accused no proper notice of the charge preferred;
4. do not allow adequate time and facilities for the accused to prepare his defence, to call witnesses and to instruct counsel on his behalf;
5. do not always provide an effective right of appeal or effective procedure for clemency.

Deplores the secrecy in which almost all the criminal trials in Hungary have been conducted since 4th November 1956 and regrets the refusal of the authorities in Hungary —to allow impartial legal observers "to trials which are of concern to lawyers of all nations."

Sir, they have refused even impartial observers to come and see the trials that take place there. It is a very important matter and the Government of India should view the happenings that are still going on in Hungary with alarm. Mere pious wishes will not do and we must see that the sufferings to which people are being subjected are done away with as early as possible.

I am glad, Sir, that the Indian Parliamentary Delegation has been invited by the Hungarian Government and, as stated by the Prime Minister, this Delegation will be visiting Hungary on its return from London. I know, Sir, some very eminent men are on this Parliamentary delegation and it is led by no less a person than Pandit Kunzru for whom I have the highest regard. It is good that they are visiting Hungary but, Sir, at the

.55 RSD—9,

same time, I would not like this question of Hungary to be side-tracked and it should not be allowed to remain out of picture till the visit of this delegation to that country. I would like our delegation in the U.N. to adopt a forthright attitude in this matter. As I stated earlier, wherever there may be repression, wherever freedom is affected, we must raise our voice against that, whether that freedom is assailed by one power or other. That is of no concern to us. If freedom is affected or is assailed by the Western Powers, we have to raise our voice against that; if that freedom is assailed by the Communist Bloc of countries, we have to raise our voice against that and there should be no double standards in this question. That is my request to this Government and that is my plea with the Government of India. That is what the P.S.P. has stood for and will always stand for.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the people of India as a whole irrespective of the different ideologies or the communities they belong to, are solidly behind the Government of India in their foreign policy and in the actual conduct of foreign affairs of the country. One important and paramount point and ingredient in the country's foreign policy is that we earnestly and fervently want peace in the world. This is not a mere pose or pastime. As has been repeatedly pointed out by our Prime Minister, this desire for peace is dictated by vital and solid interests of the country. The country is engaged in the stupendous and sacred task of lifting its masses from their age-long poverty and squalor. It is bending all its energies and resources to the huge task of reconstruction. There is a crying need and urgency about this reconstruction. While the country is engaged in this onerous task, it does not want its attention to be diverted from the same task or to encounter any avoidable hurdle or hindrance on its path. Any disturbance of peace in any part of the world might affect

[Janab M. Muhammad Ismail Saheb.]

our programme of work. This was well evidenced only recently during the Suez Canal crisis. So, in our own interest we passionately want peace in the world.

In addition to this vital self-interest, there are the Indian traditions, culture and spiritual back-ground all of which definitely and decisively weigh the balance with us in favour of world peace. At the same time, when one speaks of the vital interest of our own country in the maintenance of world peace, it does not in the least imply that our Government is motivated or activated by anything like gross selfish interests in carrying out its foreign policy. The attitude adopted by the Government towards the various international events and incidents in the world are based on and inspired by a clear sense of fairness and justice, a sense of right and wrong. The Government has not hesitated to follow a particular direction wherein lay justice even when they knew that our self-interest lay in some other direction. For example, we are in bad need of foreign exchange and foreign aid for the execution of our plans and yet that need did not deter our Government from taking an attitude in important matters which was opposed to the stand taken by powers like America who are in a position to assist us and others with their immense financial resource;;. We are a Member of the Commonwealth of Nations and yet our Government did not fail to condemn the British invasion of Egypt in connection with the Suez Canal issue. Again, Sir, the question of *de jure* transfer of the French possessions in India is still pending and this fact did not make the least difference to us when we were called upon to come to a decision on the Algerian or the Suez Canal issue.

Another vital principle that informs and inspires our country's foreign policy is that as long as one nation rules or dominates over another nation, there can be no permanent or enduring peace and happiness in the

world. We are highly proud of the able, scrupulous and effective manner in which the hon. Prime Minister of our country, assisted by his capable colleagues, carries out these and other principles to which our country is pledged and of the high missionary zeal and assiduity with which he advocates Panchsheel for the benefit of the whole world. But it is deeply regrettable and deplorable that certain of our neighbours do not appreciate and reciprocate the principles of peace and goodwill for which our country stands. While our Prime Minister is advocating the friendliest of relations with neighbours and peace for the whole world, some of our neighbours are doing things which are most unfriendly. I refer to the questions of Goa and Kashmir. Goa on every count is a part of India. The people of Goa want to be amalgamated with the rest of their motherland and the people of India want to take their own brethren of Goa with them. Nobody with an iota of justice can stand in the way of this amalgamation or do anything to discountenance it. The people of India including Goa are indeed becoming more and more impatient about the delay in achieving their legitimate object. But they have to be told that particularly in such international matters, the Government should be given a free hand for bringing about a solution in keeping with the country's avowed policy and principles. At the same time one can be sure that Goa is going to occupy its natural and rightful place in the Republic of India sooner probably than many expect.

Now, Sir, coming to the Kashmir issue, the entire population of this great country, including of course the Muslim community which forms an integral part of the Indian nation unequivocally and solidly support the stand taken by the Government of India on this question. That stand rightly is that in accordance with the agreement, law and procedure established for the accession of the old princely States, the State of Jammu

and Kashmir has properly acceded to India. Over and above that the people of Jammu and Kashmir have confirmed and ratified the accession, ' if such ratification was necessary, through their elected Constituent Assembly. There ends the matter. That State now is a proud part of the Indian territory.

The question which India took before the United Nations is a specific one concerning the aggression of Pakistan on Indian territory. This is a simple and straightforward issue. But it is deplorable that the United Nations has not given a verdict on such an issue and has thereby kept the dispute between two neighbours in irritating pendency and suspension for nearly a decade now.

Sir, if by military alliances and such other things Pakistan thinks she can bamboozle India into any unbecoming position she is very much mistaken. India can more than meet her on any ground. India indeed took exception to her military alliances. She did so not out of fear or for the sake of questioning Pakistan's right of doing anything with her own freedom or security, but because of India's anxiety and inherent right of seeing that any possible conflagration that may well be brought to the confines of a country participating in such military alliances should not come dangerously near India's own borders, the borders of a country which is passionately for the maintenance of peace in the world.

Obtaining military aids from powerful foreign countries does not make a weaker country really and enduringly strong. It may well recoil upon her in course of time. A reasonable and friendly relationship with a neighbour and that too with such a neighbour as India, will any day be worth much more than all the military pacts put together. In saying so I am not advising or coaxing anybody, but I am only stating the bare truth. That India is forbearing and accommodative is shown by the fact that even in the

midst of numerous provocations she is willingly taking part in many conferences with Pakistan and continues to try to settle things in a reasonable manner. The reply to this from the other side may be adverse and hostile propaganda and clandestine bomb explosions. But I am sure that India's efforts for a just settlement will certainly not go in vain.

Kashmir is a national cause. It is not a Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or Christian question. The Muslims are among the stoutest supporters of the Government in the cause. This has been repeatedly made clear by the President of the Indian Union Muslim League, that is myself, several times. The Muslims will be in the uttermost forefront in defence of the honour, integrity and interest of the country.

Now, Sir, our country with the able leadership of the Prime Minister has by now proved, at least to those who are prepared to be convinced, that India earnestly desires the friendship of every country and the maintenance of stable and honest peace in the world.

May the Almighty God always maintain our motherland in righteousness and grant her ever increasing success, prosperity, strength, happiness and glory is my fervant prayer.

سردار بدھ سنگھ (جموں اور کشمیر) :

وائس چیرمین صاحب - انٹرنیشنل
پالیسی کے سلسلہ میں پرانم منسٹر
صاحب نے کشمیر کا ذکر واضح طور
پر کر دیا ہے اور کشمیر کے متعلق
اس قدر لتیرچر چھپ چکا ہے کہ
شاید اب اس کی ضرورت نہیں رہی
کہ اس میں اضافہ کیا جائے یا اس
کے متعلق کچھ اور بیان کیا جائے اور
ابھی حال ہی میں یہ مسئلہ پھر

(سردار بڑہ سنگھ)

سکھوڑتی کونسل میں پیش ہونے والا ہے آپ صاحبان نے اخبارات میں آج تک کے سب کچھ واقعات دیکھ لئے ہیں، پڑھ لئے ہیں اور سمجھ لئے ہیں کہ کیا کچھ ہونے والا ہے - ہم سے پہلے جسٹس اسپیچیز ہوئی ہیں، جن اصحاب نے اس کے متعلق ذکر کیا ہے، اس کو سن لیا ہے کہ چونکہ کشمیر کا ہندوستان کے ساتھ الحاق ہو چکا ہے اس لئے اب یہ معاملہ یو۔ این۔ او۔ میں زیر بحث نہیں آنا چاہئے - تھیک ہے، میں ان کا شکریہ گزار ہوں کہ انہوں نے اس بات کو تسلیم کر لیا ہے کہ الحاق مکمل ہو چکا ہے - دو تین چار سال پہلے اس کے متعلق کئی ایک کم شک ہی رہا جس کی وجہ سے ہمیں بڑی پریشانی رہی - اس حقیقت کے پیش نظر کہ جب سارا لٹریچر چھپ چکا ہے تو مجھے کچھ عرض کرنے کی اب کیا ضرورت ہے اس کے متعلق میں صرف اتنا ہی عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ پچاس برس سے میں کشمیر میں پھر رہا ہوں - میں نے قریباً سارے کشمیر کی چھ چھ زمین دیکھی ہے - جو چائنا اور رٹیا کی حدود ریاست سے ملتی ہیں - ہندوستان (سروے) کے لئے وہاں تک کی سروس میں، میں پانچ برس جانا رہا اور مجھے وہاں کی صورت حال کی جو واقفیت ہے وہ شاید کسی پمفلٹ

میں یا کسی کتاب میں یا کسی اخبار میں نہیں آئی ہے - میں چاہتا تھا کہ ہاؤس کے سارے معزز ممبران یہاں موجود ہوتے تو سن لیتے لیکن امید ہے کہ جو کچھ میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں اس کو وہ بعد میں پڑھ لیں گے -

میری عرض یہ ہے کہ تیس ہزار مربع میل کا ہمارا رقبہ پاکستان کے ویرانہ قبضہ میں ہے جس میں دس لاکھ آدمی ہیں اور آجکل ان کی جو حالت ہو رہی ہے، ان کے اوپر جو ظلم اور تشدد ہو رہا ہے، جس طرح سے وہاں قتل اور کشت و خون ہو رہا ہے، گولیاں چل رہی ہیں اور ان کو بھوکا مارا جا رہا ہے اس سے تو یہی ظاہر ہے کہ بچائے آزاد کشمیر یا غلام کشمیر کے وہ تو ایک مکمل جیلخانہ ہے - ہمیں نہ صرف اپنے ملک کا خطرہ، رنج، فکر، غم اور غصہ ہے بلکہ اپنے اور بھائیوں پر جو مصیبت گذر رہی ہے وہ بھی تو ہمارے لئے ناقابل برداشت ہے - سنہ ۱۹۴۸ سے سنہ ۱۹۵۳ تک جبکہ پہلی منسٹی تھی تب اور بعد میں اب تک ہمارے تمام لیڈر جو کہ نیشنل کانفرنس کے تھے جس میں کہ ۹۰ فیصدی مسلم تھے انہوں نے اور تمام ملک میں بلاشبہ صاف طور پر کہا تھا کہ کسی رائے شماری (پلیبیسائیٹ) کی ضرورت نہیں ہے

اور ہم نے پرممانیٹ طور پر مستقل طور پر ہند کے ساتھ الحاق کر دیا ہے اور اس کی تصدیق آئینی طور پر اخلاقی طور پر اور قانونی طور پر ہو چکی ہے - الحاق کی تصدیق مکمل ہے اس کے متعلق پرائم منسٹر صاحب انڈیا نے بون ذکر کیا ہے - انڈیا کے پرائم منسٹر صاحب کو بڑی فکر ہے کشمیر کی اور اس میں شک نہیں کہ ان کو اس معاملہ میں بہت غم غصہ اور دکھ بھی ہے - ٹھیک ہے - میں صرف یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جتنی دیر ہوتی جاتی ہے اتنا ہی ہمارا کار بگڑتا جاتا ہے خطروں بڑھتے جاتے ہیں اور پریشانی زیادہ ہوتی جا رہی ہے - ایک طرف تو یہ سیز فائر لائن کی تلوار ہماری گردن پر لٹک رہی اور پاکستان کی توہینیں بلذوقیں ہمارے سامنے تلی ہوئی ہیں اور دوسری طرف اس بات کا کوئی خیال نہیں کرتا کہ اس طرح سے کشمیر کا معاملہ جو لمبا ہوتا جا رہا ہے اس کا دائرہ کمیت اثر کس کے اوپر پڑتا ہے - میں آپکو چند باتوں کی واقفیت کرانا چاہتا ہوں کہ پانچ لاکھ آدمیوں میں سے دو لاکھ ادھر چلے آئے اور تین لاکھ کی تعداد میں بیچارے مسلمان جانے پر مجبور ہوئے - وہ لوگ وہاں پکڑے گئے قیدی تصور ہوئے اور کیمپوں میں دشمن کے شکنجہ میں ٹوپ رہے ہیں - علاوہ انہیں دشمن کے قبضہ میں

جو ہماری چھ سات نکصیلیں ہیں ان میں رہنے والے لوگ بڑی مصیبت میں ہیں بڑی تکلیف میں ہیں اور ان کی پریشانیاں بڑھتی جا رہی ہیں - ساتھ ہی ساتھ پاکستان فوجی طاقت بڑھا رہا ہے - اس کے پاس ایٹمیٹک اسلحہ فوجی سامان اور تمام فوجی ایکسپرٹس اور ٹیکنیشنس ہیں - کافی بدیشی آفیسرس کسی نہ کسی اقدے (بیس) میں ٹریننگ دیئے گئے سیز فائر لائن کے اس پار موجود ہیں - اور دن رات اقدے (بیس) بنا رہے ہیں اور جنگ کی تیاریاں کر رہے ہیں - اس وقت جب ۱۹۴۷ء میں ہم نے ایکسپت کیا تھا ہندوستان کے ساتھ اور پھر حملہ کے وقت ۳۱ دسمبر سنہ ۱۹۴۷ء کو حملہ کو روکنے کی درخواست کی جس کو آج قریب ۹ سال گزر گئے دسواں سال جا رہا ہے تب سے پاکستان کی طاقت پچاس گنا بلکہ سو گنا زیادہ بڑھ گئی ہے - میں نے یہاں کئی دفعہ کہا تھا کہ اس کو وہاں سے نکال دو اور اگر نہیں نکالو گے تو وہ ہمارے علاقہ میں آکر حملہ کریگا لیکن آپ نے ہماری بات نہیں مانی - آج یہ حالت ہے کہ چار میل سے دو سو میل تک دشمن ہمارے یہاں گوسا ہوا ہے اور چھ سو میل کے گھیرے کے اندر وہ بارڈر پر چھایا ہوا ہے - میں یہاں پر خاص بات یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

وہ کسی نہ کسی وقت اچانک آپ کے جموں و کشمیر پر حملہ کر سکتا ہے اور وہ کسی کی نہیں مانتا کیونکہ اس کے پاس آدمیوں کی کمی نہیں ہے۔ مدد کی کمی نہیں ہے وہ کہتا ہے کہ لاکھوں کی تعداد میں قبائلی اس کے پاس موجود ہیں جو پہلے کی جنگ میں کرائے پر لڑ چکے ہیں۔ ان کو بلندوق دیدیجئے اور دو دوٹی کھانے کو دے دیدیجئے اور لوٹ مار کا مال بھی اور کہتے چلو دنگو آن، وہ چل دیں گے۔ پاکستان کے پاس مکمل لوائی کا ساز و سامان ایتھوڈیٹ موجود ہی ہے روپیہ بھی اسکو باہر سے مل رہا ہے۔ اس طرح سے اس کو فل مدد ملی ہے اور وہ جب چاہے حملہ بول دے۔

آپ نے اخباروں میں پڑھا ہوگا کہ پاکستان کا خفیہ منصوبہ ہے کہ تین دن میں وہ بھارت کے کشمیر والے علاقہ پر قبضہ کر سکتے ہیں۔ ادھر انتہائی بدقسمتی سے ہمارے ملک کی یہ حالت ہے کہ ملک سیلاب کے پانی میں ڈوبا ہوا ہے۔ زمون اور آسمان مخالف ہو گئے۔ عظیم نقصان ہوا۔ چاروں طرف سے ہمارے اوپر دشمن گھیرا ڈال رہے ہیں۔ سرحد پر گولا بارود ادھر سے ادھر پہنچایا جا رہا ہے اور کشمیر میں بم پھٹ رہے ہیں۔ دشمن چڑھائی کرنے والا ہے اور ادھر ہماری حکومت کہتی ہے کہ دیکھو تحقیقات ہو رہی ہیں بات چیت ہو رہی ہے۔

سمجھ میں نہیں آتا کہ آپ کی بات چیت سے کیا اثر ہونے والا ہے اور کب تک ہم انتظار کریں گے۔ میں نے جب اخبار میں پڑھا کہ پاکستان حملہ کرے گا تو میرے دماغ پر ایک جھٹکا آیا کہ اگر پاکستان کشمیر پر حملہ کرتا ہے تو دو دن کے اندر رشیہ اسکے برخلاف اعلان جنگ کر دے گا۔ کشمیر ہندوستان کا ملک ہے لیکن اگر حملہ ہوا تو رشیہ مدد کرے کے لئے جنگ میں کود پڑے گا۔ اس ایوان میں ایک اسپیکر کے دوران میں نے کہا تھا اور اس کی چھپی ہوئی رپورٹ کتاب میں موجود ہے کہ رشیہ اور چائنا بے جان ملک نہیں ہیں، طاقتور ملک ہیں، دنیا میں ان کی دھاک ہے وہ زندہ قوم ہیں، تو چائنا اور رشیہ اپنے دروازے کے سامنے پاکستان کو بہانہ بنا کر امریکہ کو یا دوسرے سامراج وادی ملکوں کو اڈے نہیں بنانے دیں گے جس سے وہ ان کو ختم کر دے۔ آپ کو یہ تصویر معلوم ہونی چاہئے جیسے فرض کیجئے کہ یہ ہمارا حال ہے اس کے نارتھ میں خیال کیجئے کہ کشمیر ہے اور ادھر اوپر سرحدی علاقہ اسکاودو ہے اور ادھر گٹکت ہے۔ پاکستان کی حدود سے چل کر ہم پہنچتے ہیں مشرق کو جہاں سے سورج نکلتا ہے۔ لداخ تک چاروں طرف سے ہارتھر کا یہ علاقہ دس ہزار سے گیارہ ہزار مربع میل تک کا گھرا ہوا ہے۔ اور یہ وہ سارا

علاقہ ہے جس میں چائنا کو، افغانستان کی اور ریشیا کی حدیں ملی ہوئی ہیں۔ گلگت اور اسکاردو کے علاقے روس (ریشیا) کی حدود کے نزدیک بلکہ عین ریشیا کے سامنے ہیں جہاں پر پاکستان بہ امداد امریکہ آدے بنا رہا ہے، بیس بنا رہا ہے وہاں دو گھنٹے کے اندر ریشیا کے سہیلکڑوں ہوائی جہاز آ جا سکتے ہیں۔ ہزاروں سپاہی اتر سکتے ہیں۔ لیکن وہ ہمارا دیش ہے اس لئے نہ وہ اس میں ابھی سپاہی اتارتا ہے اور نہ ہی ہوائی جہاز اتارتا ہے۔ اس کی دوستی ہمارے ساتھ مکمل ہو چکی ہے۔ پکی ہو چکی ہے۔ لیکن اگر ہم یہ کہتے رہیں کہ ہم پاکستان کے ساتھ سمجھوتہ کریں گے یا صلحنامہ کریں گے ہمیں لڑنا نہیں چاہئے ہمارا ملک لڑائی نہیں چاہتا ہے تو اس سے کوئی نتیجہ نہیں نکلے گا۔ خطرہ بڑھے گا۔ آپ دیکھئے وہ اس علاقہ میں چونکہ ہمارا ہے منگلا باندھ بنا رہا ہے جس سے پچاسوں گاؤں غرق ہو جائیں گے اور ایک لاکھ سے زیادہ آدمی تباہ و بے گھر ہو جائیں گے۔ پانی پاکستان لے جائے گا وہ اپنے ہوائی جہازوں کو بھیج کر اور ہمارے علاقہ میں اڑان کو کے نقشہ بنا کر اپنے یہاں لے جا رہا ہے اور ایجنٹوں کو بھیج کر ہمارے یہاں بم پھرتا رہا ہے۔ اس طرح ہمارا علاقہ چھٹا چلا جائے گا وہ ہمیں نوجھتا

چلا جائے اتنا بڑا علاقہ ہمارے قبضہ سے چلا جائے پھر ہم کہیں کہ ہمیں لڑنا نہیں ہے ہمیں پاکستان سے نہیں لڑنا ہے۔ لیکن آپ اس نظریہ سے سمجھئے کہ وہ ملک ہمارا ہے اور جو لوگ اس پر قبضہ کئے ہوئے ہیں وہ باقی ہیں۔ اس کو واپس کرنے کے لئے اگر اس طرح باتوں سے ہم کام کریں گے تو وہ ہمارے علاقے کو کبھی نہیں دیکھا۔ کب تک ہم یہ حالت برداشت کرتے جائیں گے۔ جتنی آپ صلح صفائی سے کوشش کرتے ہیں اتنا ہی وہ مخالفت کرتا اور پرواہ نہیں کرتا ہے یہ کتلیے افسوس کی بات ہے۔ ایک چھوٹا سا ملک تراتا ہے اور آپ کی پرواہ نہیں کرتا اور ہماری حالت یہ ہے کہ ہم کہتے ہیں کہ ہم نے پروٹیسٹ کیا ہے اور سکھوڑتی کونسل میں یہ کریں گے وہ کریں گے۔ میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ چائنا اور ریشیا کے لئے ناممکن ہے کہ پاکستان کو وہاں پر قدم رکھنے دیں گے۔ جہانتک ہماری بات ہے جب تک ہم زندہ ہیں ناممکن ہے کہ ہم کسی باہری مخالف طاقت کو اپنے ملک میں داخل ہونے دیں گے۔ چارنگ رپورٹ کے مسودہ کو مدنظر رکھتے ہوئے ہمارے پرائم منسٹر اور شری کرشنا میٹن صاحب نے یہ آخری فیصلہ کر دیا کہ کشمیر کے مسئلہ پر از سر نو بحث ہو۔ تو حملہ آور کو باہر نکالنے کا مطالبہ کیا جائے۔ ہمارے تمام

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

لیڈر ان نے اور ہماری نیشنل کانفرنس نے ایک لفظ سے کہہ دیا ہے کہ سیکوریٹی کونسل پر ہمیں کوئی اعتبار نہیں ہے کیونکہ یہ ایک سپدھا سا مسئلہ تھا کہ پاکستان کو حملہ آور قرار دیا جائے اس کو پاکستان سے کہنا تھا کہ تم کشمیر کے ملک سے نکل جاؤ تمہارا وہاں کوئی حق، تعلق یا واسطہ نہیں ہے - مگر معاملہ دانستہ لٹکایا جا رہا -

ایک عجیب تماشا ہے - دنیا کے اور بھی مسلم ممالک ہیں لیکن وہ مسلمانوں کے ساتھ ہمدردی کے نام پر حماہ و کشت و خون نہیں کرتے ہیں کشمیر میں جو کچھ ہوا، جس طرح سے مسلم عورتوں کی بھی عزت و عصمت کو لوٹا گیا، انہیں دشمن بھٹا لے گئے، ان کے اوپر ظلم ڈھائے، ہمارے ملک کا لاکھوں کروڑوں روپیہ لوٹا گیا و مال برباد ہوا ہزاروں قتل و خون کئے گئے لیکن سیکوریٹی کونسل والا کوئی کچھ نہیں بولتا کہ اس قدر ظلم کرنے کے بعد پھر پاکستان مدعی کیسے بن گیا - ادھر ہمیں ایک مستغیث کی بجائے ملزم کے کتھرے میں کھڑا کر دیا گیا کہ یہی انصاف ہے؟ یہی عدالت ہے؟ یہی سیکوریٹی کونسل ہے جس کا نام حفاظتی یونین ہے - عجیب انصاف پرستی ہے - میری عرض یہ ہے کہ جو دو لاکھ ریفیوجی ہو کر آئے ان کا بھی کوئی

فکر ہے مبارک ہیں وہ لوگ جو اپنے گھروں میں بیٹھے ہیں، مبارک ہیں وہ لوگ جن کا جان و مال نقصان نہیں ہوا ہے - ہم لوگوں کے ایک ایک گھر سے بیسیوں رشتہ دار گذر گئے، بچے پوتے پونیاں مارے گئے ہزاروں آدمی قتل ہو گئے دو لاکھ آدمیوں کی ساری زمین و جائداد اور گھر بار ختم ہو گئے - ڈیڑھ لاکھ ریفیوجی ہمارے ہاں پڑے ہوئے ہیں جنہیں ابھی تک کوئی پختہ گھر بلا کر دیا نہیں ملا ہے - کمپینیشن کی بات جانے دو - یہاں دہلی و ہندوستان کے دیگر شہروں میں کشمیر کے ہزاروں ریفیوجی مکانوں و کاروبار رقیقہ کے لئے درخواستیں کر رہے ہیں - کے برس تک آپ کہتے رہیں گے کہ تحقیقات کریں گے دیکھیں گے اور انتظار کرو پھر کہتے ہیں کہ لڑنا ہم کو نہیں ہے - ہم تمام ملکوں کی مارل سپورٹ حاصل کرنا چاہتے ہیں، یہ ہمارا مارل ہے - ایک طرف ہمارا انڈیا پروموتہم ہے - ہم امن، صلح، صفائی، سچائی و انصاف کا راستہ اختیار کئے ہوئے ہیں - دوسری طرف دھوکہ بازی ہے سخت دشمنی کا برتاؤ اور سیاسی بے ایمانی ہے - ایسی حالت میں سمجھو نہ ناممکن بات ہے - یہ ہمیشہ لڑنے پر آمادہ ہونگے - ان کے دل کبھی حق و انصاف کی بات نہیں آتی - ان کو عام لوگوں کے ساتھ کوئی ہمدردی نہیں ہے میں بھی ایک ریفیوجی ہوں اور ریفیوجیوں کی حالت

کو سمجھا اور بھگتا ہوا ہوں - جو
میرے پنجابی رفیوجی بانی ہیں
ان کو اس بات کا کافی تجربہ ہے اور
وہ اس چیز کو جانتے ہیں مگر ہماری
حالت ان سے جدا ہے - اس معنی
میں کہ ہمارے جو رفیوجی بھائی
کشمیر ہیں انکو نہ کوئی کمپنیشن
ملا نہ ان کو بسانے کے لئے انتظام کیا
گیا اور بیچارے مایوسی اور مصیبت
میں انتظار میں پڑے توپ رہے ہیں۔
لیکن میں کہتا ہوں کہ اگر آپ کو
کمپنیشن دینا نہیں ہے کہ ابھی
فیصلہ نہیں ہوا تو خدا کے واسطے
پرمانہ کے واسطے ہمیں فی الحال
کہیں پر باعزت طور پر پسانے زندہ
رکھئے سمجھو کہ جو گھر ملا ہے اس کا
کرایہ تو مجھ سے لیا جاتا ہے لیکن
میرا جو مکان ادھر پڑا ہے اور سب
کے کئی لاکھ کی قیمت کے مکانات
وہاں ہیں اس کا کسی کو کوئی کرایہ
نہیں ملتا - جن پر پاکستانی قابض
ہیں ان کا کوئی معاوضہ نہیں ملتا -
میرے رفیوجی بھائیوں کو اور رشتہ داروں
کو غرضیکہ کسی کو بھی کسی طرح
کا کوئی معاوضہ نہیں ملا ہے - وہ
لوگ مارے مارے پھرتے ہیں، تڑپ
رہے ہیں، ان کو پورا راشن و سامان
زندگی نہیں مل رہا ہے - کئی بار
انہوں نے مصروفیت دئے ہیں کہ کم
سے کم ہمارے لئے ایک گھر تو بلا دو
روزگار کرنے کے لئے انتظام کرو کسی
ایک جگہ بسا دو ہمارے واسطے کوئی

کاروبار کا سلسلہ چلا دو، نوکری دیدو
کسی طرح کی صورت گذارہ ہو - اگر
آپ ان کو کمپنیشن ابھی نہیں
دلا سکتے ہیں تو کم از کم زندہ رکھنے
کا سامان و سہارا تو دیدیں - لیکن
یہ خاطرخواہ نہیں ہو رہا ہے اور
ایسی صورت میں اس کا اثر ڈائریکٹ
ہمارے اوپر پڑ رہا ہے -

میں مانتا ہوں کہ آپ کا تیفلس
پر بہت خرچ ہو رہا ہے - بیشک
خرچ ہو رہا ہے اور کہیں اتنا خرچ
نہیں ہو رہا ہے - صرف کشمیر کے
فرنٹ پر اتنا زیادہ خرچ ہو رہا ہے -
لیکن لوائی بھی تو یہی ہے اور لوائی
کہاں ہو رہی ہے آپ کی؟ ایسی
حالت میں بھی جبکہ یہ آپ کی
آنکھوں کے سامنے ہے کہ کس طرح
ہمارا ملک برباد ہوا اور پریشان ہو
رہا ہے دو بلاگوں کے درمیان ہمارے
پرائم منسٹر صاحب اندیا کھڑے ہیں
امن و شانتی کیلئے - اس ملک میں
کئی قومیں ہیں، کئی ذاتیں ہیں،
کئی مذہب ہیں اور پھر باہر کے
ملک والے یہاں آکر ہمارے معاملات
میں دخل دے رہے ہیں ان کے حالات کو
خراب کرنا چاہتے ہیں - کتنی مشکلات
ہیں - ایک طرف یہ ہے اور دوسری
طرف دونوں بلاگوں کے اندر ہم پھنس
گئے ہیں - ادھر رشتہ اور چائنا ہے اور
ادھر برطانیہ اور یونائیٹڈ اسٹیٹ آف
امریکہ ہے - لاکھوں کروڑوں روپیہ حملہ

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

کو روکنے کے لئے فوج میں خرچ ہو رہا ہے، مجبوری ہے لوگ مصیبت میں ہیں، لیکن روپیہ لوگوں کی بھلائی کے کام میں نہیں لگ رہا ہے۔ آپ ہی بتائیے کہ وہاں کیسی حالت میں یہاں گئے ہیں - جن کا مال سب کچھ خطرہ میں ہے - میں کہتا ہوں کہ یہ معاملہ ایسا سیریس ہو رہا ہے کہ اس میں جتنی ذیلے ہوگی، جتنی دیر ہوگی، اتنا ہی ہم تباہ ہو جائیں گے -

(Time bell rings.)

ہم تو میدان جنگ میں دو توپوں کے درمیان پڑے ہیں - دونوں دھڑوں کے درمیان ہیں - آپ ریزولوشن سامنے رکھتے ہیں، بار بار بحثیں ہوتی ہیں اور ہوتی دھینگلی لیکن آخر کار اس بات کا کیا اعتبار ہو سکتا ہے کہ سیکورٹی کونسل ہمارے حق میں فیصلہ کرے گی - میں پرائم منسٹر اور گورنمنٹ سے یہ درخواست کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم نے اپنے آپ کو آپ کے سپرد کر دیا ہے - ہم آپ کی پالیسی سے متفق ہیں لیکن برائے خدا اس پالیسی کا ہم پر جو اکثر پڑ رہا ہے ہماری زندگی کے لئے جو خطرہ دن بہ دن بڑھ رہا ہے لوگوں کے دلوں میں بے چینی ہو رہی ہے کہ نامعلوم کب ہم پر بمب بوسینکے یہ سوال کہ ہم کو کمپنیشن کب ملے گا دور کا ہے کیونکہ ملک دشمن کے قبضہ میں ہے ہماری تمام جائداد

کفذات، مال و اسباب اس کے قبضہ میں ہے کوئی فیصلہ نہیں ہو پاتا اس چیز کو ختم کیا جائے اور ہمارے لئے کوئی نہ کوئی صورت نکالنے جس سے ہم باعزت طور پر زندہ سکیں۔

(Time bell rings.)

تو میں آپ لوگوں سے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم لوگوں کی حالت بہت دردناک ہے - ہندوستان کے بھائیوں کو معلوم ہونا چاہئے کہ ہم لوگ کس پوزیشن میں رہ رہے ہیں -

(Time bell rings.)

श्री ह० प्र० सक्सेना : मेहरबानी करके अब आप बन्द करें ।

سردار بدھ سنگھ : میں ایک منٹ

میں ختم کر دیتا - تو میں یہ عرض کر رہا تھا کہ سیکورٹی کونسل میں فیصلہ نہ ہونے کی وجہ سے اس معاملہ میں دیر ہوتی جا رہی ہے - اس چیز کا اثر ہم لوگوں پر، رفیوجیوں پر جو اس علاقہ سے ہیں جس پر اس وقت پاکستان کا جابرانہ قبضہ ہے پڑ رہا ہے - گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کو سیکورٹی کونسل سے یہ کہنا چاہئے کہ حملہ آوروں کو ہمارے علاقہ سے نکال دیا جائے کیونکہ انہوں نے جبراً ہمارے علاقہ پر قبضہ کر رکھا ہے - ان کو اس زمین پر قبضہ کرنے کا کوئی حق نہیں ہے ہمارا علاقہ ہم کو واپس ملنا چاہئے۔ اگر جلدی ایسا نہیں ہوتا اور اس چیز میں اور دیر لگتی ہے تو میں بڑے ادب سے آپ صاحبان سے اور گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا سے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمیں بلا کرائے کے گھروں میں

ایک جگہ بسایا جائے - یہاں
 کاروبار کرنے کے لئے ہمیں پیسہ دینا
 چاہئے اور دوسری سہولتوں کی جائیں
 جس سے کمزور زندہ رہ سکیں اور
 اپنی گزر بسر کر سکیں - جتنے عرصہ...

(Time bell rings).

†[सरदार बुध सिंह (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, इन्टर-नेशनल पोलिसी के सिलसिले में प्राइममिनिस्टर साहब ने काश्मीर का जिक्र बाजे तो रपर कर दिया है और काश्मीर के मुतल्लिक इस कदर लिटरेचर छप चुका है कि शायद अब इसकी जरूरत नहीं रही कि इसमें इजाफा किया जाय या इसके मुतल्लिक कुछ और बयान किया जाये और अभी हाल ही में यह मसला फिर सिक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में पेश होने वाला है। आप साहिबान ने अखबार में आज तक के सब कुछ वाक्यात देख लिये हैं, पढ़ लिये हैं और समझ लिये हैं कि क्या कुछ होने वाला है। हम से पहले जिस कदर स्पीचिंग हुई है, जिन अहसासों ने इसके मुतल्लिक जिक्र किया है, उसको सुन लिया है कि चूँकि काश्मीर का हिन्दुस्तान के साथ इलहाक हो चुका है इसलिए अब यह मामला यू० एन० ओ० में जेरे बहस नहीं आना चाहिए। ठीक है, मैं उनका शुक्र-गुजार हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बात को अब तस्लीम कर लिया है कि इलहाक मुकम्मल हो चुका है। दो तीन चार साल पहले इसके मुतल्लिक कई एक को शक ही रहा जिसकी वजह से हमें बड़ी परेशानी रही। इस हकीकत के पेशेनजर कि जब सारा लिटरेचर छप चुका है तो मुझे कुछ अर्ज करने की अब क्या जरूरत है, इसके मुतल्लिक मैं सिर्फ इतना ही अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि पचास वर्ष से मैं काश्मीर में फिर रहा हूँ। मैंने करीबन सारे काश्मीर की चप्पा चप्पा जमीन देखी है, जो चायना और रशिया की हद्द रियासत से मिलती है। बन्दोबस्त (सर्वे) के लिये वहाँ तक, सर्विस में,

मैं पाच वर्ष जाता रहा और मुझे वहाँ की सूरत हाल की जो वाकफियत है वह शायद किसी पैम्फलेट में या किसी किताब में या किसी अखबार में नहीं आई है। मैं चाहता था कि हाउस के सारे मुअज्जिज मੈम्बरान वहाँ मौजूद होते तो सुन लें। लेकिन उम्मीद है कि जो कुछ मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ उसको वह बाद में पढ़ लेंगे।

मेरी अर्ज यह है कि तीस हजार मुरब्बा मील का हमारा रकबा पाकिस्तान के जबर्दस्ती कब्जे में है जिसमें दस लाख आदमी हैं और आजकल उनकी जो हालत हो रही है, उनके ऊपर जो जुल्म और तशद्द हो रहा है, जिस तरह से वहाँ कत्ल और कुश्तोखून हो रहा है, गोलियाँ चल रही हैं और उनको भूखा मारा जा रहा है, उससे तो यही जाहिर है कि बजाय आजाद काश्मीर या गुलाम काश्मीर कहने के वह तो एक मुकम्मल जेलखाना है। हमें न सिर्फ अपने मुल्क का खतरा, रंज, फिक्र, गम और गुस्सा है बल्कि अपने उन भाइयों पर जो मुसीबत गुजर रही है वह भी तो हमारे लिये नाकाबिले बरदास्त है। सन् १९४८ में सन् १९५३ तक जब कि पहली मिनिस्ट्री थी तब और बाद में अब तक हमारे तमाम लीडर जोकि नेशनल कान्फेन्स के थे जिसमें कि नव्वे फीसदी मुस्लिम थे उन्होंने और तमाम मुल्क ने बिला शुबहा साफ तौर पर कहा था कि किसी रायशुमारी (प्लैबीसाइट) की जरूरत नहीं है और हमने परमानेंट तौर पर, मुस्तकिल तौर पर हिन्द के साथ इलहाक कर दिया है और उसकी तस्दीक आयनी तौर पर, इखलाकी तौर पर और कानूनी तौर पर हो चुकी है। इलहाक की तस्दीक मुकम्मल है इसके मुतल्लिक प्राइममिनिस्टर साहब इंडिया ने भी जिक्र किया है।

इंडिया के प्राइममिनिस्टर साहब को बड़ी फिक्र है काश्मीर की और इसमें शक नहीं उनको इस मामले में बहुत गम, गुस्सा और दुख भी है। ठीक है। मैं सिर्फ यह अर्ज करना

[सरदार बृध सिंह]

चाहता हूँ कि जितनी देर हुई जाती है उतना ही हमारा काज बिगड़ जाता है, खतरे बढ़ते जाते हैं और परेशानी ज्यादा होती जा रही है। एक तरफ तो यह चीज फायर लाइन की तलवार हमारी गर्दन पर हर वक्त लटक रही है और पाकिस्तान की तोपें, बन्दूकें हमारे सीने पर तनी हुई हैं और दूसरी तरफ इस बात का कोई खयाल नहीं करता कि इस तरह से काश्मीर का मामला जो लम्बा होता जा रहा है उसका डाइरेक्ट असर किसके ऊपर पड़ता है। मैं आपको चन्द बातों की वाकफियत कराना चाहता हूँ कि पाँच लाख आदमियों में से दो लाख इधर चले आये और तीन लाख की तादाद में बेचारे मुसलमान जाने पर मजबूर हुये वह लोग वहाँ पकड़े गये, कैदी तसव्वुर हुये और कैम्पों में दुश्मन के शिकंजा में तड़प रहे हैं। अलावा अजी दुश्मन के कब्जा में जो हमारी छः सात तहसीलें हैं उनमें रहने वाले लोग बड़ी मुसीबत में हैं, बड़ी तकलीफ में हैं और उनकी परेशानियाँ बढ़ती जा रही हैं। साथ ही साथ पाकिस्तान फौजी ताकत बढ़ा रहा है। उसके पास अपटूडेट असलहा, फौजी सामान और तमाम फौजी ऐक्सपर्ट्स और टैकनिसियन्स हैं। काफी विदेशी औफिसर्स किसी न किसी अड्डे (बेस) में ट्रेनिंग देने के लिये सीजफायर लाइन के उस पार मौजूद हैं और दिन रात अड्डे (बेस) बना रहे हैं और जंग की तैयारियाँ कर रहे हैं। उस वक्त जब सन् १९४७ में हमने एक्सीड किया था हिन्दुस्तान के साथ और फिर हमला के वक्त ३१ दिसम्बर १९४७ को हमला को रोकने की दरखास्त की जिसको आज करीब नौ साल गुजर गये, दसवाँ साल जा रहा है तब से पाकिस्तान की ताकत पचास गुना बल्कि सौ गुना ज्यादा बढ़ गई है। मैं ने यहाँ कई दफा कहा था कि उसको वहाँ से निकाल दो अगर निकालोगे नहीं तो वह हमारे इलाका में आकर हमला करेगा। लेकिन आपने हमारी बात नहीं मानी। आज यह हालत है कि चार मील से दो सौ मील तक दुश्मन हमारे यहाँ घुसा हुआ है

और छः सौ मील के घेरे के अन्दर वह बार्डर पर छाया हुआ है। मैं यहाँ पर खास बात यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह किसी न किसी वक्त अचानक आपके जम्मू और काश्मीर पर हमला कर सकता है और वह किसी की नहीं मानेगा क्योंकि उसके पास आदमियों की कमी नहीं है, मदद की कमी नहीं है। वह कहता है कि लाखों की तादाद में कबाइली उसके पास मौजूद हैं जो पहले की जंग में किराये पर लड़ चुके हैं। उनको बन्दूक दीजिये और दो रोटी खाने को दे दीजिये और लूट मार का माल भी और कहिये चलो। "गो आन"। वह चल देंगे। पाकिस्तान के पास मुकम्मिल लड़ाई का साजो सामान अपटूडेट मौजूद ही है और रुपया भी उसको बाहर से मिल रहा है। इस तरह से उसको फुल मदद मिली है और वह जब चाहे हमला बोल दे।

आपने अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा कि पाकिस्तान का खुफिया मंसूबा है कि वह तीन दिन में भारत के काश्मीर वाले इलाका पर कब्जा कर सकते हैं। इधर इंतहाई बदकिस्मती है हमारे मुल्क की यह हालत है कि मुल्क सेलाब के पानी में डूबा हुआ है। जमीन और आसमान मुखालिफ हो गये। अजीम नुकसान हुआ। चारों तरफ से हमारे ऊपर दुश्मन घेरा डाल रहे हैं। सरहद पर गोला बारूद इधर से उधर पहुंचाया जा रहा है और काश्मीर में बम फट रहे हैं। दुश्मन चढ़ाई करने वाला है और इधर हमारी हकूमत कहती है कि देखो तहकीकात हो रही है, बातचीत हो रही है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि आपकी बातचीत से क्या असर होने वाला है और कब तक हम इन्तजार करेंगे। मैंने जब अखबार में पढ़ा कि पाकिस्तान हमला करेगा तो मेरे दिमाग पर एक झटका आया कि अगर पाकिस्तान काश्मीर पर हमला करता है तो दो दिन के अन्दर रशिया उसके बरखिलाफ ऐलान जंग कर देगा। काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का मुल्क है लेकिन अगर हमला हुआ तो रशिया मदद करने के लिए जंग में कूद पड़ेगा। इसी एवान में एक स्पीच के दौरान मैं

मैंने कहा था और उसकी छपी हुई रिपोर्ट किताब में मौजूद है कि रशिया और चाइना बेजान मुल्क नहीं है, ताकतवर मुल्क है, दुनिया में उनकी धाक है, वह जिन्दा कौम है, तो चाइना और रशिया अपने दरवाजे के सामने पाकिस्तान को बहाना बना कर अमेरिका को या दूसरे साम्राज्यवादी मुल्कों को अड़डे नहीं बनाने देंगे जिससे वह उनको खत्म कर दे। आपको यह तस्वीर मालूम होनी चाहिए कि जैसे फ्रेंच कीजिए कि यह हमारा हाल है इसके नार्थ में आप खयाल कीजिए कि काश्मीर है और उधर ऊपर सरहदी इलाका इसकार्ड है और इधर गिलगित है। पाकिस्तान की हद्द से चलकर हम पहुंचते हैं मशरिफ को जहां से सूरज निकलता है। लद्दाख तक चारों तरफ से बार्डर का यह इलाका दस हजार से ११ हजार भुरब्बा मील तक का घिरा हुआ है और वह यह सारा इलाका है जिसमें चाइना की, अफगानिस्तान की और रशिया की हद्दे मिली हुई हैं। गिलगित और इसकार्ड के इलाके रूस (रशिया) की हद्द के नजदीक बल्कि एन रशिया के सामने हैं जहां पर पाकिस्तान बड़मदादे अमरीका अड़डे बना रहा है, बेस बना रहा है वहां दो घंटे के अन्दर रशिया के सैकड़ों हवाई जहाज आ जा सकते हैं। हजारों सिपाही उतर सकते हैं लेकिन वह हमारा देश है इसलिए न वह इसमें सिपाही उतारता है और न ही हवाई जहाज उतारता है। उसकी दोस्ती हमारे साथ मुकम्मल हो चुकी है, पक्की हो चुकी है। लेकिन अगर हम यह कहते रहें कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ मित्रता करेंगे या मुलहनामा करेंगे, हमें लडना नहीं चाहिए, हमारा मुल्क लड़ाई नहीं चाहता है तो इससे कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलेगा। खतरा बढ़ेगा, आप देखिए वह उस इलाका में जो कि हमारा मगला बाध बना रहा है जिससे पचासों गांव गंके हो जायेंगे और एक लाख से ज्यादा आदमी तबाह व बेघरबार हो जायेंगे। पानी पाकिस्तान ले जायगा वह अपने हवाई जहाजों को भेजकर और हमारे इलाका में उड़ान करके नक्शा बनाकर अपने यहां ले जा रहा है और

एजेंटों को भेज कर हमारे यहां बम फटवा रहा है। इस तरह हमारा इलाका छिनता चला जाये, वह हमें नोचता चला जाए, इतना बड़ा इलाका हमारे कब्जे से चला जाए, फिर हम कहे कि हमें लडना नहीं है, हमें पाकिस्तान से नहीं लडना है। लेकिन आप इस नजरिया से समझिये कि वह मुल्क हमारा है और जो लोग उस पर कब्जा किये हुये हैं वह बागी हैं। उसको वापस करने के लिए अगर इस तरह बातों से हम काम करेंगे तो वह हमारे इलाके को कभी नहीं देगा। कब तक हम यह हालत बर्दाश्त करते जायेंगे। जितनी आप मुल्ह सफाई से कोशिश करते हैं उतना ही वह मुखालफत करना और परवाह नहीं करता है। यह कितने अफसोस की बात है। एक छोटा सा मुल्क डराता है और आपकी परवाह नहीं करता और हमारी हालत यह है कि हम कहते हैं कि हमने प्रोटेस्ट किया है और सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में यह करेंगे वह करेंगे। मैं यह कहना चाहता हू कि चाइना और रशिया के लिए यह नामुम्किन है कि वह पाकिस्तान को वहां पर कदम रखने देंगे। जहां तक हमारी बात है जब तक हम जिन्दा हैं नामुम्किन है कि हम किसी बाहरी मुखालिफ ताकत को अपने मुल्क में दाखिल होने देंगे। जॉर्ज रिपोर्ट को, मसविदा को मद्दे नजर रखते हुए हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर और श्री कृष्ण मेनन साहब ने यह आखिरी फैसला कर दिया कि काश्मीर के मसला पर अज सरे नौ बहस हो तो हमलावर को बाहर निकालने का मुतालबा किया जाय लेकिन हमारे तमाम लीडरान ने हमारी नेशनल काफ्रेस ने एक लपज से कह दिया है कि सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल पर हमें कोई एतबार नहीं है क्योंकि यह एक सीधा सा मसला था कि पाकिस्तान को हमलावर करार दिया जाय, उसको पाकिस्तान से कहना था कि तुम काश्मीर के मुल्क से निकल जाओ तुम्हारा वहां कोई हक, ताल्लुक या वास्ता नहीं है। मगर मुआमला दानिस्ता लटकाया जा रहा है।

एक अजीब तमाशा है। दुनिया के और भी मुस्लिम मुल्क हैं लेकिन वह मुसलमानों

[सरदार बूट सिंह]

के साथ हमदर्दी के नाम पर हमला व कुश्तोखून नहीं करते हैं काश्मीर में जो कुछ हुआ, जिस तरह से मुस्लिम औरतों की भी इज्जत व अस्मत् को लूटा गया, उन्हें दुश्मन भगा ले गये, उनके ऊपर जुल्म ढाये, हमारे मुल्क का लाखों करोड़ों रुपया लूटा गया व माल बरबाद हुआ हजारों कत्ल व खून किये गये लेकिन सिक्किम रिपोर्टी कौंसिल वाला कोई कुछ नहीं बोलता कि इस कदर जुल्म करने के बाद फिर पाकिस्तान मुद्दी कैसे बन गया। उधर हमें एक मुस्तगीस की बजाय मुल्जिम के बटहरे में खड़ा कर दिया गया। क्या यही इन्साफ है। यही अदालत है। यही सिक्किम रिपोर्टी कौंसिल है जिसका नाम हिफाजती यूनियन है? अजीब इन्साफ परस्ती है। मेरी अर्ज यह है कि जो दो लाख रिफ्यूजी हो कर आये उनका भी कोई फिक्र है मुबारक है वह लोग जो अपने घरों में बैठे हैं, मुबारक है वह लोग जिनका माल व जान का नुकसान नहीं हुआ है। हम लोगों के एक एक घर से बीसियों रिश्तेदार गुजर गये, बच्चे पोते, पोतियां मारे गये, हजारों आदमी कत्ल हो गये, दो लाख आदमियों की सारी जमीन व जायदाद और घरबार खत्म हो गये, डेढ़ लाख रिफ्यूजी हमारे यहां पड़े हुए हैं जिन्हें अभी तक कोई पुस्ता घर बिला किराया नहीं मिला है। कम्पेन्सेशन की बात जाने दो। यहां दिल्ली व हिन्दुस्तान के दीगर शहरों में काश्मीर के हजारों रिफ्यूजीज मकानों व कारोबार वगैरा के लिए दरख्वास्तें कर रहे हैं। कैं बरस तक आप कहते रहेंगे कि तहकीकात करेंगे, देखेंगे, इंतजार करो और फिर कहते हैं कि लड़ना हमको नहीं है। हम तमाम मुल्कों की मोरल सर्पोट हासिल करना चाहते हैं। यह हमारा मोरल है। एक तरफ हमारा अहिंसा परमोधर्म है। हम अमन व सुलह, सच्चाई व ईसाफ का रास्ता अख्तियार किये हुये हैं। दूसरी तरफ धोखाबाजी है, बेईसाफी है, सख्त दुश्मनी का बर्ताव और सयासी बेईमानी है। ऐसी हालत में समझौता नामुम्किन बात है। यह हमेशा लड़ने पर आमादा

होंगे। उनके दिल में कभी हक व ईसाफ की बात नहीं आती उनको आम लोगों के साथ कोई हमदर्दी नहीं है। मैं भी एक रिफ्यूजी हूं और रिफ्यूजीयों की हालत को समझा और भुगता हुआ हूं। जो मेरे रिफ्यूजी भाई हैं उनको इस बात का काफी तजुर्बा है। और वह इस चीज को जानते हैं मगर हमारी हालत उनसे जुदा है। इस मायने में कि हमारे जो रिफ्यूजी भाई कश्मीरी हैं उनको ना कोई कम्पेन्सेशन मिला, ना उनको बसाने के लिये इंतिजाम किया और बेवारे मायूसी और मुसीबत में, इंतजार में पड़े तड़प रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं कहता हूं कि अगर आपको कम्पेन्सेशन देना नहीं है कि अभी फैसला नहीं हुआ तो खुदा के वास्ते, परमात्मा के वास्ते, हमें फिलहाल कहीं पर बाइज्जत तौर पर बसाइये, जिदा रखिये। मुझे जो जो घर मिला है उसका किराया मुझ से लिया जाता है लेकिन मेरा जो मकान उधर पड़ा है और सबके कई लाख कीमत के मकानात वहां हैं उसका किमी को कोई किराया नहीं मिलता। जिन पर पाकिस्तानी काबिज है उनका कोई मुआवजा नहीं मिलता। मेरे रिफ्यूजी भाइयों को और रिश्तेदारों को गरजे कि किसी को भी किसी तरह का कोई मुआवजा नहीं मिला है। वह लोग मारे मारे फिरते हैं, तड़प रहे हैं, उनको पूरा राशन व सामाने जिदगी नहीं मिल रहा है। कई बार उन्होंने मेमोरेण्डम दिये हैं कि कम से कम हमारे लिये एक घर तो बना दो, रोजगार करने के लिये इंतजाम करो किसी एक जगह बसा दो। हमारे वास्ते कोई कारोबार का सिलमिला चला दो, नोकरी दे दो, किसी तरह की सूरते गुजारा हो। अगर आप उनको कम्पेन्सेशन अभी नहीं दिला सकते हैं तो कम से कम जिदा रहने का सामान व सहारा तो दें। लेकिन यह खातिर स्वाह नहीं हो रहा है और ऐसी सूरत में इसका असर डायरेक्ट हमारे ऊपर पड़ रहा है।

मैं मानता हूं कि आपका डिफेंस पर बहुत खर्च हो रहा है। बेसक खर्च हो रहा है। और

कहीं इतना खर्च नहीं हो रहा है। सिर्फ काश्मीर फ्रंट पर इतना ज्यादा खर्च हो रहा है। लेकिन लड़ाई भी तो यही है। और लड़ाई कहां हो रही है आपकी? ऐसी हालत में भी जबकि यह आपके आंखों के सामने है किस तरह हमारा मुल्क बरबाद हुआ और परेशान हो रहा है दो ब्लाकों के दरम्यान हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब इंडिया खड़े हैं। अमन व शांति के लिये। इस मुल्क में कई कौमें हैं, कई जातें हैं, कई मजहब हैं, और फिर बाहर के मुल्क वाले यहां आकर हमारे मुआमलात में दखल दे कर यहां के हालात को खराब करना चाहते हैं। कितनी मुश्किलत हैं। एक तरफ यह है और दूसरी तरफ दोनों ब्लाकों के अन्दर हम फंस गये हैं। इधर रशिया चाडता है और उधर बरतानिया और यूनाइटेड स्टेट आफ अमेरिका है। लाखों करोड़ों रुपया हमला को रोकने के लिये फौज में खर्च हो रहा है। मजबूरी है, लोग मसीबत में हैं, लेकिन रुपया लोगों की भलाई के काम में नहीं लग रहा है। आप ही बताइये कि हम वहां कैसी हालत में फंस गये हैं। जिनका जान व माल सब कुछ खतरे में है। मैं कहता हूं कि यह मुआमला ऐसा सीरियस हो रहा है कि इसमें जितनी डिले होगी, जितनी देर होगी, उतना ही हम तबाह हो जायेंगे।

(Time bell rings.)

हम तो मैदाने जग में दो तोपों के दरम्यान पड़े हैं। दोनों धड़ों के दरम्यान है। आप रैजोल्यूशन सामने रखते हैं, बार बार बहस होती है और होती रहेंगी लेकिन आखिरकार इस बात का क्या एतबार हो सकता है कि सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल हमारे हक में फैसला करेगी। मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर और गवर्नमेंट से यह दरख्वास्त करना चाहता हूं कि हमने अपने आपको आपके सुपुर्द कर दिया है। हम आपकी पालिसी से मुत्तफिक हैं लेकिन बरायेखुदा इस पालिसी का हम पर जो असर पड़ रहा है, हमारी जिंदगी के लिये जो खतरा दिन ८ दिन बढ़ रहा है, लोगों के दिलों में बेचैनी हो रही है कि नामालूम कि कब हम पर बम बरसेंगे

यह सवाल कि हमको कम्पेंसेशन कब मिलेगा दूर का है। क्योंकि दुश्मन के कब्जे में है, हमारी तमाम ज़ायदाद, कागजात, माल व असबाब उसके कब्जे में है। कोई फैसला नहीं हो पाता। इस चीज को खत्म किया जाये और हमारे लिये कोई ना कोई मूरत या रास्ता निकालिये जिससे हम बाइज्जत तौर पर जिदा रह सकें।

(Time bell rings.)

तो मैं आप लोगों से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि हम लोगों की हालत बहुत दर्दनाक है। हिन्दुस्तान के भाइयों को मालूम होना चाहिये कि हम लोग किस पोजीशन में रह रहे हैं।

(Time bell rings.)

श्री ८० प्र० स्वसेना : मेहरबानी करके अब आप बन्द करें।

सरदार बुध सिंह : मैं एक मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा। तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल में फैसला न होने की वजह से इस मामले में देर होती जा रही है। इस चीज का असर हम लोगों पर, रिपयूजियों पर जो उस इलाके से हैं जिस पर इस वक्त पाकिस्तान का जाबराना कब्जा है, पड़ रहा है गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को सिक्युरिटी कौंसिल से यह कहना चाहिये कि हमलावरों को हमारे इलाके से निकाल दिया जाये क्योंकि उन्होंने जबरन हमारे इलाका पर कब्जा कर रक्खा है। उनको इस जमीन पर कब्जा करने का कोई हक नहीं है। हमारा इलाका हमको वापिस मिलना चाहिये। अगर जल्दी ऐसा नहीं होता और इस चीज में देर लगती है तो मैं बड़े अदब से आप साहबान से और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमें बिला किराये के घरों में एक जगह बसाया जाये। यहाँ पर कारोबार करने के लिये पैसा दिया जाये और दूसरी सहुलतें दी जायें जिससे कि हम जिदा रह सकें और अपनी गुजरबसर कर सकें। जितने अर्सा

(Time bell rings.)

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, the Prime Minister spoke about some very vital points this morning. I want to take two or three points out of his speech and discuss them as far as they interest us. The first point I would like to take up is the area that we call West Asia. Now, this area, since the discovery of oil, the formation of NATO and the Baghdad Pact, has been a cauldron of intrigues, jealousies and enmities and even warfare. Jordan was recently in ferment. It had refused British aid and was trying to follow an independent foreign policy like Egypt and Syria. Very soon a revolt was seemingly manufactured in order to frighten the King of Jordan on the consequences of an independent foreign policy. Immediately, he went back to accept British and American aid and now seems to be even a better member of the Baghdad Pact than some of its original members, although it is not yet a member of the Pact itself.

Now, Syria has come into the picture. The Prime Minister spoke about Syria quite at length this morning. Syria is really the result of the policy of military pacts followed by the Western countries. Now, Sir, nothing seems more sensational in the Western countries these days than developments in Syria, not even the breakdown of the disarmament talks or even the massacres in Algeria. All these developments in Syria seem to happen after Syria accepted Russian aid. Syria has been following a policy which she calls 'positive neutrality'. She was and is in sympathy with some of the policies of Egypt. The same French who attacked Egypt last year ruled over Syria not long ago. Egypt after having accepted Czechoslovak and Russian aid, was accused of being pro-communist. Now, Syria is similarly being accused of being pro-communist. There was a plot manufactured in Syria to overthrow the Government. Some foreign embassy staff were suspected of complicity in the plot and they were asked to leave

the country. Immediately a widespread campaign was set about throughout the Western countries in order to force Syria into a situation to warrant military intervention, maybe under the Eisenhower Doctrine. Even Jordan stepped up its campaign of vilification against Syria.

Talking to correspondents in Washington quite recently about the Syrian developments, President Eisenhower overruled any possibility of military intervention in Syria under the Eisenhower Doctrine, because Syria has not asked for it; nor is it likely to ask for it. The Eisenhower Doctrine provides for a country to ask for military intervention. But he described what he called Soviet penetration into Syria as being first in the form of economic aid, then in the form of military aid and then reducing the country to the status of a satellite. The word 'satellite' like Quisling is not used in a very complimentary sense. And if Russia would like to retaliate by the same term, perhaps she can call several countries who are receiving military aid from the United States as American satellites. And Pakistan perhaps can very well deserve this description not only because she is accepting military aid but also, if you take into account, some of the very fulsome and adulatory speeches made by Mr. Suhrawardy when he was in the United States. I see that the Government of India has taken note of some of his speeches in the United States made against this country. His speeches made in respect of the United States also deserve to be taken notice of for their sheer adulatory vocabulary. I should think they afford a psychological study into the person who made those speeches; also it is a good study in contrast, abuse of India in one breath and praise of the United States in the other. Now, allow me, Sir, to quote only a few passages from those speeches, because they are very interesting. Speaking at Washington airport on July 10, Mr. Suhrawardy said: "Pakistan has not been able to repay the United States its kindness

even, in a small measure. I am proud that Pakistan and the United States are allies." Speaking at a banquet given by Mr. Dulles the same day, he said: "It is the proud privilege of Pakistan to be associated with the United States in a common purpose. The people of the United States work for the dignity of man and for the preservation of such values as constituted the basic heritage of man." Addressing the United States House of Representatives on July 11, he said, very humbly: "I feel I am presuming to address a house which has immense power and potentiality.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The United States is the bulwark of democracy and freedom. But for its endeavours, possibly, by this time, the world would have been shaken and shattered. I recall the time when, if you had desired to conquer all the nations of the world, you could have done so. But it is due to your moral strength that peace was saved." Then, to the Senate, he said: "In your hands, the Atom and Hydrogen bombs are something that preserve the peace, but in the hands of others they are utilised to destroy the peace."

Now, these are some of the speeches which perhaps only a satellite can utter. It is good for us to remember that there is danger in such statements for us too.

Coming back to Syria, the United States is very concerned about developments in Syria. Turkey is said to be encircled on three sides by Russia and Syria. The fourth is, of course, open, that is, the Mediterranean. The Syrians say that they have been encircled on all sides. But nobody takes any notice of that. There is a talk of isolating Syria from the rest of the Arab world—to teach Syria a lesson. Now, I want to ask, why all this bother about Syria, little Syria accepting Russian aid, following a policy of what she calls positive neutrality. We also follow a bit of a similar policy which the Americans call neutralism, but we call non-55 R.S.D.,—10.

alignment. The Great Master who founded Christianity spoke about his religion—which religion the United States follows—as follows: 'He that is not with me is not against me.' Now, that in a nutshell appears to me to be the essence of the meaning of our policy of non-alignment. The American policy seems to be: 'He who is not with me is against me.' The Prime Minister also spoke this morning about the break-down of disarmament talks in London and there is an amendment also on the subject. I thought I could say a few words on that too. I am glad that the Prime Minister has taken notice of the break-down of the London disarmament talks, because it is a serious matter and there is need to do something in the matter to revive hopes of peace in the hearts of mankind. It is a serious set-back to the achievement of peace in the world. It is accepted on all hands that disarmament is the key to the foreign policy of any country interested in peace. The break-down of the London talks, Sir, reminds me of an event which took place some time last century, of the scepticism of William Pitt, the Younger, about the desire of Napoleon for peace. The special envoy of Napoleon in London, Fouchet, went to the British Prime Minister, William Pitt, and said, "Sir, Emperor Napoleon wants peace." William Pitt replied. "No doubt, but what for?" This break-down makes one almost feel that the Great Powers which are represented at the Disarmament Sub-Committee meetings in London did not very much show that they were interested in peace. Arms are symptoms, not the cause. Armaments are visible signs of national passions and international unrest. The incentives that prompt nations to arm must be removed first before armaments can be reduced permanently. The tragedy of these London talks has been, Sir, that they were an exercise in detailed and elaborate futility. The arms race today is costing the world annually about a hundred thousand million dollars—converted in terms of rupees, about 50 thousand crores. Imagine how much better off this world would be if that amount can be transferred

[Shri M. H. Samuel.] , to economic development. The armed forces of the world number about 20 million. The three nuclear Powers have between them major missiles and long-range bomber capacities. That is the magnitude of the disarmament problem. The western nations would like to have disarmament step by step—each step and each process supplementing the other and each enforceable—whereas Russia would like to have disarmament piecemeal, separately. The Americans seem to think that the Communist nations between them have a preponderant strength in men and they want to counter-weight them by having the deterrent strength—what Mr. Dulles called 'massive retaliation by nuclear weapons'. Now, I think, the time has come when we should really put forward some helpful suggestions to clear the air of fear and suspicion in the minds of the Big Powers. I know we have made some suggestions for an initial agreement on the banning of nuclear tests. That is a very useful suggestion. But I would like to go back to the original suggestion made by Mr. Bernard Baruch, a very famous man in atomic politics, who said about ten years ago that all the atomic bombs should be handed over to an International Authority which would control all the natural resources and technical material for making atomic bombs; that all bombs should be de-bombed or dismantled in order that there is no contamination by fall-out because there would be no more blasting of atomic weapons. Now, that is a very useful suggestion. Perhaps, people might accept this remedy because of sheer desperation, as scientists say that, in an atomic war, this planet of ours can be obliterated perhaps in one single afternoon.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. It is time.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: All right. I thank you, Sir.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajas- I than): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this I morning we heard our Prime Minis- i

ter's speech on the international situation and our policy thereon. It was indeed very encouraging and heartening to see our Prime Minister warming up when dealing with certain points. As far as the theory is concerned, all of us are one with the Prime Minister and we feel that the foreign policy adopted by our country could not have been better. But, unfortunately, the warmth of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Ministry remains within the precincts of these two Houses. When they get out of the atmosphere of these Houses and they are pressed with practical difficulties, we all of us somewhat feel that that warmth somehow or other disappears and other forces take hold of the actions. As far' as other countries are concerned, we do get on well to a certain extent, but where national interests are concerned, we always give in. *

Sir, it is true that we have got our own background to which we have to see, as the Prime Minister often said. Also, the Prime Minister is the spiritual heir of Mahatma Gandhi and he has inherited certain moral values which, unfortunately, in this wicked world are not to be found in others. Therefore, we judge others by our virtues and it is here that we often fail, and fail to deliver the goods, which is expected of a country like India and of a statesman and leader of the country of the stature of Mr. Nehru.

Sir, it is no doubt true that this modern world is faced with very great difficulties, crises and serious situations which in the past were not dreamt of. Even then, others also exist here and somehow or other they manage to do their job. As far as some of us are concerned, we fail to understand certain points and I would be grateful if the spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry would enlighten me on certain points which I would like to put before the House.

First, of all, it is true that in international affairs, the situation changes from minute to minute, day to day

and year to year and we cannot have a set policy. But even then, in conducting a country's policy, one has to have a little consistency. As far as we are concerned, what we can see is that somehow or other, we apply two standards on the same problem. If somebody commits a wrong and another person also commits a wrong, then both should be measured by the same scale. But what do we find here in regard to the international matters? To start with, when we got the independence, we were told that our policy would be of dynamic neutrality. In pursuing that policy we were faced on the issue of Korea and Tibet with the Russian bloc and thus came into clash with Russia, and we had to receive some snubs from them in regard to our policy. That completely took us off our feet and since that day we are afraid, it appears to be so, to say anything against them.

Then, Sir, as far as democracies are concerned, they live on criticism; they live on discussion. They feel that they can advance their ideas by mutual discussion. And we felt that to be the safe ground to go to any extent to criticise. It was a matter of real satisfaction and pride to us, Indians, that when this Suez Canal crisis took place, our country took the lead to condemn the British and the French, and very rightly too. It was really a matter of very great pride. But when the question of Hungary came, what did we do? Whatever prestige we gained through, I must say, the stature of our Prime Minister, was overnight brought to the lowest level because we somehow or other applied two standards in those cases.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): There was condemnation.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I know there was condemnation. I agree. But there are condemnations and condemnations, and therefore if we compare the two, we will be able to see the difference. Now, Sir, the only thing that I want to say is this that two standards were applied. Now the question of Hungary is coming for-

ward before the United Nations and the Prime Minister this morning referred to that also. Well, what are our views on this issue? The Prime Minister tells us that in our view the rising in Hungary was essentially a nationalist rising, in our view the people of that country should be left to decide their own destiny, in our view foreign forces should not be kept in that country and all our efforts have been bent to help the people of Hungary, and not to condemn anybody. Sir, these are very excellent words and if these sweet and excellent words can help the people of Hungary nothing would be better. I also know that the Prime Minister does not believe in penance or in invoking the blessings of God so that the hearts of the Russians may melt and soften towards Hungary and they should withdraw their forces. That can be done only if certain moves are made. Otherwise, human nature being what it is, nobody would like to give up whatever is in his possession. And therefore I do not know how the Prime Minister will be able to help the Hungarians unless pressure is brought to bear on the nation which has got a hold over them. And that can be done only if they sit together and bring about world opinion to condemn one who is doing wrong. Very rightly we took the lead in the condemnation of the British and the French, and they had to bow down before the world opinion and they had ultimately to quit. Similarly therefore if Hungarian people have to be helped, we will have to bring pressure to bear on Russia to see that a foreign country is not crushed like that, especially when they are in partnership with us in the Panchsheel. Otherwise there is no meaning of our having Panchsheel whatsoever.

Then, Sir, there is another instance of double standard. The Prime Minister referred to China this morning and said that no policy question of any importance can be decided in the Far East without China being included in such talks. It is quite right. Similarly on many occasions the Prime Minister has expressed the view that as long

[Shri Jaswant Singh.] as 600 million people in China are not represented, the United Nations taken its roots there. Therefore I do not know cannot be said to be representative of the world why we should apply two standards, one to opinion. It is all true. But, Sir, either we are China and the other to Israel. Now, Sir, this is in supporting China from altruistic point of view regard to our foreign affairs. Naturally we want or because it is our policy to do that. If to be friendly with all the countries consistent, it is because of our giving importance to the of course, with our policies. But others are not moral value, then I would like to know why we so blind. They see our motives, and the result is are applying a different standard to Israel. Is it that when we are in need of any help, they just because it is a small country and it has no throw us away at crucial moments, as was done importance? Whatever Government there on the issue of Kashmir. The Prime Minister may be in Israel, we as practical men should was talking of the Western Bloc letting India recognise Israel. We also know that Israel is down. It is ! all very well to say these things, but surrounded by six Arab I countries with a we must also see whether we ourselves are not population of something like 40 million responsible for the situation that has been people, and if we cannot help it, they brought about.

Sir, as far as the question of 3 P.M. „ Hungary is concerned, it is a very important one and it will be coming very soon and some of us would like to know as to what the position of our representative is going to be. I would say in a minute, to sum up, that if we fail and if we let down the public opinion as we did last time, our prestige will go down very much. In the Eastern Economist, 'The Week's Notes', there is a sentence which very well sums up the position and I cannot do better than read it in order to give my real feelings in regard to this issue. It says:

"The Russian aggression provoked the indignation of the entire world. In fact in the history of the world no other nation's fight for freedom excited greater sympathy than that of the Hungarians. It is therefore unfortunate that India apparently should indulge in legal and political niceties, oblivious to a nation's agony and grief, rather than come of bodily into the open and demand the end of Russian aggression in Hungary. This policy does not seem to be based on the dictates of conscience and common humanity, but on opportunism and partisanship. This time, India cannot have even the excuse of being ignorant

Whether our Prime Minister likes that Govern-

4279

of the facts of the case. It has before it now the report of the United Nations' Special Committee on Hungary. If there is any defect in the report, the blame for it lies with Mr. Janos Kadar's Government which obstructed the Committee from getting at the truth. The attitude of India as of any other Afro-Asian country will make known once for all to the free world whether its policy of neutralism does or does not flow from sincere conviction. Let not India lose the opportunity to speak out."

This in a nut shell is the position.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Is it Editorial Notes?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is not. It is from 'Weekly Notes', from *The Eastern Economist*.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Holy of the Holies.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Near home, regarding our relations with Pakistan, I don't know how far a self-respecting nation can go. Pakistan would not save us at any cost. She will continue to hit us at every stage. We would receive hits and tell them "We are your good friends and we will be nice to you." As far as Kashmir is concerned, I don't know *the* agony which the Prime Minister was undergoing this morning in explaining the position of India. He was under great trouble as to why even big nations, obviously friendly nations, are letting down India etc. We have also been told that Kashmir is India and it is part of India. I would very humbly like to know from him as to whether we do treat Kashmir as part of India? I respectfully submit that we don't treat Kashmir still as part of India. \Vt are having most of the difficulties because of this. We consider Kashmir as something not part of India. The other day we passed the Wealth Tax Bill and the Expenditure Tax Bill is

now before the House and I was reading yesterday the Bill. It is written that, this applies to the whole of India except to Jammu and Kashmir. I find it so in many other enactments as well. It is said that the writ of our Supreme Court does not run in Kashmir. We undoubtedly receive chits, which may be inspired, from foreign visitors, to say that condition in Kashmir is first-class; that condition in the Pakistan-held Kashmir is very bad. All these we hear and we give a great deal of publicity to these. I would like to know why some of our eminent Congress people and particularly Shrimati Mridula Sarabhai, who at one time was the General Secretary of the A.I.C.C., a person of her status, send pamphlets practically every day and I receive pamphlets practically every day and I do believe that similar pamphlets are being received by every Member of this august House. . . .

SHRI BHUBANANANDA DAS (Orissa): She is not in the Congress.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That adds to the tonnage of paper that we sell.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: So we would like to know the condition in which people are in Kashmir. She says that there is no civil liberty, there were no proper elections and the Constituent Assembly was a farce and what not. It is high time that our Government put their foot down against their own nationals, the Congress Party people, one who had the opportunity and occasion to be the General Secretary when Mr. Nehru himself was the President of the Congress. When we hear such Congress propaganda

(Time bell rings.)

How many minutes more? I alone speak on behalf of my Party and I understood I was to be given half an hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take 2 or 3 minutes more. You have taken 22 minutes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: So I would like to know why these activities are not stopped, and why we are treating Kashmir as a separate entity, when the Kashmiris are so anxious? My friend Sardar Budh Singh was complaining that they are treated differently and that they have come to take shelter which is not being given. When Maharaja Hari Singh of Kashmir has acceded to India, why Kashmir is being treated as a separate entity and not as part and parcel of India? So the troubles that we are facing are of our own making. If we think that an aggressor has occupied our country, do you mean to say that we should be praying to God to give good sense to the aggressor to clear out? You can take it for granted, as Sardar Budh Singh just now stated, that if our Prime Minister and the External Affairs Ministry do not change their policy, so far as Pakistan is concerned, then we have lost for good at least one-third of Jammu and Kashmir. The Pakistanis are practical people. Even if the U.N. gave a decision in our favour, if the Prime Minister wants to continue his policy so far as Pakistan is concerned, we can never get that part of Kashmir which is under Pakistan's occupation. It is almost a settled fact. We have even given a hint to Pakistan and they have taken it and they are not going to lose their hold.

Regarding Goa also our policy is the same as that of our policy towards Pakistan. It is a matter of regret to say that it appeared that somehow or other, this fear of international reaction, of our being unpopular with others, our falling from the moral virtues, our getting into a relegated position as the moral leader of the world—all these forces have got hold of our External Affairs Ministry. The other day the hon. Deputy Minister in reply to a question said "What can we do? They fire from their territory and if bullets come into our territory, we cannot help it." This amazing statement we heard on the floor of this House and

in other places too. The I.C.B.M. has been invented. Naturally from Russia or America they will fire them on the enemies and then how it would look if they say "What could we do because they have not fired from our territory." I don't understand this. Because of our weak policy, because of our weak-kneed policy or attitude that we have taken, because of the fear that has gone into our bones, they have been encouraged. What is Portugal as compared to India? Look at the audacity that they have. They trespass in our land, they violate our land and air-space, they catch hold of our people and police personnel, carry them away, kidnap them and then we protest, they return and shoot them at random and we protest and protest and it ends there. This is harming our prestige and reputation as a great country.

In regard to international affairs, so far as our interest is concerned, our Government has not safeguarded our interests fully.

Sir, I would sum up by saying that as far as other countries are concerned, we have been successful to a certain extent, but we have been employing two standards. And as far as our national affairs are concerned we have completely failed.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are a peaceful nation and we have adopted a policy of peace and non-violence within and peace without. This policy is rooted in our culture and in our traditions. It is rooted in our religious traditions and this is a policy which serves the immediate interests of our nation. During the past few centuries, Mr. Deputy Chairman, when we were under foreign domination, time stood still in this country and we have therefore, to make up for that lost time. We have to develop and strengthen our nation. And this requires that we do not get embroiled in any war, further that war on a large-scale should be avoided, or at worst, the period of peace should be continued as long as possible.

to-, deputy Chairman, of late war clouds have been gathering in the Middle East. Europe has attained a sort of military equilibrium. The Pacific zone is not of great importance from the military point of view. The Middle East is important for both the power blocs. Through the Middle East pass the arteries of trade and commerce on which depend the economic existence and economic stability of the nations of Europe. In the Middle East we find oil which is the basis, in the opinion of some writers, of modern diplomacy. But the Middle East, fortunately or unfortunately, is also contiguous to what is known as the soft underbelly of the Soviet bloc countries, more especially the U.S.S.R., because in that area, contiguous to the Middle East are located some of the most important power, oil and armament projects of Soviet Russia. Therefore, this area has become the arena of conflict. Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have read of late that Soviet Russia has attained some sort of influence in the counsels of Syria and that they are building up Syria militarily. The nations of the West have also been arming and arming heavily countries which surround Syria and keep her in a sort of iron grip. When we are debating this issue in this House, I am afraid, the U.S.A. is air-lifting and air-dropping tanks and other military supplies in Jordan and the Lebanon is being supplied with tanks by France. We read only a few days back that the U.S. Mediterranean fleet was strengthened and moved 'to eastern Mediterranean. We read at the same time that part of the Soviet fleet passed through the Dardanelles and was now safely berthed in Albanian ports on the Adriatic sea-coast. It seems we are reverting now to gun-boat diplomacy. May be that the men who hold the destinies of these powerful nations in their hands are merely bluffing. May be that they do not mean business. But I am reminded of a quotation from a great writer which says:

"The trouble with foreign affairs today is that you can never tell

whether dictators are clever men bluffing or imbeciles who mean it."

Whatever that may be, in such a situation, anything said or done somewhere may have serious repercussions and the whole world may be set ablaze. Therefore, in the interests of our nation and in line with the policy and the principles that we have been pursuing, the earnest effort of our diplomacy should be to establish stability or at least to help in stabilising the situation in the Middle East.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, it has been rightly pointed out by the previous speaker that one of the factors which disturb the peace in the Middle East is Israel. Israel is an accomplished fact, a *fait accompli*, an established fact, a *fait accompli*, an established Republic of China. It should, therefore, be our endeavour to establish a sort of working relationship between the Arab States and Israel. If the Arab States and Israel cannot practise co-existence it is futile to expect that the powerful nations of the world whose social systems are mutually antagonistic, would practise it or act up to it. Co-existence is a philosophy not only for the big. It should be a working principle also for the small. I would, therefore, again assert and emphasise that our diplomacy henceforth should endeavour to establish a sort of working alliance between the Arab States and Israel.

Secondly, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have to recognise and appreciate that we can be helpful in easing tension in general and in easing tension in disturbed regions if our approach to the problems arising in those regions is marked by restraint. The Prime Minister, in the debate in the Lok Sabha, while defending our attitude on Hungary said:

"But generally we have avoided this business of condemnation whether of big or of small powers, not because we thought we would

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.] gain anything thereby ourselves, but because when one is trying to solve a problem, it does not help calling names. Our efforts, whether in Europe or in Asia have been to create an atmosphere for solution. That has been our approach to all these problems and that is going to be our approach now."

I would, Sir, emphasise and underline these words—"and that is going to be our approach now".

How many minutes more please?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Each Member gets ten minutes.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I thought it was fifteen minutes. Anyway, I will take only another minute or two.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are twenty-two speakers from the Congress side.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: An unrestrained attitude and an unrestrained expression of opinion instead of helping in the solution of issues really complicates them. I appreciate, therefore, the restraint which we have exhibited on the Oman issue. While our friends sitting on the other side—and I find Mr. Bhupesh Gupta now putting on the earphones; he is more attentive now—condemn our attitude as weak and vacillating, I feel that here is an attitude which is dictated alike by prudence and the interests of peace. I wish this attitude and this approach were more in evidence in future.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the policy that the Government of India are following in international affairs is, in the opinion of this House, in the opinion of this country and many other countries, a sound one. Sir, a non-alignment policy has not pleased some of the powers but it is surely not on account of what my hon.

I friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh said about I double standards. If he wants to look for double standards, he has to look elsewhere, not in India. If only India had followed a policy of double standards, today India would have pleased all and everybody would ' have liked India but the very fact that some of the big powers do not like India's policy in international matters shows that India is consistently, unerringly, following a policy of strict non-alignment. Sir, the famous five principles, the Panch-sheel, which our Prime Minister has placed before the world have been pursued by many of the Governments in the world, Governments new and old, Governments big and small. These five principles have been acclaimed by more than three-fourths of the population of the world. If only big powers that count today in the world and in the Security Council had understood India's policy and had respected the five principles which are underlying India's foreign policy, the cold war would not have developed and tensions would have reduced. As everybody knows, and as the Prime Minister said today, the cold war which was expected to go has been fast developing and tensions have been increasing. This, in my opinion, is due to the fact that big powers in the Security Council and the big Western Powers have not placed themselves in the right; in order to inspire confidence and respect in other Governments and in the people of the world, the big powers must place themselves in the ' right. They must have the moral strength to do it but, today, Sir, I am sorry to say that they do not have that moral strength which it is necessary for them to have. I would take the United Nations first. The United Nations, if it is to be respected, if its word should be a command to others in the world, should follow and pursue the right policy. As it is now, It reflects only—I would not say only but shall say mostly—the big powers. The United Nations must reflect all The first drawback, according to me,

is that China has not been admitted to its rightful place. China, which was on the map long before some of the powers of the Security Council were on the map of the world, China, which is the most civilised country, an ancient civilised country, a country which was civilised before any of those people in the new world had even learnt to speak, has been today ignored in preference to a small island called Formosa. How can the United Nations or these big powers convince anybody in the world that have a sense of justice, that they have a sense of fairness? Sir, statesmanship, the logic of facts, loyalty to the principles of the Charter and a sense of fairness requires that these big powers ought to correct themselves and give China her rightful place. Number two drawback in the United Nations-policy is with regard to India. Sir, the House knows that Korea was not a Member of the United Nations but when the Northern forces were alleged to have crossed the 38th parallel, the Security Council met in all haste without anybody asking them to do so and sent the United Nations Emergency Forces into Korea. Here is a case where India is a Member of the United Nations and India brings to the notice of the United Nations the aggression by Pakistan in Kashmir. What does the United Nations do? The United Nations ignores the fact that its own mediator found the fact of aggression by Pakistan to be true but it does not think of asking Pakistan to quit Kashmir. The United Nations does not think of sending its forces to Kashmir to have the Pakistani forces vacated. Sir, today I agree with the Pakistani demand that the United Nations Emergency forces should be sent but not for the same purpose for which they want it but for the purposes of vacating Pak¹³ forces from Kashmir. Why does not the United Nations do that? Today so much is talked about Hungary and they say that in Hungary fundamental rights are being violated and that peoples' movement is being

suppressed. That may be right; if it is so, then it is wrong but, Sir, see what is happening in Kashmir, for instance. In parts of Kashmir, see what is happening. See what is happening in Goa. In Goa, fundamental rights are being suppressed and the whole of Goa has been turned into a torture chamber and people, irrespective of their age, sex, etc., are huddled into these prisons and are tortured. The merchants are fleeced and today there is no rule of law in Goa, but has the United Nations given thought to this question? Of course, this question does not stand on all fours with the situation in Hungary because in the case of Goa nobody has complained to the United Nations whereas in the case of Hungary, a complaint was lodged. That I admit but the fact is that fundamental rights are suppressed here also. Even the United Nations goes a long way to do everything it can to see that the fundamental rights of the people in Hungary are not suppressed but no such thing is done with regard to Goa. South Africa has defied the United Nations and what is the United Nations going to do about it? The treatment of Indians, people of Indian origin, in South Africa was brought to the notice of the United Nations in 1946. A Commission was appointed but then the South African Government non-cooperated. The United Nations again passed another Resolution and still the South African Government did not respect it and finally walked out of the U.N. What has the United Nations done about it? It has kept quiet. When the United Nations wanted the racial question to be examined, South Africa walked out of the General Assembly in 1955 and yet the United Nations has not been doing anything. These contradictions must go if the United Nations has to enforce strict non-interference by nations.

Let us take the big powers. In the case of Britain, for instance, what justification did she have for invading the Suez area? She had no justifica-

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] tion whatsoever. What justification had she to proceed against Oman? No justification whatever and here we find Mr. Malcolm Macdonald saying that twenty-nine nations gained self-determination in the course of these two years on account of Britain. In that case, why not give self-determination to Cyprus also? That they do not think of doing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They are attacking freedom.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: France was one of the powers invading Egypt and I thought France would have learnt a lesson but here is a press statement given by the French Foreign Minister, M. Pineau. He said, "France does not regret her action in Egypt last autumn, but she does regret her failure to occupy the whole of the Canal zone, as such action would probably have prevented what has now happened in the Middle East". In this attitude, how can you command respect from even the smallest people in the world, even the smallest nation?

(Time bell rings.)

I have not even taken ten minutes, j Sir.

R. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken ten minutes.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I want two or three minutes more, Sir. I have, Sir, to leave the other points aside and bring to the notice of my Government one relevant factor and that is this. Sir, propaganda against India has been going on. Our Government, as they are very generous, have been ignoring this anti-Indian propaganda and they have been ignoring the thing merely for the fact that they think people can discern between what is right and what is wrong and therefore no harm is done. But they do not know the vicious force of such propaganda. However discerning a man may be, if such pro-

paganda is constantly dinned into his ears he will come to believe in it. In the world how many discerning people there are, Sir?

I am now bringing to the notice of the Government, Sir, a paragraph which is appearing in a book entitled 'Non-Intervention' written by Thomas and Thomas. This is an American publication, Sir, and the paras will be very interesting to this House. I am sure, Sir, this House will be interested in knowing how clever and vicious that propaganda can be. There are two parts. Please show me some indulgence. Now they say about Goa: "Since the year 1510 three small areas on the west coast of the Indian Peninsula have been in Portuguese hands. These areas are Goa, Diu and Daman—have a total population of 637,846, and are considered an integral part of Portugal. The areas are treated as Portuguese territory lying overseas, and not as a colonial empire, the citizens of these territories enjoying the same rights and privileges as all Portuguese citizens. India has been waging an unceasing propaganda campaign within and without these areas attempting to arouse public opinion to a state of hostility against the lawful Government of the area and trying, by these means, to force Portugal to sign them over to India. Portugal has steadfastly refused to relinquish part of its integral territory and has taken strong counter measures within Goa, Diu and Daman to negate the effects of India's illegal propaganda campaign." It goes on in this strain, Sir, but for want of time I am stopping it here.

Well, Sir, the Government have been allowing admission for all books and all sorts of magazines to enter India. I do not know if the External Affairs Ministry have been following what is appearing in American papers, particularly the 'Time'. There are from time to time scurrilous attacks in that paper against the person of the Prime Minister and against India Government's policy.

I want to humbly suggest to our Government, whatever may be the expense, that they must see that this foreign anti-Indian propaganda is countered. Sir, I read a statement just a few days ago, a statement about France in which the French Government has taken a decision to send one good propagandist to every country just to counter any propaganda against France. I wish that our Government similarly takes such measures, not to carry on propaganda against others or for us but to counter anti-Indian propaganda.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री अन्नवेश्वर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) :
उपसभापति महोदय, वैदेशिक नीति पर जब हम विचार करते हैं तो हमें यह खयाल करना चाहिये कि १९४७ में जब मे कि भारत को स्वराज्य मिला तभी से यह हमारी नीति नहीं है बल्कि जहाँ तक मेरी याददाश्त है १९२७ में मद्रास कांग्रेस में जो नीति हमने अपनायी थी वही नीति विकसित और प्रस्फुटित हुई है। उस नीति में हमने जनतंत्रवाद, स्वतन्त्रता और शान्ति के मन्त्र रखे थे। साथ ही गांधी जी के बताये गये रास्ते का भी, उनके द्वारा बताये गये मंत्र का भी, खयाल रखा कि "self reliance in all activities" आत्मनिर्भरता पर हमने खयाल रखा है। इसी से जब १९४७ में स्वराज्य हुआ तो हमने किसी का दामन पकड़ने के बजाय—चाहे वह अमेरिका का दामन हो या रूस का दामन हो—नानएला-इनमेंट की पालिसी ली और उस नानएला-इनमेंट की पालिसी में सेल्फ रिलायंस, आत्मनिर्भरता की बात थी। वह पालिसी हिन्दुस्तान के लिये एक बहुत पुरानी पालिसी है जिस पर कि हम बहुत पहले से अमल करते आये हैं। तो जब हम वैदेशिक नीति पर विचार करते तब हमें काफी गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये। मैंने इन अमेंडमेंट्स को देखा है जो

कि अभी मूव किये गये हैं। इन तरमीमों को देखने के बाद यह मालूम होता है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के बार बार इस विषय पर विश्लेषण करने पर भी हमारे कुछ भाई यह कोशिश करते रहते हैं कि हम अपने देश को किसी के साथ जोड़ लें किसी ब्लाक में हम चले जायें। इसी बात पर जो थोड़ा सा समय मुझे मिला है वह लेना चाहता हूँ।

पाकिस्तान अमेरिका के ब्लाक में चला गया, उसने मिलिटरी एड ली भी, वह सीएटो में भी शामिल हो गया, तो इससे पाकिस्तान को नुकसान हुआ है, या फायदा इस बात पर हम जरा विचार करें। आज अमेरिका से उसे लड़ाई का बहुत सारा सामान मिल गया हो और वह हमारे लिये भयावह बात हो यह दूसरी चीज है लेकिन आज पाकिस्तान के पांव लड़खड़ा रहे हैं क्योंकि वह कभी अपने पांव पर खड़ा नहीं हुआ। उस देश के अन्दर जितनी गुटबन्दियां चल रही हैं उसका भी विशेष कारण यही है कि उसके नेताओं का ध्यान अमेरिका की तरफ है, अमेरिका के डालर की तरफ है। इसी तरह से और मुल्कों में विशेष कर अरब के मुल्कों में, क्या हालत है? उनका नेतृत्व मजबूत नहीं है और उनके दुर्भाग्य से उनके बीच में कोई श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू नहीं है। आज अरब मुल्कों की क्या हालत हो रही है? कभी आइज़नहोवर साहब अपना वक्तव्य निकालते हैं, कभी "वैकम थ्योरी" निकालते हैं और कभी रूस की तरफ से शेपिलोव साहब—हालांकि अब वह नहीं रहे हैं, चले गये हैं—अपने बयान निकालते हैं। दोनों बड़े बड़े राष्ट्रों की कोशिश है कि अरब इकाई को अपने चंगुल में फांसे और इसी से आज अरब तबाह है। यहां पर जो तरमीमों दी गई हैं वह हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई एक तरफ के हो कर रूस की तरफ के हो कर, देते हैं। लेकिन उनका भी अरब मुल्कों की मदद करने में ज्यादा हाथ नहीं है। जिस तरह से आइज़नहोवर के बयान हैं उसी तरह से इनके भी हैं और इनसे अरब मुल्कों की

[श्री अश्वमेध प्रसाद सिंह]

कोई मदद नहीं हो रही है। हमें इससे सबक सीखना चाहिये। देखिये रूस के ब्लाक में यूगोस्लाविया गया था लेकिन आज वह वहां से चला आया है और स्वतन्त्र है। तो पाकिस्तान में क्या हुआ अरब कंट्रीज में क्या हो रहा है यूगोस्लाविया जिस रूप में रूस के ब्लाक से निकला और १९२७ से हमारी क्या नीति रही है इन सब बातों पर विचार कर के ही हमने नानएलाइनमेंट की पालिसी अस्तित्वार्थ है और अब हमारे लिये यह एक सर्वोत्तम नीति है लेकिन यह पालिसी कोई जादू की छड़ी नहीं है, कोई टेलिसमन नहीं है। हमारे भाई श्री किशन चन्द जी साहब इसको मानते हैं कि हमारा जो वर्ल्ड पीस का सिद्धान्त है जो कि कोएजिस्टेंस और पंचशील पर है वह ठीक है लेकिन फिर कहते हैं कि कामनवेल्थ में क्यों हो और फिर गोआ की तरफ भी इशारा करते हैं। अगर सचमुच हम वर्ल्ड पीस चाहते हैं और हम यह मानते हैं कि पंचशील की जो हमारी नीति है वह एक सर्वोत्तम नीति है तो उससे यह कहां निकलता है कि दुनिया में जो हम चाहें वह हो जाये। गोआ के सम्बन्ध में इसके सिवाय और दूसरा तरीका क्या हो सकता है कि हम लड़ें लेकिन यदि लड़ेंगे तो फिर दुनिया में शान्ति कहां रहती है, पंचशील कहां रहता है। तो इस चीज को हमें जरा गहराई से देखना चाहिये। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने ऐलान किया है कि गोआ हिन्दुस्तान में आयेगा, हिन्दुस्तान में आ कर रहेगा, वह स्वतन्त्र होगा और वहां से विदेशी शासन हटेगा लेकिन इस मामले में हम फौज का इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे। हमारी पंचशील की जो पालिसी है उससे यही चीज प्लो करती है, यही बात निकलती है इसको हमारे मित्र को बहुत आसानी से समझना चाहिये। इसी तरह से पाकिस्तान से हमारा झमेला है। जैसा कि मैंने कहा कि पाकिस्तान तो एक ब्लाक में चला गया है और वहां से बड़ी मदद लेता है, डालर लेता है और फौज भी सामान लेता है लेकिन उनकी हालत

इतने पर भी यह है कि जो वह जम्मू और काश्मीर का पूरा हिस्सा चाहता था वह नहीं ले सका है, इतना चाहने पर भी वह उसको नहीं ले सकता है। इसी तरह से अगर हम किसी पावर ब्लाक में चले जाय तो हम भी नहीं ले सकेंगे और अगर लड़ेंगे तो एक प्रमान युद्ध मच जायगा, दूसरा महाभारत हो जायगा। इसीलिये हम उसको शान्ति से लेना चाहते हैं।

विदेश नीति के ऊपर जब जब बहस होती है तब यही सब अमेंडमेंट्स बार बार आते हैं और जब इनके ऊपर प्रकाश डाला जाता है तो फिर फिर वहां बाने सामने आ जाते हैं। जहां तक देशों के बीच सम्बन्ध है उसमें मतभेद है, राजनीतिक पाटियां हैं लेकिन जहां तक विदेशी नीति का संबंध है इस विदेशी नीति के साथ देश भर के लोग हैं, राजनीतिक पाटियां भी अमेंडमेंट लाती हैं वह युद्ध राजनीतिक मनलव से आता है लेकिन देश भर के लोग इसके साथ हैं और मैं कहता हूं कि इस नीति से हमारे देश का सुरक्षा और समृद्धि है, दुनिया की सुरक्षा और समृद्धि है इस नीति का ठन हो नह हमारे बच्चे पालन करेंगे, हमारे बच्चों के बच्चे पालन करेंगे और इतिहास इन तारीखों के बारे में कहेगा कि हमारे बीच एक श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू थे जो कि ठोक रास्ते पर चले। इस नीति को रखने से हमारे सामने अंत में गौरवमय भविष्य है और इतिहास इस नीति के बारे में जब हम बान करेंगे तो हमें यह कभी नहीं साबितना चाहिये कि हम दायें या बायें जायेंगे। इस मसाले का हम भारतीय चरम से देखना चाहते हैं अमरीका या रूस चरम से इसको नहीं देखना चाहते हैं, हालांकि हम भारतीयों की रूस और अमरीका दोनों के मित्र हैं और रहेंगे, उस हालत में भी जब कि कोई हम से कम मैत्री रखे तब भी हम अपनी ओर से पक्की मैत्री रखेंगे। चीन इतना बड़ा कम्युनिस्ट देश आया और हम डेमोक्रेसी में विश्वास रखते हैं लेकिन सब से पहले हमने

उसको रिकगनाइज़ किया। आज भी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जितना बोलते हैं कि चीन को यू० एन० ओ० में लिया जाय उतना हस का कोई भी नेता नहीं बोलता है क्योंकि हमारी असली दोस्ती है कोई मतलब की दोस्ती नहीं है। तो हम जितना डेमोक्रेसी पर डटे रहना चाहते हैं उतना ही नानएलाइनमेंट की पालिमी पर भी डटे रहना चाहते हैं। इसमें कोई राजनैतिक दाव-पेंच नहीं है, यह हमारी बहुत पुरानी नीति है और मद्रास कांग्रेस से प्रस्फुटित होती हुई यह नीति आई है। इसको हम पकड़ें रहेंगे, हमारे देश के लिये यह एक पत्थर की लकीर है और इसने हम दायें बायें नहीं हो सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am tempted to refer to one or two remarks made by some hon. Members in the course of this debate but before I do so, I would like to touch on two points arising out of the Prime Minister's statement to the House this morning. The hon. the Prime Minister referred to the frustrating experience of these disarmament talks that have been going on during the last few years, especially during the past year. The Disarmament Sub-Committee which has been meeting in London for the last more than five months has dispersed without coming to any agreement. The hon. the Prime Minister also referred to the fact that that particular Committee did not think it necessary even to hear the Indian representative who wished to talk to them on the memorandum which had already been submitted by the Government of India. Of course, they have their own excuses for refusing permission to the Indian representatives. There in the air-conditioned ante-chambers where these big Powers *meet*, India may not be heard, but in this wide world there are millions and millions of human beings who are anxious to

hear India and who lend their valuable support to the stand taken by India on international issues. The hon. Prime Minister has himself said that in all his travels throughout the continent, apart from the official receptions, he has had millions of millions of people coming to hear him, not, as he himself said, as the Prime Minister of India but because India is voicing forth a certain opinion which is absolutely necessary for the world to accept if world peace is to be maintained. Sir, the next session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is about to be held. We here in Parliament have passed a resolution on the question of suspension of nuclear tests and we have made it clear that as a first step in reaching disarmament there must be a nuclear truce—suspension of nuclear tests—and we have also made it clear that this kind of suspension of test must not be made dependent on any other aspects of disarmament political or other. The voice of this Parliament and the voice of the Government of India have been taken up by several countries throughout the world. Only recently the other day there was a conference in Tokyo to which five Prime Ministers had sent their messages. The Chairman of this very House had sent a message to that conference and they have with one voice lent their support to the stand taken by India on this question. Now, when this General Assembly of the United Nations is meeting shortly, I should have expected the Indian delegation to have given notice of a Resolution on this question and tried to secure top priority for a discussion of this issue. Advance publicity is being given to all sorts of questions—Hungary for instance. But this is a question on which we have taken a definite stand and in which millions of people all over the world are interested. We may not be heard by the Disarmament Committee—that packed Committee—but we are being heard and we will be heard by the millions of people and as a positive step in this direction we must do

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.,] something to focus the attention of the world on this very important point in the forum of the United Nations General Assembly.

The second point I have is this. Sir, I had occasion to read the speech of President Nasser inaugurating the first session of the Egyptian Parliament and I was very much struck by a sentence in it. He said that apart from whatever resolutions may have been passed there, the very fact of the convening of the Bandung Conference meant a turning point in history. The hon. Prime Minister this morning and the various speakers later have made it clear that today the international outlook is a bit gloomy and every country in Asia feels that her security is threatened. This talk of making Goa a base for the NATO Powers is a very serious thing and the biggest ever armada sent by any country in the history of this world is being rushed to the Mediterranean threatening the national sovereignty of the Arab nations. I can multiply many such instances. Atomic weapons are being airlifted not only to the Middle East countries but as the Defence Secretary of U.K. said first at Singapore and then in Australia, the Baghdad Pact Powers and the SEATO Powers are being armed with nuclear weapons. So the security of all countries in Asia is threatened at this stage. Of course in the matter of armaments the Asian countries are not strong. We may not be strong, but in the ultimate analysis the will of the millions of people must prevail and more than anything else if some concerted action is taken just to voice the opinion of all these countries of Asia and Africa on this burning question of the day, that voice of the millions will prevail. So I think there is all the need to call a second Bandung Conference. There may not be unanimity but these burning issues which are of vital importance to the world have to be discussed there from this angle and I think this

suggestion of mine must be seriously considered by the hon. Prime Minister.

An hon. Member—I think it was Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray—in his zeal to question the *bona fides* of the Communist Party and its attitude towards Goa, travelled all the way to Brazil and found some Communist Party making some statement. I just asked him about the authenticity of the information and he said that it was reported in the *New York Times*. We on this side of the House are accustomed to this sort of reports especially in the *New York Times*. I only wish that before he thought of attacking the *bono fides* of the Communist Party especially in its attitude towards Goa, he had tried to build up his case on better material than what is available in *New York Times*.

Now, certain hon. Members continue to be deeply moved by the events in Hungary; in fact, some of them do not appear to be moved by any other recent development in the world. I think it was Mr. Sinha who referred to the hon. Prime Minister's statement that the material on which the U.N. Committee's Report on Hungary was based was not complete and the hon. Mr. Sinha himself said that that Committee went there and got all the material but nothing from Hungary nor from the Soviet Union. Now anybody who goes through that Report will find that the whole case is built up on material—unverified material—supplied by emigres living abroad. The case might have been argued out well but on what material and supplied by whom? We know that the refugees who are under Western care are not to be relied upon in their attitude towards the particular happenings. Sir, I do not want to say more about that.

Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to the extreme impropriety of members of Government when they are sent abroad to represent India at official functions indulging in state-

ments which have an intimate bearing on the domestic policies of this country. I too feel very strongly that the hon. Mr. S. K. Patil need not have been sent there to anticipate the decision of election tribunals which are having their session in Kerala today. Those tribunals are still proceeding with their work and at this stage to convey such suggestions is extremely improper. I would not dwell any more on the extreme impropriety of such an action. Then there was the hypothetical question. If there is deterioration of law and order in a particular State, the powers of the Constitution are there. Talking of such hypothetical issues before a world audience while talking to the world Press does not bring credit to our country. I am not referring to this because I happen to come from Kerala. He may like to carry on a domestic war against Communism but when he goes abroad as a representative of India one should have thought—all of us should have thought—that he would have spoken as a representative of India and not as a party man trying to score debating points against rival political parties. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, speakers who have preceded me have spoken in detail about the various aspects of India's foreign policy and I do not want to repeat all those points. I would like to confine myself to only one aspect and one point of the foreign policy. That will be a most important one which the Prime Minister has given as the keynote of today's speech. Disarmament and the United Nations policies are the two great important things of the present day. The world today is in the gravest hour of its peril and crisis. The stockpiling of arms is proceeding at a very rapid pace and soon it will be growing into a great menace. As a matter of fact, fifty per cent of the productive wealth of the world is today diverted to the manufacture of arms and maintenance of armies. The annual arms bill runs to nearly one

hundred thousand million dollars and the armed personnel that are kept militarily trim is supposed to be 20 millions. The bulk of the world's military power is divided between the communist and non-communist countries. The Western Powers have about 8-7 million of armed forces supported by 40,000 to 50,000 planes; and the communists are also supposed to have almost the same. The one great advantage of the Western Powers seems to be their navy. They are having more forceful weapons in the armaments of the nations. In the field of nuclear arms, it is very difficult to assess the strength and the progress of individual nations. But if the detonation of these nuclear weapons is any indication, we will be having a rough idea of the progress and the strength of each country. In the recent past U.S. had nearly 80 to 85 explosions; the U.S.S.R. 30 to 40; and the United Kingdom 12 explosions in their testing grounds. Today we have got knowledge of another great and most potentially harmful weapon in the form of ballistic missiles that are going to be a great menace to this world. They have suggested fanciful names such as 'Nike', 'honest John', 'corporal' and 'Red stone'. These inter-continental ballistic missiles have got a speed of about 15,000 miles an hour and can be launched **from** small bases. Also they can be launched from ships and a surprise war is imminent. The sub-committee of the United Nations has been sitting for the past six months in London and they have postponed their deliberations, and the conference has come to an abrupt end. We were hoping that with the direct interest taken by the heads of the great States of the world we will have a settlement and **that** the world will be free to live in peace and prosperity for ever. But there has been a sudden stalemate and we find in the papers today the U.S.S.R. accusing the United States for the breakdown of the talks; and the United States Senate Disarmament Committee accusing Russia for the breakdown of the talks. But we **are**

[Shri T. S. PATTABIRAMAN.] not interested to fix the blame on one particular nation or one particular individual. We are anxious that this world should not be annihilated, that this world should not be destroyed out of existence, because of the development of these nuclear weapons. It is certain that if a war breaks out it will not be a long-drawn one. The war will not be for three years or five years. It may be brought to an end in the course of two or three hours. The destruction will be complete. The detonation of these nuclear weapons, the fissionable and fusion-able bombs will destroy this world beyond all redemption and beyond all recovery and the world will become one desolate country, as that of the Mars or moon. So the necessity is greater and I am sure that we will have to consider this problem of disarmament immediately and concentrate all our energies on that. The world must be made safe to live in and the responsibility remains squarely on the shoulders of the U.N. The Government of India have always stood for peace and outlawing of war as a means of settling conflicts between nations. Our efforts to localise conflicts in Korea, Vietnam and many other places have earned us the gratitude of the world. Therefore, we must pursue this path of peace and mobilise opinion and support from the neutral countries for the maintenance of peace and outlawing of these weapons. The United Nations session is just now going to start and I am sure the problem of disarmament and the disarmament talks will be looming large before them. Hence, I would like to suggest, rather request that a five-fold approach be made in the United Nations by our delegation. Firstly, stopping of nuclear tests and abandoning further production of all nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles; secondly, destruction of all the existing stock-piles under the supervision of the U.N.; thirdly, facilities for U.N. to have open sky inspection and ground inspection throughout the member countries to spot concealed

bases if any; fourthly, immediate recommencement of the disarmament talks by the U.N. Sub-committee possibly with a larger membership. Today the Sub-committee consists of the United States, the U.K., the U.S.S.R., Canada and France. But a few additions of neutral countries should be there, so that there will be a speedy settlement and there may be also a satisfactory settlement that will be saving the world. Fifthly, insulation of the problem of disarmament from political questions and conflicts, especially of the unification of two Germanys. India gave to the world in the past the message of peace, love and non-violence through its greatest apostles, Asoka, the Buddha and Gandhiji. Today the world is on the brink of a catastrophe and it lies on India's shoulders once again to champion the cause of the peoples of the world and I am sure our Government will rise to the occasion. I earnestly hope and pray that our beloved Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, who will be leading the Indian delegation to U.N. shortly, will take up the crusade for a lasting peace and a lasting civilization. Not only the people of India, not only the teeming millions of Asia, not only the brave people of the so-called dark continent of Africa but all the freedom loving people of all continents will be grateful to them and India for fighting this crusade, perhaps the last chance to save humanity.

SHRI AHMED SAID KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I hope you will agree with me that it is very difficult even to touch the fringe of the question in such a short time. To survey the international situation of the whole world in such a short time is difficult and still I agree with you that you have been forced to put this restriction on time, because there are so many Members who are keen to speak. This very keenness of our Members shows that they are very deeply interested in I foreign affairs and particularly in that part of foreign affairs which concern us closely and touch us very much.

namely, Kashmir and Goa. I am very glad that in this debate so many Members have taken part. This shows the solidarity which is in our House in backing our Prime Minister in his foreign policy. Today the debate has shown definitely that India stands firmly and solidly behind the Prime Minister in supporting his foreign policy. Some friends say sometimes that no progress is being made in foreign affairs. Well, what progress is possible? We have discarded war as a means to settle things and I believe in this country there is nobody who disagrees with us there. There is nobody who will come forward and say that no, let us involve this country into a war. Well, that has been ruled out.

4 P.M.

The other question is negotiation. Negotiation means that both parties should be prepared to negotiate for a settlement. Unilateral negotiation is impossible. Now, take the case of South Africa. Whenever the U.N.O. passed a resolution that there should be negotiations between India, Pakistan and South Africa, we showed our willingness to negotiate. But South Africa was not willing. Then how can we settle these things? I am sure, if Portugal or Pakistan is willing to negotiate things with us, India will be only too pleased to come to a settlement with them through negotiations.

Sir, not India, but some outside papers and press have said that we are not trying to honour our international commitments. Today, our Prime Minister has said this very very clearly, in most unequivocal terms, that we are willing to honour every international commitment. We do not want to repudiate any one. But the United Nations Resolution said certain other things and if we are willing to abide by our international commitments, the other party should also be willing to abide by their international commitments. It is no use others' saying, "As far as we are concerned,

55 BSD—11

we are not going to obey the orders or instructions of the United Nations." And it was definitely said in the Resolution of the United Nations that Pakistan should vacate that part of Kashmir occupied by it and that all their military personnel should go out. But they have not gone out. When they are not willing to withdraw them, it is futile—I think it is very wrong—to say that we are not trying to fulfil our international commitments. One of the members of the Opposition said, "Why blame others? We ourselves are not treating Kashmir as a part of India." And then to prove his case, he said that some of our laws are not applicable to Kashmir. Sir, I am not speaking for the Government, but according to my mind, the present position seems to be correct. Let me remind you, Sir, that after freedom, all these Indian States acceded to the Indian Union. That was the first step. If they had not merged, then many of our laws would not have been applicable to them, although they would still remain a part of India. What I feel is this. When other States merged into India, Kashmir did not merge. But when Kashmir acceded to India, it became an integral part of India and the fact that certain laws are not applicable there does not take out anything from the fact that Kashmir is a part of India.

Sir, as regards the question of Middle East, I will say just a few words and finish. The problem of the Middle East is really the problem of Arabs and Israel and so long as this problem is not solved, there will be no peace in the Middle East. The first duty of all these Big Powers is to concentrate on the solution of the Israeli question as well as the question of lakhs and lakhs of Arab refugees who are homeless in Arab countries. If this question is settled once for all, I think there will be peace and goodwill. If this is not settled, then no amount of effort by the United Nations or any other body will be able to keep peace in the Middle East.

श्रीमती चन्दावती लखनगाल (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज यह माना जाता है कि हमारी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति दो गुटों की राजनीति है और रूस और अमेरिका इन दो गुटों के नायक हैं। आज समस्त दुनिया के देश, रूस और अमेरिका के इन दो गुटों के अन्दर आ जाते हैं और इन दोनों गुटों की विभिन्न विचारधाराएँ हैं। इनकी क्रिया और प्रति क्रिया मिल कर, ऐक्शन और रिएक्शन मिल कर अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति का संचालन कर रहे हैं। लेकिन इसके अलावा एक और दृष्टिकोण है जिसके अनुसार यह प्रतीत होता है कि रूस और अमेरिका इन दोनों की विचारधाराएँ भिन्न भिन्न हैं। इन दोनों का आधार इन दोनों का असूल एक ही है और वह हिंसा का असूल है। रूस और अमेरिका ये दोनों एक ही रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं और वह हिंसा का रास्ता है। हम देखते हैं कि एक ओर अगर एटम बम्ब बनता है तो दूसरी ओर हाइड्रोजन बम्ब बनता है, एक ओर अगर हाइड्रोजन बम्ब बनता है तो दूसरी ओर राकेट तैयार होता है, एक ओर अगर राकेट बनता है तो दूसरी ओर उससे भी भयंकर कोई हथियार ईजाद करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। इस प्रकार अमेरिका और रूस इनकी विभिन्न विचारधाराएँ होते हुये भी दोनों का एक ही रास्ता है और उसके मुकाबिले में यदि कोई दूसरा रास्ता दुनिया के अन्दर है तो वह अहिंसा का ही रास्ता हो सकता है।

श्रीमन् इसमें शक नहीं है कि विश्व की राजनीति काफी समय से युद्धवादियों के हाथ में चली आ रही है। युद्धवादियों का कहना है कि दुनिया के मसले युद्ध के द्वारा ही हल हो सकते हैं और उसके अनुसार काफी देर से बड़े बड़े भयंकर युद्ध होते चले आ रहे हैं। नेपोलियन ने युद्ध किया। उसके बाद कैसर ने युद्ध किया और अपने ही जमाने में एक विश्वव्यापी युद्ध हिटलर के द्वारा हो चुका है। लेकिन परिणाम क्या रहा? इतिहास का यह निर्णय है कि दुनिया के

मसले युद्ध के द्वारा हल नहीं हो सकते। युद्ध युद्धों का अन्त नहीं कर सकता, बल्कि एक युद्ध अपने से भी भयंकर युद्ध की भूमिका तैयार करता है, दूसरे युद्ध की तैयारी के लिये एक क्षेत्र तैयार करता है।

इस प्रकार हम देखते हैं कि इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि आज तक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति युद्धवादियों के हाथ में रही है, लेकिन इसमें भी कोई शक नहीं है कि वह फेल हो चुकी है और इतिहास का यह निर्णय है कि वह फेल हो चुकी है। दो विश्व युद्धों के बाद भी आज विश्व के गगनमंडल पर तृतीय विश्व युद्ध के बादल मंडला रहे हैं और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति की यह भयंकरता इस बात का सबूत है कि युद्धवादियों की अहिंसा की नीति असफल रही है। इसलिए आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि दुनिया हिंसा के अलावा किसी और रास्ते की आजमायश करे और वह रास्ता अहिंसा का ही रास्ता हो सकता है, वह वही रास्ता हो सकता है जिस पर चल कर बापू के नेतृत्व में इस देश ने अपनी आजादी को दस साल पहले प्राप्त किया था और दुनिया के सामने एक नया रास्ता रखा था रक्तहीन क्रांति का। जब से हमारा देश आजाद हुआ है हम अपने प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, के नेतृत्व में दुनिया की अंतर्राष्ट्रीय नीति को एक नया मोड़ और एक नई दिशा देने का प्रयत्न करते जा रहे हैं। अभी तक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय नीति की बीणा से केवल एक ही स्वर निकलता था और वह हिंसा का स्वर था लेकिन हमने इसके अन्दर एक नया स्वर जोड़ा है और वह स्वर अहिंसा का है, मैत्री का है, विश्वप्रेम का है और इस प्रकार हमने अपनी एक तटस्थ, स्वतंत्र विदेशी नीति का अविष्कार किया है। हमारी नीति का आधार अहिंसा है, इसका लक्ष्य विश्व-शान्ति है और इसका नाधन पंचशील है। हमारा दावा है कि दुनिया के जो मसले हैं वे युद्ध द्वारा नहीं बल्कि शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से, मैत्री के सम्बन्ध से,

भाषसी समझौते से भली प्रकार हल हो सकते हैं। लोग कहते हैं और हमारे ऊपर यह आक्षेप लगाया जाता है कि हम बड़े बड़े सिद्धान्तों की बातें करते हैं लेकिन जब अपने मसलों को हल करने की बात आती है तो हम अपने सिद्धान्तों पर अमल नहीं करते हैं लेकिन मैं दो उदाहरण दे कर यह सिद्ध करना चाहती हूँ कि हम अपने मसलों में भी हमेशा अपने आदर्शों के अनुसार चलने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं।

जैसा कि कहा गया, हमारे सामने इस समय दो ज्वलन्त समस्याएँ हैं, एक तो गोआ की और दूसरी काश्मीर की। हम इन दोनों समस्याओं को शान्तिपूर्ण तरीकों से सुलझाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। आपके सामने अभी बतलाया गया और प्रधान मंत्री ने भी आज प्रातः काल अपने भाषण में बताया कि गोआ और काश्मीर के मामले हमारे लिये कितने अहम मामले हैं, गोआ और काश्मीर दोनों ही हमारी मातृभूमि भारत के अविभाज्य अंग हैं और जब तक ये दोनों हमें पूरी तरह से नहीं वापस मिल जाते तब तक हमारी आजादी अधूरी ही रहेगी लेकिन फिर भी, इतना होने पर भी हम यही कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि हम इन दोनों ही समस्याओं को शान्तिपूर्ण तरीकों से सुलझाएँ। हमारा यह सोचना है, हमारा यह विश्वास है कि गोआ की समस्या को हम ठीक उसी तरह से सुलझा सकेंगे जिस तरह से कि हमने फ्रांसीसी बस्तियों की समस्या को सुलझाया है। इसी तरह से काश्मीर समस्या के सम्बन्ध में भी—हालांकि वह दिन पर दिन पेचीदा होती चली जा रही है, हालांकि दिन पर दिन विकट परिस्थितियाँ उत्पन्न होती चली जा रही हैं—हमारी ओर से निरंतर यही प्रयत्न हो रहा है कि हमारे द्वारा कोई भी ऐसा कदम न लिया जाय जिससे कि शान्ति भंग हो। काश्मीर के मामले में हम यू० एन० ओ० के पास गये, सीज फायर को माना और नो-वार डिक्लेयेशन किया,

यह सब इसी लिये किया कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ दुश्मनी करना नहीं चाहते थे। लेकिन इसका परिणाम क्या हो रहा है? उधर से धमकियों पर धमकियाँ हमें मिलती चली जा रही हैं और इसके अतिरिक्त, जैसा कि कहा गया, अमेरिका की सैनिक सहायता ने पाकिस्तान की स्थिति को और भी मजबूत बना कर हमारे सामने एक भयंकर परिस्थिति पैदा कर दी है। लेकिन फिर भी, इन सबके बावजूद भी, हमारा यह दावा है और यह विश्वास है कि अन्त में सत्य की ही विजय होगी और हमारा जो शान्तिपूर्ण तरीका है उसकी धाक दुनिया में बैठेगी।

इसके अतिरिक्त दुनिया के अन्दर जो आज सैनिक संधियाँ हो रही हैं, जो मिलिटरी एलायंसेज हो रहे हैं, उनकी तरफ जो हमारा रुख है वह भी हमारा अपना ही रुख है, स्वतंत्र रुख है और वह दोस्ती का रुख है। यह आप जानते हैं कि हमारा युद्ध में विश्वास नहीं है, हम सैनिक संधियों से, मिलिटरी एलायंसेज से और युद्ध से घृणा करते हैं इसलिये हम मिलिटरी एलायंसेज के नहीं बल्कि पीस एलायंसेज के हामी हैं और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को जब कभी अपने घरेलू कामों से समय मिलता है तो दूसरे देशों के साथ पीस एलायंसेज शान्ति संधियाँ स्थापित करते हैं, शान्तिपूर्ण सम्बन्ध स्थापित करते हैं और उसके परिणामस्वरूप आज दुनिया के अन्दर शान्तिपूर्ण देशों का एक ऐसा मजबूत संगठन पैदा हो गया है कि जिसकी आवाज को दुनिया की बड़ी बड़ी शक्तियाँ भी वज्रन देती हैं।

श्रीमन्, आज दुनिया के जितने मसले हैं उन पर विचार करने के लिये हमने एक नया तरीका, एक स्वतन्त्र तरीका, दुनिया के सामने रखा है। जो मसले सामने आते हैं उन पर हम इस दृष्टि से विचार नहीं करते कि उससे रूस नाराज होगा या अमेरिका खुश होगा। हमारे विचार करने का एक ही

मापदंड है, एक ही कसौटी है और वह यह कि हमारे द्वारा मानवता का सम्मान हो, हमारे द्वारा नैतिकता का सम्मान हो और जहां हम देखते हैं कि न्याय और मानवता पर कुठाराघात हो रहा है विश्व शान्ति को खतरा पैदा हो रहा है, वहां हम अपनी आवाज उठाते हैं और जोरदार आवाज उठाते हैं और इस बात की परवाह नहीं करते कि अमेरिका हमसे नाराज होगा या रूस हमसे खुश होगा ।

श्रीमन् इस प्रकार अपनी वैदेशिक नीति के द्वारा हमने दुनिया को एक नया मार्ग दिखाया है और अपने प्रधान मंत्री के संचालन में चलते हुए हमारा देश इस नीति के द्वारा उन्नति के मार्ग पर आगे बढ़ने का एक बड़ा सफल प्रयास कर रहा है । हमारी प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ी है, हमारा मान बढ़ा है और हम दिन दिन उन्नति के मार्ग पर बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं । इससे अपने देश का ही भला नहीं होगा बल्कि सारे संसार के लिये यही एक नीति है जो कि आज युद्ध की विर्भाविका से त्रस्त मानवता को, पीड़ित मानवता को, मुक्ति प्रदान कर सकती है ।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो प्रस्ताव प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा रखा गया है उसका मैं हार्दिक समर्थन करती हूं ।

SH

RIMATI K. BHARATHI (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, whatever may be our problems and burdens, we have always felt happy whenever the frontiers of freedom have extended in any part of the world. Thus the dawn of freedom in Malaya makes us happy. It brings cheer and joy to us. Let us send our greetings and best wishes to these newly emancipated people. So also the news that in British Guiana free elections were held and Dr. Chedi Jagan and his party which came out victorious are allowed to form their Government is a welcome one.

But, Sir, with the evolution of the 'ultimate weapons' humanity seems to be passing through a phase of penultimate destruction. Today, people say that Hitler with whom Chamberlain shook hands at Munich and Stalin across Poland, was a mad man, with a mania for destruction. It was he who started on the road to the atomic weapons. Now those on whom the legacy of Hitler has fallen seem to have perfected atom for the annihilation of mankind. And I wonder, Sir, whether the men at the helm of modern nations have not inherited Hitler's madness as well as perfected it too. Sir, at least one thing can be said that the working of their mind is not in tune with the requirement of this age.

Sir, the greatest powers are manoeuvring against each other, the weak and small nations being the pawns in these games. The U.S.A. is trying to encircle the U.S.S.R., with military bases from which atomic weapons can be brandished. But it seems that the U.S.S.R., has gone ahead now with inter-continental ballistic missiles, and there is no need for any more bases for them. The U.S.S.R., had been sowing some form of discord among the Western Powers and wooing or weaning away from them their Sheikhs and Sultans and other allies. Today the Middle East is rife with these manipulations. Heat in and around Syria seems to have risen to a very high degree and we find sparks coming out of Oman and Yemen. Persia and the whole Peninsula of Arabia floating on oil is highly inflammable. Any moment the sparks that appear here and there can touch off a great explosion which can eventually blow up the whole world.

Sir, British industry and her economic life are mainly built upon the oil resources of the Middle East. The Suez Canal is a vital life line to them. The U.K. as she has evolved through the last two or three centuries has to manufacture and trade or to perish. One cannot but fight like a wild cat when one is driven to a tight corner

and held at bay. In fact, Sir, something like that seems to be the position of the U.K. The newly awakened nationalism in the erstwhile colonial countries has suddenly become conscious of the accumulated injustice of centuries and age-long suppression. They are highly surcharged with emotion, an emotion which can be so blind as to drive them into the lap of a 'New Master'. There are powers ready to take advantage of them. All those things create a riddle, so puzzling, so complicated that it may be a hard nut to crack. What is happening in South Africa? Worse things are happening there, we are told. Elsewhere, also the domiciled European community wants to suppress the original inhabitants, or rather the sons of the soil and Asians who had migrated and settled down there. A war of annihilation is going on in Algeria. Moderation may be necessary in the case of the extreme nationalists, who may have become intolerant of the European domiciled. But a modern outlook is needed on the part of the European settlers and Nations as well. The domiciled men want to dominate over the sons of the soil. They have dominated over them for decades, nay even centuries, and exploited them. The memories of the past have created certain psychological conditions both among the Europeans and the Africans which makes the problem more and more complicated.

Sir, European politics still continues to be of immense significance, as far as the problems of the world are concerned. With the elections round the corner, West Germany has assumed great importance. Even otherwise she occupies a pivotal position as regards the peace of the world is concerned. Unification of Germany and her non-alignment are of extreme significance. Moscow speaks of confederation and Western Powers speak of free elections and unification. Moscow wants neutralisation and Western Powers longingly look at a united Germany, occupying a pivotal position in the N.A.T.O. A non-mili-

tarised neutral Germany, united through free elections, may be the right solution. But the Great Nations are in no hurry to solve the problem, it seems.

Sir, India with her past experiences of colonialism with her past history of a determined and successful struggle for freedom, with her present policy, devoid of any bitterness arising out of the past, with her conditioning under one of the greatest of men, humanity has ever produced, with her present leadership, full of the sense of history, and world perspective, is pre-eminently fitted to play a role, in the reconciliation of conflicting interests and unravelling the most ramified of situations.

Of course, although devoid of atomic weapons, lagging behind industrially, her words have now and then, lit up the horizon, when the world seemed to be hopeless, enveloped in dismal darkness. India has brought into the world community a new value. In olden times nations seemed to brandish their swords openly and felt elated by that. 1 Now at least this much of change we note. They may mean war, but they speak only in terms of peace. They may organise peace conferences, but they perfect inter-continental ballistic missile. How funny it is that now they speak of banning ultimate weapons! They speak of people's democracy though they mean only to subjugate other peoples! Secretly they may be proud of their power for perfect destruction. But at least openly they are ashamed of war. Hitler and Mussolini w*re openly militarists. They sang hymns in praise of Mars. But the great Nations who laid them low to a large extent, seem to have inherited their unholy Ghosts. Yet they don't openly speak their language. When a nation feels ashamed of a thing, it may work its way to hope and in our own humble way, we have contributed to this change of value. (*Time bell rings.*) Can I have a few more minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only one minute more.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: But in spite of the compliments now and then paid by the Western Nations, they seem to dislike India, if I may say so. In fact more than any, they need the good offices of a Nation like India to extricate themselves from the many false positions in which they have landed themselves. Western Nations speak of democracy. If they really want to win the battle for democracy, they must fight the battle with ideals and not with armaments. Because of this race of armaments, the so-called democracies are losing the battle for people's hearts and ideals. Wherever they fought it with ideals, they have won it, as in India in the first round. Free India became a friend of the British, though not an ally. That was the reaction of the other nations also, where freedom was conceded. But I am afraid in the second round of the battle, the Western Nations are losing.

By refusing to stand firmly on the side of justice, in the Kashmir question, and promoting the intransigence of Pakistan, the Western Nations have materially injured Pakistan and have emotionally estranged Indians. So also by encouraging Portugal to cling on to that little bit of Indian territory of Goa, or arming Pakistan up to the teeth, the Western Nations are not going to win the hearts of one-fifth of the human race that inhabit this land of ours. I don't hesitate to say that it is a pennywise and pound foolish game. When Pakistan cries hoarse by shouting Jihad, if U.S.A. puts arms into her hands, how can anyone mistake it as a friendly act towards us? We should be fools to believe that. Perhaps U.S.A. wants us to be deluded, that the arms are to fight international communism. But Pakistan has declared 'No Jihad' against Russia and China. For the last 10 years, Pakistan has been perpetuating aggression against Indian territory in Kashmir. Giving arms to Pakistan is definitely not an act of friendliness to us . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Madam. Shri Kishen Chand.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, an hon. Member criticised that the Opposition brings forward amendments year after year worded almost in the same way. May I point out to him that in my amendment I have said 'That this House fully supports the fundamental principles of foreign policy of our Government'. But in carrying out that foreign policy, I beg to submit, there are certain interpretations of that foreign policy which are not consonant with the fundamental principle. Unless and until we discuss among ourselves the principles, it is not possible to evolve something better and more suited to the conditions of the world. The hon. Prime Minister began this morning with the disarmament conference. I think that last year when the Summit Conference was held at Geneva, the world was nearest to the attainment of the ideal of peace. There were great hopes and expectations that we shall move forward in the direction of greater co-operation among the Great Powers of the world but it is surprising that the events of the last one year have slowly and gradually diminished that co-operation between the Great Powers. There was first the venture in Suez Canal. Then it was followed by a long drawn-out disarmament conference which began in the early part of this year. It has been dragging on but side by side there have been events happening in Cyprus. There was a new election in America and the President was re-elected. After that there has been a slight change in the American foreign policy. There is a Mid-East Doctrine. 'Egypt and Syria approached the Communist countries for their arms aid. The Western Bloc's arms are being given to nations round about Syria, namely, to Jordan, Lebanon etc. We hear now that arms are being given to other Mid-East countries. The result is that the disarmament conference, more or less, fails and each side says that the

move must come from the other side. Thus a stalemate has been reached. Every big bloc is now concentrating on supplying arms to the Middle Eastern countries, to Syria or Lebanon and we are entering into a much greater arms race than before. An hon. Member has pointed out that the combined expenditure on armies in the whole world is Rs. 50,000 crores a year, which means some ten times our Second Five Year Plan. Every year the nations of the world are spending Rs. 50,000 crores on this armament race and in maintaining the armies. If only 5 per cent, of that amount was spent in the industrialisation of the backward and underdeveloped countries, that would have been a greater security for world peace than this supply of arms to the under-developed countries.

The hon. the Prime Minister said that when he went to Europe last year, he was enthusiastically welcomed by the peoples of the nations which he visited, not because of his personal greatness, but because he stood for the ideal of world peace. He tried to indicate that there was intense desire in the world, at least in that part of the world which he visited, for world peace. Yet these nations could not bring any pressure on their, governments for the attainment of their objective of peace. They go on spending large sums of money in this arms race, to which there seems to be no end. The ultimate weapon has been more or less found in the ballistic guided missile with the nuclear head. The result of all this is that the condition of the world today is one of great turmoil and the prospects of peace, the prospects of world peace have receded further.

Sir, in this context, we have to examine what should be our policy. We are a weak nation as far as military power is concerned. So we can only be silent spectators and see the grim tragedy progressing. The hon. Prime Minister, some two or three years back had a great status in the world and my submission is that he

did not utilise that opportunity for creating in the world an area of peace. The Bandung Conference was called and it passed certain resolutions and the matter ended there. We did not follow up the Bandung Conference with greater efforts to combine the nations of the Middle East, the nations of Africa and other East Asian countries in order to bring them together to form a big bloc of peace, not a warring bloc like the U.S.S.R., or the U.S.A., but a group of nations wedded to the ideal of peace. But we permitted that opportunity to slip away and that opportunity is gone. Now we can only just be spectators.

The hon. Prime Minister said that we do not want to pose as leaders. But some time back we have been sending as our representatives persons who have administered advice to other countries whether it was wanted or not wanted. Of course, we are adopting a better attitude now, a better attitude of keeping quiet, of keeping silent and not expressing our opinion unless the matter is very urgent or we are sitting in a conference as a member where we have to express our opinion. This is a correct attitude. However, the injury has been done, during the past two or three years by expressing unwanted advice. By giving expression to our opinions we have created more enemies than friends and any prestige we had built up is, more or less, gone.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Who are our enemies please, except Pakistan?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If there are no enemies of ours, there are no friends of ours. We are creating enemies by misleading our friends. I will not call even Pakistan an enemy of our country, but say that they are misguided by their leaders.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Misguided friends.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: We have become a friendless country. We have no friends because of our policy.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): I would say we have no enemies.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The point is that we are now only silent spectators of events in the world.

Coming next to matters nearer home, I shall deal with our relationship with Pakistan and our relationship with the Portuguese government in the matter of Goa. Sir, in this matter also, I feel that things have been drifting for the last ten years. In the affairs of nations as in those of men, opportunities arise and if you do not take advantage of a particular opportunity but let the opportunity slip away, you have to bear the consequences.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have more friends now than at any time in history.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Opportunities were there during the period from 1948 to 1952 and if we had made any proper efforts for solving the problems of Kashmir and Goa, they would have been solved a long time back, even before 1952. But from 1952, after the end of the Korean war and our interference and our expression of opinion on Korea, since that time, slowly and gradually we went on losing our friends and we have missed the opportunity. If we had tried to settle these things in 1952 we could have done it. I have been wondering what is the cause of our delay, of our postponing things from time to time. I think that as some of the advisers of the Prime Minister come from regions which are remote from the areas of turmoil, and they come from Kerala, a State which has had peace and tranquillity for 2,500 years, so those people do not realise the turmoil and the struggle through which northern India has passed in the days of the struggle for freedom and in the time of partition. The people of northern parts of India, who had lived through the days of partition, can only realise the great suffering that

the refugees who have come and migrated from Pakistan and the refugees who are now migrating from East Pakistan have continually to face. The result is that we have a policy of "Wait and see." We go on waiting without taking any action. Some friends ask, "What could we do in Goa? Do you want us to go to war over Goa?" Well, I certainly do not want that. I never said it. But the point is, we won our freedom through Satyagraha, by an unarmed people and thus we could get freedom for Goa. There were thousands and thousands in India who were directly connected with the people residing in Goa and were prepared to go as unarmed friends for the freedom of their brethren. Our Government came in the way and they positively stopped unarmed people going to the rescue find help of their brethren in Goa.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): But that would have been invasion.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Could we have wrested our freedom from the British without such a struggle? I do not see why if similar . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of information, Sir. Was my hon? friend Shri Kishen Chand one of the men who volunteered to go to Goa sometime back?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I submit, Sir, that here we do not discuss individuals and my own personal life- is not under discussion. I am only saying that people were prepared and they would have done it. But our Government said that we are doing everything necessary, that we are going to liberate Goa within six months or in a year. I can produce the statements of the Prime Minister in this House to the effect that steps are being taken for the liberation of Goa and that it will be accomplished very shortly. But the thing has been dragging on. Every six months similar statements are made and nothing is accomplished.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): What do you suggest should be done?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I had suggested, and the people had suggested live years ago, that they would be willing to offer Satyagraha and liberate their brethren in Goa. They would have done it but we stopped it.

Now, Sir, take the case of Kashmir. We talk about Kashmir and the Prime Minister was very sad today about the continuous calumny and wrong propaganda that is being carried on by Pakistan against India. We also feel the sorrow that was caused to the Prime Minister, but here also, I submit, we have allowed things to drift on. Before Pakistan was receiving arms aid from the U.S.A., she would have been in a better mood to conciliate with India, to come to terms with India, but when they started getting military aid from the U.S.A., they wanted to talk from a position of strength. Now, they are not prepared to discuss with India and they are not prepared to come to terms with India because they think that they are getting military aid and they will become stronger. When they become stronger, they might threaten India. The hon. Prime Minister had to admit that in spite of the urgent needs of the second Five Year Plan, we had to divert large sums of money and of foreign exchange, for the purchase of war materials, armaments, jet planes and the like, and we had to divert it because the security of India is more important than anything else. But, did we do anything in 1950? In 1949, the Resolution was passed by the United Nations but did we fix a time limit that within this period either Pakistan demilitarises or the matter ends there. We went on keeping it open, pending, and all these negotiations took place. Some Administrators came and some deputations came, somebody came and we went on negotiating but, is this the way of deciding matters?

I will give you one example. Take the case of the public debt of India

at the time of partition. Was it not essential that when India took over the responsibility of the entire public debt, that some portion should have been apportioned to Pakistan? No; in the partition deed and in the Government of India Act, there is no mention about the public debt and the hon. Finance Minister made a state-merit in this House only a few days back in which he said that he assumed that because the population of Pakistan was such and such percentage of the total population of India, the same percentage ought to have been the portion of the public debt of Pakistan. I am surprised, Sir, that for ten years we have kept quiet about it. We had been showing in our accounts that Pakistan would pay nine crores whereas Pakistan had been assuming in their accounts that it would be five crores. There is no communication between India and Pakistan about this matter. Now, let us come to the other matter about canals using, river waters, waters of the three rivers. Progress on the Indian side is stopped and yet we go on negotiating with Pakistan, giving them time, extension and so on while, at the same time, the demands of Pakistan go on rising. First of all, it was for canals which were going to be linked to the three rivers of Punjab but they want storage of water. There is dispute about the quantity of water to be stored and they want to construct very big dams so that they can get Rs. 200 crores from India for storage dams. Is it ever possible to negotiate with a country like that? We go on giving them opportunity after opportunity. Only a year and a half back, our Prime Minister, in a very accommodating mood made a statement that if Pakistan approaches, he will be prepared to agree to the cease fire line as the dividing line. I beg to say that this type of loud thinking, without considering the consequences of the statements that are made, does lot of injury to our country. I submit, Sir, that the principles of our foreign policy are good but, as has been pointed by my friend, Mr. Sinha,

[Shri Kishen Chand.] in the matter of Hungary and in the matter of so many other things, our attitude has not been correct. In the matter of the Suez Canal dispute, our attitude was correct but in the case of Pakistan, Goa and Kashmir, our policy has been a vacillating policy with the result that today we have got difficult problems before us and, unless we change our foreign policy, these difficulties will go on multiplying.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I heard Mr. Kishen Chand speak, I wondered whether he was really approving the main principles of our foreign policy or indicting the men who were carrying out that foreign policy. He has overstated, as is customary with him and with his party, the case against the execution of our foreign policy. One of the many things that Mr. Kishen Chand said was that we had not built up a sort of a third force in the world, that we were not functioning as a third military bloc. He did not exactly use that word but that was the idea that he wanted to convey. Assuming that there is unity in the Asian-African bloc on all questions—it is not a big bloc industrially or economically or militarily speaking—how can that bloc, of such a character, function as a third bloc? All that we could hope to do under the existing state of the world was to function as an objective force in world politics. Our claim is that we bring to bear upon the questions that come up before the United Nations—our loyalty is to the United Nations Charter—an independent mind. I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that claim can be justified by looking at our record in the United Nations. Time will not permit me to go into all those questions. Take the question of the Middle East. That question is complicated by Imperialism in the Middle East. You have the oil interests there. The colonial powers have created Israel in the midst of the Arab world, surrounded by the Arab countries and no solution has been found for the refugee pro- i

blem there. You have the Baghdad Pact countries. They are receiving assistance from certain big powers. Why then do you wonder if Syria looks after her own interests and turns to the Soviet world for aid? I do not know whether it has turned to the Soviet world but, on the assumption that it has turned to the Soviet world for aid, I do not think imperialists can indict Syrian politicians for doing so while they themselves have created this problem. You have not contained communism; you have encouraged communism in these lands.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say a word or two about the disarmament problem. I was greatly disappointed with the deadlock at the Disarmament Conference but I think the basic reason for that failure is the desire to put in the forefront political issues. The question of German reunification is a very difficult question, and a united Germany may be possible in a disarmed Europe; it may not be possible in an Europe divided into two military blocs. Therefore the utmost effort should have been made to solve the disarmament question, and I do hope that this deadlock is a temporary one.

I would like, Mr. Deputy Chairman, now with your permission to say one or two words about Kashmir and Goa. We have in Pakistan a Prime Minister who has been indulging in a language of hostility against this country. He had the audacity to call our Prime Minister an international criminal. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not know whether it would be proper on my part to call the Prime Minister of Pakistan a moral leper. I venture to think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that a man of Mr. Suhrawardy's antecedents, a man of Mr. Suhrawardy's character, a man of Mr. Suhrawardy's habits of mind, his Hollywood outlook on life, a man of that type, a man of that character is not fit to hold the position of Prime Minister of a neighbouring country, and it is a great tragedy that a great people like the people of Pakistan should be submitting to the

rule of a man like Mr. Suhrawardy. I would like also to say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that we get in this country people who call themselves friends of India. They are supposed to be Liberals. I have great admiration for the American people and the American Liberals in particular and what I want to say was that I was reading only this morning, Mr. Deputy Chairman, a book and here is what a certain lady who has been visiting India, and this city in particular, has to say about the Kashmir issue. You will find her love of truth very well exhibited in this paragraph. The book written by Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean entitled. *The Nature of the Non-Western World*:

"The historic issue which divides India and Pakistan and, in 1948, brought them to the verge of war, is the future of Kashmir, a princely State, at least four-fifths of whose population are Muslims, but whose ruler at the time of partition, Maharajah Singh, was a Hindu. Singh found it difficult to decide in 1947 whether to link his State to India or Pakistan. The decision was made for him, on the one hand, by Hindu riots against Muslims, which brought Pakistan warriors from the militant Punjab, armed with weapons from Pakistan to invade western Kashmir, where they set up a State known as Azad Kashmir, with its capital at Muzzafarabad; and on the other by the Indians, who in retaliation, sent in troops which still occupy the State of Kashmir, with its capital in Srinagar. Fighting between the two contending forces was averted by the establishment of a cease-fire line under the United Nations' auspices, which since then has served as the frontier between Pakistani-influenced and India-influenced Kashmir, with the State divided on a prolonged temporary basis somewhat like North and South Korea, or North and South Viet-Nam."***

(Time bell rings.)

She goes on to say many other things, but there is no atom of truth in this

statement on Kashmir affairs. We have put our case before the Security Council in the speeches which were made by Mr. Krishna Menon. I would like this case, Sir, to be presented to the public of the world in a simple pamphlet, which we can distribute to all the nations of the world, wherein the main facts of the Kashmir dispute are set out. The main facts are simple; Kashmir's accession to India, Pakistan's invasion of Kashmir, the Resolution of the 13th of August in which the Security Council laid down certain terms which so far as we are concerned we have always been willing to comply with but which Pakistan has not complied with.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I shall just finish, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Of course it is a very big subject and one can go on talking for a long time about it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wanted to say something about Goa. I think this question of Goa is very very important from the point of view of our future defence, and I was glad that the Prime Minister made a pointed reference to it. These visits of Mr. Suhrawardy to Portugal are of a very disturbing nature and I do not know whether there is any deal going on between the Portuguese Government and the Government of Mr. Suhrawardy. Let us make it clear that we want to be friends with all the countries of the world. Though we have every desire to remain within the Commonwealth, though we have every desire to be on the friendliest terms possible with the great people of the United States, there are certain things we shall not tolerate. Those things we shall not tolerate because they go vitally against our interests. We shall not tolerate Goa to be converted into a base in its country, happen what might. Let there be no mistake on that point and let there

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] be no surrender, let there be no com-cromise on that issue.

Thank you very much.

DR. ANUP SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say just a few words about some of the remarks made by the opposition.

My friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, said that we have two standards, two moral standards by which we judge international issues, and unfortunately he gave an example which, I think, is utterly untenable. He said on the one hand we persistently advocated that China should be recognised and admitted to the United Nations whereas we are very reticent and reluctant to recognise Israel. I am really surprised at that analogy. Israel—I do not want to go into the merits of the case—was improvised and planted in a hostile world and India's reluctance at that time v/as well-meaning and could be understood. China is a great country and not to recognise China and admit her into the United Nations is certainly wrong from every point of view.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is exactly my point.

DR. ANUP SINGH: I see no contradiction there. Your point was that we were guilty of contradiction.

Shri Kishen Chand said that on the one hand we have been mere spectators whereas we should have been more effective, and at the same time he says that we are friendless. I think that he was objecting to our making too many speeches on giving recognition, but how could we be merely spectators, silent spectators and at the same time go round and advise people, as he contends, that we have been doing?

As for the world situation, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to deal with only two points, the disarmament conference and the situa-

tion in the Middle-East. Naturally I have to just skip over the ground because the time is very limited. About the disarmament conference I feel, Sir, that this Disarmament Sub-Committee from its very inception, on account of its composition could not have held forth any great promise of success. It is no use blaming anyone at this stage but I do feel that an honest effort should be made once again to revive this committee. It has not collapsed; it has only adjourned. I think it should be expanded to include other powers, because the question of nuclear weapons does not affect primarily or exclusively only those who are capable of producing these weapons. They are the concern of every man, woman and child on this earth. I would therefore suggest that some other powers, possibly from different regions, should be included.

5 P.M.

Secondly, I would say that perhaps the ideal solution is that the United Nations General Assembly should take up this matter. The United Nations Assembly, with all its shortcomings, is a world forum which has a commendable record of many achievements. It commands the respect of most of the people and I think if the United Nations Assembly were to ban the test and manufacture of atomic weapons perhaps as a second step, this will be a great moral victory because anyone who would dare to violate it, will have the moral stigma of being the aggressor. That is one specific suggestion that I am making.

As for the situation in the Middle East, I think Mr. Loy Henderson who is the expert trouble shooter is absolutely correct when he says that the situation in Syria is rather serious; in fact it is extremely serious. It might have serious effects on the security of the whole free world. What exactly are the issues there? Again without being able to go into details, I would say that the same attempt is being made to browbeat Syria and to put pressure on her to

change her independent neutral policy as was done in the case of Egypt. The pattern is exactly the same; excuses may be slightly different. Fortunately for us the attempt in Egypt failed and I have no doubt in my mind that whatever may be the seeming and temporary success of the new policy in Syria in the long run it is bound to fail because in the Middle East today the issue is that of nationalism. I happened to be in Egypt for about a month, only a short while ago. Those people are busy building up their country; they are going through the same mental process or evolution as we are going through. I had the great privilege of interviewing President Nasser. At one stage rather reluctantly I said, 'Sir, you have been called a Communist.' He smiled and shrugged his broad shoulders and said, 'Mr. Singh, I go round asking for wheat, willing to buy food. Certain Powers—I do not want to name them—not only refuse to sell food to me but they tell other people also not to sell to me. So in sheer desperation I turn to the Soviet Union and they make an honourable deal without any political strings. What am I supposed to do—let my people starve? If I accept that—not help but something paid and bought on a business transaction—I am immediately called a Communist. I am very much used to it; in fact, I have become immune to such characterisation.' It is being said that there is Communism in Syria. Certainly there are certain political parties, small ones, which are extremely radical but I do not think that these present attempts are going to help anyone. There is no Communism in the Middle East; at least not that I can see because those people are sick and tired of armed intervention. They have memories of very ugly and bad days as we have. (*Time bell rings*). I saw many projects in Egypt and I was told that the same thing was happening in Syria. I think the greatest danger in this part of the world is not Communism but the Eisenhower doctrine and if our great

friends, the Americans, could be induced to see that Communism is not the issue in the world today but there are much larger issues, the issue of disarmament, the issue of nationalism, the issue of self-determination and right of the people to live their own lives, I think if the Americans and the Western Powers could be induced to see this and to reorientate their outlook and to help the naturally backward people, they will be making a much larger contribution than what they are supposed to be doing at present.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): Sir, I should like to limit my observations to only one or two topics. The first topic is Kashmir. I have made some study of this question and I think that the so-called demand for plebiscite is not at all binding on India. It has no legal basis. I should like to quote the opinion of a distinguished jurist who is a Member of our Law Commission. He has stated that "under the law the Government may accept or refuse the instrument of accession but the law does not give it any authority to accept it conditionally or provisionally. The condition of plebiscite relied upon was beyond the powers of the Governor-General and while India may accept that as a matter of goodwill, it has no legal effect and as such cannot be accepted by the International Court as a legal obligation."

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: But the question does not arise now.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Plebiscite is being insisted on as a legal provision.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: It does not arise now; why should we talk about it?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: While on this subject I wish to say that the plebiscite is only a moral commitment on the part of India.

[Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.] My second submission is, once there is accession it is final; it cannot be followed by secession under international law. As we all know, U.S.A. went to war on this very issue because Abraham Lincoln would not permit the Southern States to secede from the Union. Therefore so far as accession is concerned, it is final. When this offer of plebiscite, or rather the proposal for the ratification of the accession by the people of Kashmir, was made by Lord Mountbatten he also made it more or less as a sort of moral commitment because he attached some conditions to the way by which the expression of the will of the people of Kashmir could be ascertained. He suggested four methods for ascertaining the wishes of the people. The first is referendum, secondly elections, third plebiscite and fourthly a representative public meeting where the people could assemble and express their wishes. Now, this proposal of plebiscite was offered to whom? This was offered to the people of Kashmir and therefore according to my reasoning this is now a purely domestic issue between the Kashmiris and India. So far as this domestic issue is concerned, it has been solved very satisfactorily by the vote of the Constituent Assembly which was elected on the basis of this very issue.

As regards Lord Mountbatten's conditions, as I said, he suggested four methods, including a representative public meeting for ascertaining the wishes of the Kashmiris. Pakistan has no part at all in this and even Lord Mountbatten used a famous expression. His first condition for the ascertainment of the wishes of the people was that "the soil of Kashmir must be cleared of the invader." These are the actual words used by Lord Mountbatten and therefore those who are now waxing eloquent on the necessity of plebiscite so far as India is concerned, they are absolutely in the wrong. I wish to say further that even if plebiscite was a legal proposal, I venture to think that the

Kashmiris have already written their verdict in blood. At the time when the whole of Kashmir was being invaded by the Pakistani tribal raiders, how did the Kashmiris behave? They did not fraternise with the so-called Army of liberation sent by Pakistan to Kashmir. If they had fraternised at that time of battle, there would have been an end of the matter and Kashmir would have been automatically annexed to Pakistan. But the Kashmiris fought to a man. In that connection I would like to quote from a very vivid description given of this invasion by Sheikh Abdulla in his own inimitable words. He says: 'It was not an ordinary type of invasion. The tribesmen attacked the State in thousands, killed, burnt, looted and destroyed whatever came their way and in this savagery no section of the people could escape. Even the monks and nuns of the Catholic Mission were either killed brutally or maltreated. At this supreme hour of crisis the entire people of Kashmir had risen like a solid barrier against the invaders.' So, my point is that this first expression of plebiscite in Kashmir is recorded in blood, and not in ink and writing. Therefore, no power on earth has any right now to insist that the Kashmiris must go through another process of plebiscite and when the conditions have changed. Now, Sir, at this moment, when the Kashmiris were fighting, Mahatma Gandhi sent round his message of hope. He recalled the heroism of the Spartans in the battle of Thermopylae and he recounted the glorious day which witnessed the formation of a national united front joined by the Sikhs, Hindus, Muslims and all the communities in Kashmir. Therefore, there was really presented a united national front from among the Kashmiris against these invaders. So, my view is this that if some European statesmen are obsessed with the idea of a plebiscite, they should be told this primary fact that plebiscite was written in blood at the time of the invasion of Kashmir by the Pakistanis.

(*Time bell rings*). My last point is this that Pakistan has not merely been carrying on a sort of an undeclared war against India, but by creating this refugee problem and keeping it up on a colossal and increasing scale, Pakistan has made India spend about Rs. 200 crores on the rehabilitation of refugees. This is a sort of undeclared war that has been pursued by Pakistan against India. We have been very much drained of our resources, valuable resources, which we could have utilised otherwise. The refugee problem is only the creation of Pakistan and the whole world is keeping silent about this issue. The Pakistan State is morally and politically bound to observe all the decent, civilized obligations with reference to the treatment of minority communities. The Hindus and Sikhs, both in the East and West Pakistan, have been squeezed out of that State, because they happened to have different religion. And lastly.... (*Time bell rings*)—I just want only one minute—about the military aid that the U.S.A. has given to Pakistan. The military aid has cost India indirectly just now a vast sum of Rs. 50 crores, which have been withdrawn from the meagre resources that are available for our Second Five Year Plan. So, the American authorities must take the consequences of this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. Prof. Malkani.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, we meet in this Parliament to discuss foreign affairs every quarter just to take stock of what has been happening. And when I take stock in my own way, I think it is a fairly good stock. When I turn round and even look at Kashmir, in a way, the thing does not appear to me tragic. We have put our case about Kashmir, after all, simply, clearly and firmly. I am sorry to say that we did not do it before. Today we talk in terms which everybody can understand, people of the world can understand. Only Pakistan does

■* not understand. Today we say very clearly that there was aggression. It is a continuing aggression and the military strength of Pakistan is growing in geometrical proportion. And today we see Pakistan is seething with hatred. All the conditions are there which I have described now. Today the conditions for a plebiscite do not exist at all. Sir, I only wish that we are able to put our canal waters dispute on as clear and on as firm a basis, so that there should be no vagueness about it at all. Generally we write a great deal and talk a great deal. But these matters in a way can be put very simply, very clearly and very forcefully and I hope we have put the case very forcefully with regard to Kashmir. We shall do the same with regard to the canal waters dispute.

When we look round again towards Nepal, I am personally satisfied. I had been to Nepal about three years back and I remember the reception we got. The information that we get now is that things are very much changed, the atmosphere there is more cordial, more friendly to India than ever before. We have been very neighbourly, as we ought to be—we have to be—and Nepal needs that neighbourliness very well. Only I would wish that our social relations, our cultural relations with Nepal were closer than they are.

Moving farther to Burma, even there it is fairly good, if not brighter. Our relations with Burma have always been good and are better, more than merely normal. They are cordial relations. There is the problem of Indians there and I think it is not an acute problem. We are sitting at a friendly round table to discuss it and solve it. It is a soluble problem.

When we turn round to the south and look at Ceylon, even there the problem, which appeared some time back as insoluble, as difficult, has appeared soluble, because the problem is now being discussed on a human basis, with a human approach—not as

[Shri N. R. Malkani.] a legal or constitutional issue, but as a human issue of importance to both the countries.

Goa is there. I have not much to say about it. Everybody has said a great deal about it. I only want to say this. As everybody says, Goa is a part of India. The question is only when; and the question is only how. I am not bothered very much about when. I bother about the how. We have built up a prestige, a great moral prestige in the world, that we are genuine and sincere about 'Panch-sheel', and our test in Goa. This capital which we have built up with tremendous moral strength, we cannot squander away by any indiscreet act. We may be misunderstood and have often been misunderstood about Kashmir and our *bona fides* about Kashmir; but I do not think there is a single nation even including Pakistan which will say that our *bona fides* with regard to Goa are questionable. We have exercised a good deal of restraint, almost to the breaking point. At the same time you will realise how a very small question, a minute national question has become a delicate question and almost a dangerous question because of support by other countries. You see how the world is, how the small nations do not do the right thing—for some purpose we cannot say. And because of the outside support Portugal has got we have got to go very cleverly, warily, cautiously, because we are treading on dangerous grounds. We must never forget that this question is not a simple question, but a difficult international question, though Portugal is small and Goa is a little place.

Sir, coming to another question and which is also in a sense important, what is happening in the Middle East? Time was when we were worried about affairs in Korea, Viet-Nam and so forth. The focal centre, the crucial centre has now shifted to the Middle East. It is not Middle East for us, as that was not Far East for us. That was only near north for us. This Middle East is only near north-west

for us. It is very near us. It is our neighbour. And what happens there is bound to influence and affect India also. And what is happening there is something very dangerous. It is extremely dangerous. Sir, I find that the countries which were political-minded, which were nationalists in the sense in which we were nationalists are being compelled, are being pushed towards communism. There was not much communism in Egypt. There is some now. To what extent, I cannot say. There was not much communism in Syria. There is a deal of communism in Syria today, and, Sir, close observers who have been to Jordan and these places say that superficially on the top or on the surface things are very nice with King Hussain, King Hashim and King Saud and so on. But all the money that is being spent on oil will one day lead to an explosion on a mass scale. Even the middle classes, the teacher class, the artisan class, the technical class, the lawyer class, and the professions are simmering with deep discontent, and even the masses now are moving from the village to the town, from the town to the city. And in the Middle East there are hardly 20 towns, and these 20 towns are fermenting and that fermenting may produce an explosion at any time. Sir, it appears as if the Eisenhower doctrine has succeeded. It has; obviously it has, rather too quickly. The success of that doctrine is visible. It is a dangerous success, because there are a few Rulers at the top and the Eisenhower doctrine supports the Rulers at the top, the feudal classes at the top. It is more dangerous, because on the other hand there is not only the Soviet military aid as heavy and as powerful as that given by America, but economic _____
(*Time bell rings*). Sir, let me finish this subject at least.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to call upon one more speaker.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Two minutes more only. Sir, there is economic

penetration in the whole of the Middle East beginning with Syria while America does not understand and has not the capacity to face, to resist, and where there is economic penetration, communism follows with the economic penetration. This kind of American quarantine economy cannot be continued very long at all, and no country can be hermetically sealed by setting up military pacts and sending military forces. Therefore, Sir, I ask: What should be our attitude? Our attitude is a very difficult attitude; it is a very trying attitude. We cannot do anything. We are sitting near a dangerous neighbour. Dangerous things are happening. But one thing I would wish ourselves to do, and that is that firmly and quickly we must tell even the Arab States which are our friends—they trust us and they almost respect us—that Israel is a State which we recognise and which we continue to recognise; it exists and it must exist. This basic fact, to my mind, must be stated by us very firmly. Today there is a vast amount of Israeli-phobia, Israeli-mania, in the Arab countries which have joined together to put down, not to put down but abolish and destroy Israel completely. To my mind, the little that we can do is to be very clear about this issue that Israel has come to stay; it must stay as part of the Middle East, as an integral part of the Middle East, as one of the States, however small, but very progressive and extremely important to keep the balance. (Time bell rings.) Therefore I say, Sir, that our policy with regard to the Israel State must "be very clear. That is all.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not concerned with armaments or disarmament. I am not concerned with the mad race now going on between these two powerful blocs. But I am concerned with India. I am concerned with the defence of India—to defend our frontiers. We are ten years old. We are free men for the last ten years. We cannot align ourselves either with

55 R.S.D.—12.

that bloc or with this bloc. It will take time for us either to align ourselves with the Western bloc or with the Eastern bloc. Today, Sir, India is held in high esteem and reverence because of the foreign policy that is pursued by our Prime Minister. The reception and the publicity given and the love and enthusiasm that were shown to our Prime Minister during his recent foreign tour clearly show what reverence and affection and regard the world has for our Prime Minister handling the foreign affairs of our country. Sir, wherever there is a crisis in this world, the world looks to our Prime Minister for a solution and his contributions and his services for world peace have earned for him the titles of Rasool-u-Salam, Prophet of Peace. Modern Buddha and Incarnation of Lord Vishnu.

Now, Sir, when we read the history of the world, when we see what is going on beyond our frontiers, we find that countries are sold for a mess of pottage. But our Prime Minister has not succumbed to the temptation that is offered by the capitalist nations, the nations that were going to pave the streets of India with dollars and gold, the nations which were going to dump all the modern weapons for our defence. Our Prime Minister has said "No; thank you very much."

Sir, now the Opposition Members have spoken about Oman. They have found fault with our Government for not having protested against aggression in Oman. But I wish to tell my friend to go through the Treaty of Sib that was concluded 35 years ago between Britain and the Sultan of Muscat. According to that Treaty the world has recognised the suzerainty of the Sultan of Muscat over Oman. That Treaty was concluded between Britain and the Sultan of Muscat, and it was registered with the then Viceroy of India, and India was a party to that Treaty. So, Sir, because of some implication we were not able to rather go to the rescue of Oman. But when this matter is going to be taken up in the Security Council, we would—

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we would like the hon. Member to develop on this theme.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Yes, he can do it when his turn comes.

Sir, now I am coming to Kashmir. When this question is going to be brought before the Security Council or the General Assembly, I am sure our distinguished representative, our Defence Minister, will do justice to the cause.

Now, Sir, about India remaining in the Commonwealth, let me say that it is our privilege to be in the Commonwealth. India will do more good to the world by remaining in the Commonwealth than by remaining out of it.

Sir, let me say that the problem of Goa has been a menace to India. We cannot call India free till Goa is liberated. I can assure my hon friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that the day is not far off when I hand in hand with him will enter Goa as liberators. Our Prime Minister whose name will go down to posterity as a liberator of India will also be known as the liberator of Goa . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not if you quote the Treaty of Sib.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Then, Sir, I come to the question of Kashmir. *(Time bell rings.)* Sir, this is a most important subject. I consider the question of Kashmir as more dangerous than the question of Goa. Now, Sir, the President of Pakistan, Major-General Iskandar Mirza, is going to visit Portugal. So, the problems of Kashmir of India and of Goa have become inter-dependent. Sir, Kashmir is ours by right and we are determined to have it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, on a point of order. When he is referring to a neighbouring country's President, he should be a little more considerate.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Sir, aggression on Kashmir means aggression on India. \

War against Kashmir means war against India. Kashmir is part and parcel of India. But I fail to understand, Mr. Deputy Chairman, why, whenever there is this foreign affairs' debate in this House, Kashmir figures most often. When Kashmir is part and parcel of India, where is the necessity for us to discuss it during, the foreign affairs' debate?

(Time bell rings.)

The other day, on the floor of the House I asked the Prime Minister whether Kashmiris were Indians. To that his reply was 'Yes'. Then I put this question, whether all Indians were not Kashmiris. I know, Sir, that I cannot style myself as a Kashmiri. Even a school boy will be able to say that. But what I mean to say is that Kashmir is ours, and I must have every right to visit Kashmir, just as I have got the right to go and settle in Bengal or in Bombay or in New Delhi. Every Indian should enjoy the right of visiting Kashmir without any permit or to go and settle down there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a different matter. That will do.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: About accession . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri: V. K. Krishna Menon.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: I want to make it clear that all Indian Muslims, everybody, is behind the Prime Minister on the Kashmir issue. Especially the Muslims are united behind the Prime Minister as far as his policy towards Kashmir is concerned. Let me tell my Muslim friends that if Pakistan preaches Islamic principles, it is un-Islamic in running the State. Let me give one incident . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. I am not allowing. Please-resume your seat.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: There is no security in Pakistan . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE: (SHRI V. K. KRISHNAMENON) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, this House debates the international situation on the eve of the meeting of the 12 th Session of the General Assembly in the United Nations, on a motion moved by the Prime Minister, who, to us, in the context of Parliament, is the head of our Government but in the context of international relations, represents the aspirations and the hopes of a large number of peoples the world over. Government does not need to apologise for the comparative frequencies of our international debate which unlike the Foreign Affairs debates in some Parliaments, perhaps takes more time on the adumbration of general principles. Like all countries, we try to simplify propositions by putting labels upon them. But unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is a complex world and what is more, we deal with a very complex people when we come to Heads of Government and Foreign Ministers of other parts of the world. The United Nations Assembly which opens its Session on the 17th of this month, in its 12th Session will have before it, for its main consideration, whatever may be the order of business, the problem of disarmament because this problem of disarmament, as it is called, is not in essence merely a question of the quantum and limitation of the quantum of arms or their quality but in a sense, the reversal of the process of armament. That is its real meaning. After all it does not make much difference if a man is killed with a 9" gun or with a 19" gun. He is just dead. If we are able to make even the slightest degree of progress in disarmament, then we have changed the course of policy which rests upon the conception of negotiating from strength, of mutual extermination of your opponents and of intolerance and of all those things which make the world a very dangerous place to live in. So far as this Government is concerned, we would approach this problem, so far as I can under-

stand it, not from the point of view of the apportionment of blame on one side or the other in regard to the power blocs because it is obvious and by definition it is true, that you cannot get disarmament without agreement and if there is no agreement, it must be the fault of both sides, if there are any faults. But the fault really lies in the context of the general situation and we today have arrived at a position where the Sub-Committee debating in London for several months, has concluded its final sittings for the time being and has adjourned for a period of six months. There is nothing very tragic about this. Because during all, these discussions there have been periods when there seemed to appear rather a plateau, a plateau of agreement. Then on that plateau rose the mist of suspicion and they are separated again. In any case, according to the U.N. time-tables, they have to go back to New York in order to report to the parent Commission which alone can present a report to the Assembly. So far as we are concerned, it appears to me that we have now reached a stage when this problem has to be looked at by taking a step backwards and viewing it with a degree of objectivity. So far the Disarmament Committee which has been debating in London was originally set up on the initiative of the Indian Delegation in order that there may be a small group which would discuss in private these matters. It gradually grew or deteriorated into a general public discussion and its usefulness probably has come not to an end, but has come to post-maturity. But a great deal of the discussion had assisted in clearing the points of differences and in bringing the Soviet Union and the Western countries together on various matters. It is a mistake to think that either the Western Governments or the Soviet Government wants war. There are no people in the world today and no Governments in the world today that want war. War is not only a costly business, it is not only a risky business, no one knows what its consequences will be but everyone is sure

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

that a war on the modern scale would not leave behind either victor or vanquished. They will all be vanquished and therefore it will be a great mistake to think that there are warring nations on the one hand and peaceful nations on the other. All nations desire peace but nations have not yet found the leadership or have not yet found a degree of confidence in each other when they can throw arms away. That is the position. In a sense, it is a crisis of confidence. Therefore the U.N. will face the situation with a report of no-success from those concerned and they will be thrown back to the Members as such. The Government of India have instructed its Ambassador in New York to inform the Secretary-General that the Government of India desires that the item of disarmament should have priority over everything else. It is true that the political committee of the U.N. which is master of its own procedure will decide the order of business but it is equally important however that a country like ours which has not too many arms to disarm but is passionately interested in peace and has made its own humble contributions in that direction, should call attention of the world, indeed as other nations will do, that the subject of primary importance before the World Assembly is this topic of the reversal of the engines of war. That is what disarmament in effect is because even the proposals on which there have been agreement gives 2½ million troops to America, the U.S. 1 "mean, 2½ millions to the Soviet Union, 2½ millions to China, 750,000 to U.K. and 750,000 to France. In some cases some of these countries I have mentioned, I shall not mention them by name, have not got this quantum of troops now. In fact it is levelling up of armament so far as they are concerned but the agreement is one where people who have hitherto believed in the process of negotiating from strength, as it is called,—it is really rather ridiculous doctrine and of course if you are strong

in that way, you don't negotiate, you dictate—the essential meaning of it is that the nations of the world, if there was an agreement, have come to the stage when the process of rearmament would have been halted. The Government of India in June of last year brought to me Disarmament Commission a suggestion which was really initiated and has become incubated in the General Assembly, that a beginning must be made somewhere, however small and the way to begin it was probably to take those subjects or points of agreement on which a great deal of machinery was required. Because once the machinery came in, there is always a disagreement on the definition of the machinery. The question of whether control should come first or disarmament should come first, will always be argued. This view has found a considerable degree of acceptance as a principle and during the last 12 months, the entire disarmament talks have centred round this problem of what is called, 'limited disarmament', not limited disarmament as an objective but limited disarmament pending the abandonment of nuclear weapons. The word disarmament has succeeded. We are not without hope where in spite of all that has been said, in spite of the propositions adumbrated by France and Britain on behalf of the Western Powers and by Mr. Zorin on behalf of the Soviet Union in which both said 'we have come to the parting of the ways', both sides would realise that there can be no parting of the ways in this business. Because the world is threatened not only by atomic or nuclear or thermonuclear weapons but with large quantities of molecular weapons which are far more powerful than anything we have known in the world before and what is more, the possibility of the control of the planet from outside by satellites—not the satellites in the sense that is ordinarily used—but satellites in the atmosphere which may have vast consequences not only in observation but in the climatic and other condition; of this world. We have only

come to the beginning of this era when the control of this planet from outside would probably be the determining factor in peace. Therefore, we enter into this field of disarmament not with any gospel of our own, not with any prescriptions to find a solution, but to convey to the nations assembled that countries like ourselves, who are in a backward state of economy, who are—minded, for so are all the countries—where generally ideas of peace have reigned for a very long time, where their continuance largely rests in the world being free of large-scale conflicts, and wherein the populations are likely to be subjected to the evils of radiation far more than even the nations of the west, such countries projecting themselves into this sphere may probably assist in the finding of the beginning of a solution. But it is essential that in these discussions on dangers afflicting the world and that seems to disarmament we should be able, at any rate as a government, to go in and speak without any reservations, that we have a people behind us who are committed to the policy of peace, do not desire to assert their right by the use of force. It may sound what some friends might call a vegetarian proposal; but there are many vegetarians who have asserted themselves. So if the Government can, in spite of all the difficulties that prevail and while holding fast to the protection of our sovereign territory and permitting—

■ no incursion on it, if we are able to say,—as indeed we told the Security Council last time—that we are prepared to take the view in the circumstances of the world, to hold our hands even in the assertion of our own legitimate, legal and political rights, whether it be for Goa or Kashmir, it is likely that we shall carry some weight in this question.

It is interesting, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that at this assembly, Czechoslovakia which has a communist government and which lies between the western frontiers of Eastern Europe and the eastern frontiers of Western Europe and which is generally regarded as having a policy which is largely conditioned by the views of the Soviet

Union—I do not say that that is true in every case—Czechoslovakia on the one hand and Belgium which is, more or less, a typical western European country whose former foreign minister is now a great pandit of the NATO, Belgium about which a historian said it is not a country but a road in the sense that every marauding army walked across and this territory, had been subject to invasions—Czechoslovakia on the one hand and Belgium on the other, asked the United Nations to study this and to enquire into the conditions that afflict humanity in conditions of radiation. In other words, in spite of ideologies, that undying feeling in man that he has to survive and fight against evil in some way, that knowledge of the vast numbers of humanity that seems to be the best corrective to the great dangers afflicting the world and that seems to have come from those two entirely diverse quarters. We have been speaking away the last year or two and as a result of it, the United Nations appointed a commission to study atomic radiation. But in the United Nations like most governments, once they appoint a committee then they have to wait for a long time for the report. The scientists have not submitted a complete report on this question. But the political issues raised by these two countries is of far-reaching importance.

In the Assembly will come various other problems and we shall again hear probably from some small voices in this House and elsewhere and in the columns of some newspapers—and I say this without any malice of any kind—these strictures about what are called double standards. I think it is time that those who talked of double standards had some standards of their own; that would be the time for them to talk.

I have spoken on two or three occasions either in this House or the other, at the request of the Prime Minister on international affairs, and on the whole, have not thought it necessary to go into this repetition of foreign calumnies by our nationals. That is

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.] what it is. We are the victims of foreign propaganda—I mean we as individuals—we mouth those phrases on the problem of Hungary and double standards. I propose" to do so today.

Great play is made of the fact that we are a member of the Commonwealth, that we ought to have walked out when Egypt was invaded, or when the British Government did not rescind the treaty of the fourteenth or fifteenth century with Portugal that various other steps should have been taken. And we are also told that this country is without friends. I think there is something pathological about that person who states publicly, "I am friendless." No country should take up that position. It is quite true, Sir, that we have no allies in the world, and our policy is not likely, is not calculated, is not conceived to have allies. But we have more friends in the world than any nation can think of. This capital of ours, with its limited capacity for habitation is full of people who have come, not to see our tombs and our monuments, not to see the sights in this country, but in order to see ideas, in order to see the developments, in order to convey fraternity. I would like some of these gentlemen who follow the comparatively easy path of paraphrasing newspapers to look at the problem as it is. Which capital in the world has attracted so great a number of emissaries, not the ordinary accredited diplomats but people who come to discuss problems? These countries think it necessary and even if they do not agree with us, still they say, "Go on. We cannot do it, but you better do it." So we are not without friends and what is more, if we believe in that way, we may be without friends for at least a short time, but we shall be content to go on. It is impossible for this country to function either in the context of its internal affairs or in the context of the external affairs if it has no faith in its policy, no faith in its destiny and if its spokesmen do not have the courage to face those who are in front and those who are

behind them. I am not afraid of these people, nor is the Government.

Well, I would like them to lift from themselves this screen that blinds their minds to facts. The Ministry of External Affairs have compiled all the statements made on Hungary and I think it is necessary to bring it out, not as a vindication, not as a defence, because, our policy does not require any special defence—we are not seeking in this world any gains for ourselves. Those days are over when India, as a State, established outposts with the Air Force in Iraq, fought battles in the Middle East and the North African deserts, those days are not with us—but, I think, in the interests of truth and in justice to this Parliament, one ought to know what we did say on all these occasions. "We are fully in support of the right of the Hungarian people to choose the form of government it desires, and this is inherent in their sovereignty and their membership of the United Nations. It is our view that in dealing with a Member State (which she is now), we cannot deal with the problem as in the case of a colonial country where the peoples have no representation. Therefore, I hope that the explanation that I have made makes it quite clear where we stand on this matter. We stand for the freedom of peoples. We are against foreign domination of any country. We look forward with hope and with confidence that the Soviet Government, having announced that it is the intention to withdraw troops from Hungary—that implementation and declaration will take place soon." We can only express our policy. We cannot guarantee about any other Government doing it. I do not want to take the time of the House by reading a great deal but I think the last statement that was made is worth reading. "We make no distinctions about repression. We condemn repression whether it occurs in North Africa, in Central Europe or in Asia. For that matter, we would condemn repression even if it should occur occasionally in our own country.

Hence, I could not agree with the United States Representative more. When, however, we are asked to address ourselves to the particular problem of sending assistance and support in the context and on the basis, as I understand it, of what is contained in the Geneva Convention as regards the consequences of either foreign wars or civil commotions, then I say that that is an entirely different matter." That is to say, when an attempt is made by sending troops in order to foment more trouble, then we do not stand for it. We moved an amendment and, believe it or not, the United States accepted it. I think those of us who take part in foreign affairs debate would do well to follow what was being said on behalf of the Government. We have a right to expect from this country that the sources of information should not be either foreign or domestic reports which are unauthorised.. No one expects Members of the public to conduct researches into these matters but if anyone takes upon himself this responsibility of attacking Government policy or casting a slur upon the policy, then that should not be without a sense of responsibility that rests upon the Legislators of this country in whom the sovereignty of this nation rests. At least, we would like to expect that it is based upon facts. If anybody wishes to have these papers sent to them, I shall do that.

We are also charged repeatedly with the membership of the Commonwealth.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I should like to have a copy of the document from which the Minister has read.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): That has been circulated to us.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: It is in Library of the House. It would have been available in the Library. It is nothing peculiar for this country and there was the incident of one of the most passionate speakers in this matter of another nation, a very friendly

nation, who went off the deep end in this matter. I said, "Have you read this?" and he said "No but everybody says so". I said "No, I do not and I am part of everybody".

We are charged with membership of this Commonwealth. May I say with all respect, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that this is an inverted expression of an inferiority complex, of being afraid to be with somebody else? I am not afraid of the British or anybody else. I know of no instance in the last ten years, particularly since 1949, when the famous declaration about our Republic joining the Commonwealth was proclaimed, when we had been under any pressure from the United Kingdom. I am revealing no secret when I say.—I was the High Commissioner in London at that time and had a great deal to do with the passing of information—that I know of no case when either the present Government, the Conservative Government, or the Labour Government, ever pressed that we should remain in the Commonwealth.

DR. R. B. GOUR: On whose pressure did we refuse to vote on the Cyprus issue?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: I suggest that the hon. Member reads this document.

Therefore, it is not necessary for us repeatedly in Parliament to have to defend this matter. When these decisions were made in London the Prime Minister attended the conference, those decisions were submitted to the Houses of Parliament and Parliament in the exercise of its sovereign will endorsed those decisions. We have to be men both of idealism and of practical commonsense. In the United Nations, as in the Commonwealth, there is no more relationship than exists in any other concept of nations. Would anyone say that because there was an adverse vote in the United Nations we should walk out? We object to that and when the French walked out, we turned all the energies we had in order

•[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.] to get the French back to come on the question of Algeria on which we are passionately concerned. We did the best that we could for them to come. We regret the Union of South Africa walking out. Democratic and civilised associations do not mean that you walk out when you are criticised. This is like the old story of playing the game according to the rules except that when the game goes against you, to change the rules. (*Interruption*). I only wish the hon. Member had heard what I said.

Various other issues have been raised and two of them are Kashmir and Goa. In one sense, these are internal questions. They relate to the territory of India, one to the territory of the Union of India and the other to the territory of India but, on account of the circumstances in which these issues now subsist before the world, they have become matters of international discussion. Now, it is not necessary in this House to have to repeat our position in regard to Kashmir but, since the Security Council will take up this matter on the 24th of this month and various members of this Council will speak, I think it is apt that we should say something about this matter. The issue of Kashmir, so far as we are concerned, is a very simple one, that is to say, part of the territory of the Indian Union has been taken in occupation by an external power. We do not still call Pakistan a foreign nation and I hope we do not do it in spite of everything. It has been taken by a foreign power and annexed to her own territory under articles of her own constitution in violation not only of ordinary international law but in violation of the agreement she entered into with ourselves and the British Government under whom India was then, in violation of the undertaking she gave to the United Nations, in violation of the Resolutions passed by the United Nations and, what is more, in violation of every recital of facts that she made before the United Nations. We have for ten years very nearly put up with

this foreign occupation. It may be that history will either criticise us or speak favourably of us for the patience we have shown in this matter. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I hope that those of you who have experience in these matters would not think I am moralising in this but in these affairs, and particularly for a country like ours who have not got arms—who have not got the money to buy up nations—and what is more, who have no desire to dominate anybody, an immense amount of patience is necessary—We are not going to run away when an adverse vote comes to us; we are not going to run away because someone promises to do something in international affairs and then does not do it. In regard to Kashmir, we have stated our position as simply as possible and that is, we have entered into certain international engagements and the Government of India have very carefully used this word "engagements". Apart from this engagement, there is a single commitment and it rests, as things are today, on Pakistan and Pakistan alone and perhaps on the United Nations and, therefore, our commitments would arise only after they have been satisfied by others—and, therefore, no commitments exist now—but, at the same time, we are bound by certain international engagements. Let it not be said at any-time that this country, whether the cause, will go back upon its plighted word and that is the position of the Government of India and this House or the other House or any section of our public opinion. We are bound by the international engagement in the sense that we accept the general principles of international law and behaviour. We are bound by the two Resolutions of the Security Council of the 30th August 1948 and the 5th January 1949 subject to the assurances given by the Commission to the Prime Minister of the Government of India all of which are in the documents. Therefore, we have accepted those engagements to which not only we but Pakistan and the United Nations are parties, it is a great mistake to think that in the present state of this Kashmir business

it is a question between Pakistan and ourselves. There are other persons, the people of India and Government, including Kashmir and the United Nations. We say that the nations of the world, eleven countries represented there, have an obligation to us under the charter, have an obligation to the United Nations, to see that our sovereignty shall not be violated and, we are entitled to expect, in view of the restraint we have shown, in view of the fact that we have held our hands so far, in view of the fact that we are prepared to treat the cease fire line not as a political boundary but for purposes of vacation of the troops, in spite of the fact that though we have faith that we could drive back this aggressor who has crossed into India but in doing so we shall have to invade Pakistan which we do not want to do, that that is done. But let us make no mistake about it. If it is a question of our territory being violated again, the armed forces and the people of this country will repel that aggression.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Can we still hope that that part of India will come back to us?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: There is no use having faith and then looking that that faith will move mountains and then opening the window and see that the mountain is still there.

The facts remain, Sir, that in a context where the majority of the nations of the world largely on account of ignorance—and I will demonstrate to you in a moment—my friend Justice Sapru has given me an opportunity—in spite of all those adverse opinions, in spite of the fact that these words 'self-determination' and 'plebiscite' have always been rolled about from one place to another, for which we made some contribution ourselves, in spite of all that we are able to argue with this case, and at the end of it a well known neutral

comes over to us. And what does he say? He says the cease fire agreement is not conclusively proved to have been observed. I am not stating our position. His position is that the cease fire agreement is not conclusively proved to have been observed and therefore he says and you see it has not been observed. They say it has been observed. He does not agree that it has been observed and therefore asks for certain measures with which we do not agree, for reasons which I need not go into at the present time. Take first the development of Kashmir in terms of our Five Year Plan. The essential thing is this. A great deal is said about our law, that it will apply to all except the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is not the peoples of the former State of Jammu and Kashmir that are not conscious of their Indianness only, but it is our own people. How many people say India and Kashmir, they were two countries. We say that Kashmir is as much a part of India as Tinnevely or Bombay or even Bengal, so that what has happened there is that part of our territory is aggressed upon and we want to hold back this aggression. Aggressions have been liquidated in the past occasionally by negotiations. There is no reason to think that by the provocation of conflict we shall get there in any way but, at the same time, this Government and our people will not sit back in tension with an unscrupulous Government across the border using the powers of distressing and somewhat shameful methods of individual assassinations. No country, no Government, no political party that has got the people behind them ever used the methods of individual assassinations. It is only those who have no public opinion behind them, they think that they can take to the short-cut method by cutting somebody's throat. Therefore it is only because in Pakistan there is no democratic Government. They are the peoples who want to live with us, they are on both sides of the border, they are the same people who if they had the opportunity would have exercised their freedom, who are kept in suppression by all

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon] kinds of war lords on one side or the other, where democracy has not been practised as in this country, where in this House practically every Member, whether of the Government Party or the other has the right to find fault with the Government, where the newspapers write against the Government and still nobody gets excited about it, that sort of situation does not exist on that side and we have now come to a position where because we will not be provoked—we have not been provoked for ten years—because we have not been provoked and these soldiers of ours who are the great heroes of peace, who stand on the summits of mountains under the worst conditions and this country owes a debt of gratitude to them, and somewhat a sense of apology for the limited amenities they have in those parts, they have the consciousness that they are fighting a simple battle or engagement but they are guarding the frontiers of our motherland. I had been with them recently and it is surprising to find that there are doubts raised in this House by erudite people but there are no doubts in the minds of those men. They know very well what they are doing and I have no doubt in my mind for one moment what the officers and men are doing. Therefore that is the position with regard to Kashmir and so the task that your representatives have is comparatively simple, that is to say, they have invaded our country. We are a peaceful people. We have no desire at the present moment, what will happen tomorrow I do not know because under the parliamentary system Governments can change. Some young people think too quickly.' They make mistakes but so far as we are advised at the present moment we have no intention of waging a war with all its consequences and all that is fratricidal. After all if we inflict killing on Pakistan it may inflict it upon us. It is fratricide of a very close character. We were all citizens of one country or rather people of one country but ten years ago. But there is a limit to everything and the limit is when they

I commit further aggression that applies I to Goa as well—when they commit further aggression deliberately and seriously and in a large measure probe our international frontiers— this applies not merely to the cease-fire line—and violate our air space in order to menace our security—they are violating our air space to-day— and it is best that they don't do that because we can afford for their violation. We have nothing to hide here. Our military figures are published; our equipments are known and what is more with a Parliament like ours we cannot even keep the weapons unknown and all the answers you ask for go to the foreign press. That is why

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I could not follow but the hon. Minister seems to have said that even if the Pakistan Air Force had violated our territory we had nothing to hide from them. Does it mean that the hon. Minister does not object to our air space being violated?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I hope everybody else did not understand it that way. What I said was: Violations have taken place. We are aware of them. We have told them. But you cannot catch an aeroplane flying at a speed of 400 or 500 or 600 miles an hour with the air force we have got unless we are in the air the whole time. But if there be serious violations of our air space so as to effectively injure our independence and sovereignty then they will meet with resistance. We are not prepared to sacrifice our equipment or our men on unnecessary enterprises. We have no force

SHRI JASWANT SINH: They have already violated our sovereignty. They are already in possession of one-third of Jammu and Kashmir.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: I said they have violated our sovereignty, I said if there were any further violations of our sovereignty,

the world are realising that it is not just a question of saying 'plebiscite, plebiscite, plebiscite', because when Pakistan answered our complaint about aggression what she did was to put in a memorandum of twelve paragraphs. Only one was about Kashmir and in that she said she was not there. It was seriously denied and afterwards it has been found that she was there. So on the 24th of this month when Kashmir is discussed over again they will first go through the Jarring Report and presumably there will be other propositions. Last time they made a proposition that an international force should come into Kashmir in order to clear it of the Kashmir Government and what they called the Azad Kashmir Government and then take a plebiscite. We did not examine this proposition. We did not want to argue. We simply said that no foreign soldier either from the United Nations or from anywhere else will set foot on our soil so long as this country remains, and that is still our position, Sir. Our soil means also the soil of occupied Pakistan. So if any country makes any contribution to the assertion of the United Nations will by a vote by means of landing soldiers in occupied Kashmir we would regard it as an unfriendly act and participation in the invasion of our country, and I do not think there are many nations in the world who would want to violate our sovereignty but it is necessary that Parliament and people, on occasions when things go pretty bad, do not get cold feet about this. We cannot fight this battle on diplomatic fronts unless we are prepared to take risks. We cannot seek to persuade anybody unless we are willing to be persuaded if their persuasion was legitimate and that is the way this question is being tackled. Nobody can be sure what the result of it is because no one can be sure what the result of war is. The same thing in this matter also. We have stated our position and that position will carry out.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA:
Is there the possibility of their deciding on an international force?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: I am not concerned about their decision. I am concerned about our position. They cannot come here and no nation, no United Nations, no one will send any troops here or set his foot on our soil and so long as we of the soil are determined, they will not come here. Have faith in your representatives and your representatives stand on faith in these things.
»

The United Nations will also discuss that longstanding problem of the treatment of our nationals in the Union of South Africa and it is sometimes forgotten that even now discussions in that part of the world are going up high and unless wisdom prevails in the world as a whole, it will develop into a racial war and that racial war will lead to a violent conflict. South Africa, the racist Government, has imposed a policy that would not have been justified two hundred years ago. Even in the days before the liberation of slaves this treatment would have been considered as inhuman. Our sympathies go towards the people who are resisting them and our encouragement should also go to them but in the last few years the narrowness that has perhaps split the fellow sufferers has somewhat been closed up and there is greater cohesion and mutual understanding between Africans, Indians and Europeans in South Africa to resist this racist doctrine and the inroads on individual liberty so much so that they had to collect 150 to 200 people altogether and try them en masse and say "you are guilty". Well, that is not justice. At the present time all that they can do is to organise public opinion. Year after year the nations of the world have voted and expressed their adverse view and at our request not to introduce the word 'condemnation'. Hon. Members here ask: Why don't you subscribe to 'condemnation' in regard to Egypt or

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon] in regard to Hungary. On this question, Sir, for the last ten years there have been friends of ours who wanted to draft this resolution in words of screaming language and we are the people who have said that what we wanted is for them to negotiate and at no time have we asked for any kind of other language. But each year resolutions, whether on apartheid or on Indians in South Africa or people of Indian origin in South Africa, come up and the resolutions are passed by overwhelming majorities calling the attention of South Africa to their conduct and asking them not to do that and asking them to come to negotiations and settlement and always an overwhelming majority of people express their view? in that way with the Union of South Africa alone voting against. Unfortunately for us some other Powers like the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia and two or three others abstain from voting because they feel that on account of their other bonds they should not express themselves in that way.

I have dealt with Hungary. Then comes the problem of Goa. Here again as a responsible Government and as a member of the United Nations if we make a statement of our policy even in the heat of the moment, we should, as a responsible nation and Government, be able and willing to carry it out. May I, Mr. Deputy Chairman, put it in another form? Is there any responsible section of opinion in this country that for any purpose wants to initiate a war? So far as Government understand, there are none and therefore the taking of Goa by force is not on the carpet at the present time, that is to say, it is the same as in Kashmir. Such aggressions have taken place. Those four territories which are in that place are part of the unfinished task, the unfinished task of the liberation of India, and it has to be liberated much in the same way as we liberated ourselves. And Goa will never be liberated until the people inside Goa

decide to liberate themselves—even in Kashmir. We talk about the glory of our Army and it is certainly quite justifiable but let us not forget the initial days. It was the ordinary people of Kashmir in their rights who resisted the invasion and fought those holding actions that made it possible for the Army fight the enemy back. Similarly in Goa our sympathies—not in the mealy-mouthed fashion—but our stern determination and endorsement of their moral position are giving them the feeling that they are part of this great nation, that they are under oppression and that the fight, the resistance such as they put up, is righteous and that it is not a piece of mischief. And let us not forget this that while we fulminate about Goa part of the economic survival is due to the action of smuggling in which our people participate and when any Indian participates in this smuggling he is behaving in a traitorous fashion. It is quite true that it has diminished a great deal but here again one must be very precise in this matter. This aggression has taken place; it has been there, a permanent aggression. It is nothing else. It is invasion which has become crystallised with authority. We cannot talk; we can only accept the view that Goa is part of Portugal; that is the position that the Portuguese Government has taken. So we fight on as many fronts as we can effectively. In the United Nations we come up against this. She refuses to give information on Goa, because she is obliged under article 73 of the Charter to give information on non-self-governing territories, but she says, 'we have no colonies, we are not a colonial power. Goa is Portugal'. Since then they say it is Indian Portugal or Portuguese India. Only the other day in Bombay I said that there cannot be a Portuguese or French India any more than we can have a vegetarian tiger. How can Indians become Portuguese? So there is this camouflage that it is part of metropolitan territory. But this permanent aggression remains and this aggression has to be liquidated by the strength of our

own people. But if they take any other step then both under the principles of our foreign policy and under our obligations to the United Nations in consonance with self-respect and security we are bound to act. That is to say, if that territory . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But they are firing into the Indian territory.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, Order.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: If there is to be use of that territory either as a war base or for the purpose of importing hostile troops into this country or menacing of our frontiers, then an act of aggression has taken place and our security is threatened. Today Goa is offensive to us. It is a running sore; it is, as I said, part of the unfinished task. It is a part of the disease that we have not got rid of in full—imperialism. It is not today affecting our security. Nobody would say that the foreign possession of Goa, while it hurts our self-respect, while it hurts our moral being, while it hurts our dignity, while it does all sorts of such things, nobody will say that it offends our security. But if that territory were to be used by a country that is not friendly to us for any unfriendly purpose or if it is used as a part of a base for a general attack then it is a further act of aggression and at that time the situation would have changed whether it is the use of our territory or our air space or our territorial waters and no one is going to tell this country the extent of her territorial waters.

MR. JASWANT SINGH: One question, Sir. I want . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. Let him finish.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: Therefore on this problem of Goa it is not as if we are resting on our oars. These questions cannot be decided in a way that you can say on such a day you will produce such and such a result. Even our planned economy does not work to time; even Members of Parliament sometimes do not come

to the Chamber in time. So how can social forces be measured by the date of the calendar? You cannot do that. In spite of the stranglehold of the Portuguese on Goa we cannot hurt the population who are our own people, we have no right to starve them even for the purpose of liberating them. And in that situation the Government relax only on humanitarian grounds but it is not always possible to plug all the holes through which aid flows into Goa. But with the expression of opinion, the building up of strong opinion in this country, the expression of solidarity and our determination, it is not fair, it is not right for the people inside Goa to get any impression that we are going to bring armed assistance to Goa. That is what happened to poor Hungary I won't say, but some people gave the idea that 'all that you have to do is to rise and we will come and take you up.' But they never knew that there was somebody else also interested. It was very wrong; whether we talk about Azad Kashmir or Goa or Hungary or Formosa or Viet-nam it is wrong for any country to give the impression that someone is coming to their aid and help them, and therefore ask them to commit suicide. Therefore when we speak without a deliberate policy of implementing what we say we will do, it is not doing a service to the Goan people apart from its being a deflection from the truth. That is the position in regard to Goa.

Reference was made in another place that I had, in my speech in Bombay, appealed to the French*, the British and the United States Governments to come to our side on the Goan question. I said nothing of the kind; I made no appeal. What I said was it was the duty of all freedom-loving people, it was the duty of America, it was the duty of Britain which was relinquishing her hold on the Empire and developing Commonwealth relations, it was her duty and it was equally the duty of France who has given up her *possessions* in our country, not to support this colo-

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.] nialism. And I think one day it will be found that the peoples of these countries will tell their governments that their support of these erfete regimes of Salazaar on the one hand and Chiang-kai-sheK on the other are not serving the cause of peace.

Sir, I have no intention of answering the various observations made by my colleague in the Government during his visit to Malaya. Under a parliamentary system of Government a member of the Government has the freedom to say what he likes now-a-days and what is more he can defend himself very well.

I would, without entering into any controversy about it, introduce a correction which is necessary for reasons of fact. Some Members have spoken about double standards about our non-recognition of Israel. It is not true. We were one of the first countries, early countries, to recognise her. India recognised Israel as a nation State and as member of the United Nations but we have not got diplomatic relations and we have not sent diplomatic representatives there. But then there are many countries with which we have got good relations but we have not sent representatives. In the case of Israel we have found rightly or wrongly that from the point of view of practical application of policy it is not an easy thing to do. We will probably do more harm than good by jumping the fence in this way and losing our capacity at some time or other to bring about some amelioration in the existing conditions.

I think I am entitled to call the attention of the House to the fact that today it is partly the army of this country, the paratroop regiments that stand guard on the armistice line between Israel and Egypt and prevent skirmishes and clashes between the two and there are no troops who are more popular on both sides than these troops are. Very soon Parliament will be called upon to provide more money for sending more troops. And these soldiers have been recently visited by the Chief of the General Staff. They

are doing their duty very well, but they want to come back. It is a good sign on the part of soldiery, because they do not forget their homes. They think it is a picnic. That is not the position. The troops are there on this narrow strip with only 500 yards on each side of the line which is legally neutral territory and under conditions that are very difficult. They are drawing salaries which are far lower than the other people who are doing the same job from other countries and yet they are contented and happy and are not creating one incident all the time they are there, this way or that.

Something has also been told about the Middle East. Before I leave Goa, I think it is necessary for the House to recall to its own mind that there are hundreds of people in Goa in prisons today under the regime of Salazaar. They are citizens of Portugal. He says they are not Indians, they are citizens of Portugal. . The Government, by the exercise of diplomatic pressure, have been able to get out most of them. I think all other people are of non-Indian nationality. There are, I believe, some five or six there whom the Portuguese claim ownership or nationality and we say they are ours. But apart from that there are several hundreds, I am told, who are in prisons, in dungeons in Goa under conditions of torture and starvation. Those men are martyrs to the cause of Goa's independence— as indeed some of those who were before us in our country. We are doing—I have no desire to commit myself to any actual details by the Government of India—we have this problem very well in mind and the least we can do is to look after the dependents of these men who are in prison and the Government feel that Parliament and public opinion would feel that it is an expenditure of money and an effort that the Government was called upon to do. Therefore, while discussing Goa, and abstruse problems as to how it came about, let us not forget these men and women who are the victims of the Salazaar regime. We shall use every endeavour in international forums to raise this

issue not of Goa but of the Portuguese colonies, whether in Angola or in Portuguese East Africa or anywhere else. In East Africa our people are there—Africans and Indians. Some Indians are prosperous there and they think very much like the Portuguese. And what is more, under the conditions that exist it would be impossible for them individually to stand up to resist the rule, but a large majority of the Africans—it is a very rich country with a large timber wealth—today are under conditions which are worse than slave labour, because there forced labour exists, chained gangs and whipped about and so on. One of the United Nations' Commissions has reported on the conditions there under Portugal. So, we shall continue this. But the Portuguese do not submit information like the French, Dutch and everybody else. One thing the British did was they called us British Indians, they did not call us as English men. That is something these other people have done. That is in regard to the Goan position.

That I think covers most of what has been said today except with regard to the problem of the Middle East. Now, hon. Members have asked why is it that we did not take a position in regard to this. Now, the time is very late. So, I cannot go into the whole history. What other positions have we taken and what have been the results. In our infancy, in the first year of independence we took up the position with regard to Indonesia. That was not a failure. In the second year of our independence, or before we declared our Constitution, we took up our position, with an enormous amount of courage on the part of the Government, in establishing the Commonwealth of Nations. And it would be one of the historic achievements of this country now for the future when into that region are coming more and more nations of different stock, where in spite of the differences we can still remain together and be able to bring about some influence. Then came in 1950 our position in San Francisco where we declined under the greatest of pres-

sure to sign a peace treaty with Japan along with the Western Powers and what is more signed a peace treaty ourselves and abandoned all claims to reparations. Whether the Japanese Government thinks one way or another about it, it is worthwhile, because what we have done is, we refused the right of any country to obtain bases on the territory of a country which was under their occupation.

Then came 1952 when this Government brought to an end a bloody war which had already killed two million people, a problem that was considered not capable of solution. As a matter of fact, apart from providing a solution, it had to bear the burden of implementing it. And our troops for the first time, the first Gandhian army went out to the lines in Korea to hold the peace between two ferocious sections of the people at that time. And while yet the task was not fully accomplished, war soon broke out again. Two years later, while we were not direct parties, we became involved in the problem of Indo-China. And here our associations, our relations with the Commonwealth, our not having friends because both Russians and Americans would not talk to us—enabled us to make some contribution and today our officers and men are standing guard in order to prevent war in the war-torn territory of Indo-China. On 11th August 1954 for the first time in twenty-five years the world had one day of peace when the guns were silenced. Then came the present period when we had to take charge. I would rather ask my friends of the Opposition which Government in the relations that exist could attack Britain? We had to stand on a public rostrum to attack the United Kingdom with whom we are so closely allied and, what is more, to mobilise all the forces in order to obtain the 'vacation of aggression? So, in August 1956, up to the conclusion of the last session of the Assembly we struggled hard in order to create a situation that would not aggravate into a state of war in the Middle East. The Middle East, however, is in a very tenuous position and no speech-making by us does remove

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon] the fact that here is a cockpit of rivalry like the old kingdoms. From -either side are the great forces gathered and everybody thinking upon it as a playground. There is the great phrase-vacuum. The vacuum is for people who are ambitious. In those Middle East areas, there are vast possessions of wealth. When countries which are not democratic, when the populations have become conscious that they are the producers of wealth in those areas and when Egypt and Syria which is now holding very fast against any kind of intrusion from the west, east, north and south—is very difficult to retain their independence over the vast stretch of land from the top of east Africa right up to our own frontiers become liberated not from the tyranny of foreign rulers, but from the reactionary elements in their own countries, then we will find a different state of affairs. It may not be in the right time when we are sitting in this Chamber, but no one in social affairs can ask whether the effort should be made because there would be fruit of it tomorrow. In that case we will not be independent today. So that the Middle East still remains a sensitive proposition. There are vast numbers of troops in these areas and changes of Government from day to day, because the changes of Government do not really represent big mass changes, and we are happy to feel that some of these countries, in spite of differences that they have with us, on most questions can agree with us, whether it is Iraq or Egypt. Egypt is a very close friend of ours because it is moving in the direction of the popular Government. It is not for us to bring about enmity or create friction between ourselves and the other countries. We do not gain anything by greater enmity between Egypt and England or France, and we lose by that. And we are happy that a few months ago, Egypt out of her own volition and without any compulsion from anybody made a declaration which is international. She bound herself to international behaviour and accepted the findings of the Court in

regard to keeping the Canal open. By and large, events have shown that the approach one makes in defence of the liberty of a country and the maintenance of sovereignty should be that aggression should not pay. That is worked out.

So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister invites the House to take this international situation into consideration, and it is for the House, of course, to express itself. There are a number of amendments which are a tribute to the industrious opposition. But they sound like an American text book, the whole thing given over and over again. The Government is not able to accept any of these amendments except the one that endorses the foreign policy. But I would like to say one final word that there is nothing foreign about our foreign policy. No foreign element enters into it. The foreign policy of this country—and I am not ashamed to say—is largely governed by the consideration of our national interest, and our national interest, when it is not a narrow interest, is not inimical to anybody.

Well, I forget the observation made by my friend, Shri Sapru. He read out an extract from Vera Micheles Dean's book. I am glad that he read out an extract. She did have those views; she wrote about it, and I suppose she had since come here, and she is here at the moment. She went to Kashmir a few weeks ago. She said something about Kashmir after coming back. Therefore we must have patience. I think it is not a little bit of gainful proposition to put people into coloured bottles, because at one time they got themselves under some colour or other. Now I hold no brief for any of these writers, and I am as much a victim of the propaganda as anybody else in the world. But I still survived, and if I have been able to survive, stronger people can easily survive. She has been a historian and a student of international affairs. A few weeks ago she went to Kashmir, and I must admire the lady's honesty and courage to come out and say that the country was well-governed and

the people were free and happy. I haven't got the extracts here . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: It was published a few months ago, in March 1957.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: Yes, yes; in September 1957. She came over here, Sir, in July 1957. That simply means that the more the people know of each other, the more facts are known, and that I hope is the key-note of our relations in international affairs. This country, when the history of India is written, will discover for itself that the Prime Minister, without a great deal of fanfare, brought into the world a gospel of international affairs which is altogether new. It is a great pity—I express my personal opinion—in our effort to simplify to call them by various names.

In short, Sir, it is a pragmatic policy which allows the honesty of one's mind and the sense of fact to be able to find those solutions which are necessary for the attainment of objectives of the international peace and co-operation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to know one thing. Most of the amendments we would not press for vote. I will seek the permission of the House to withdraw them. But I would like to get one point cleared, and it is with regard to Kashmir. I heard the hon. Minister talking about engagement and commitments. Sir, as far as we understand it, we have no commitment any more subsisting, so far as the question of plebiscite is concerned. That is gone. That commitment, whatever it was, has lapsed after the integration of this thing. Therefore that should not be made conditional upon anything. That is how we understood the Government policy to be. That point should be made clear—the question of plebiscite in Kashmir, as to whether Kashmir should remain here or there does not at all arise any more after the developments up to date. Am I right or am I wrong?

55 RSD—13.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: Sir, as I said before, it is not only the people in front of you that you have to fight, but also the people who are with you. And I am happy to think that in our present circumstances the Government does not think of sending a composite delegation to these places, because we shall never say that we shall go back on any engagements. There is a difference between engagements and commitments. We have spent nights and days to find these words out. There are engagements and there have been relations that have been established, but there are no commitments. The commitment is on the side of Pakistan; when she goes out of the country bag and baggage and takes all the people and all the troops and the equipment that she did not have before the 24th of December 1948, when she stops the hatred propaganda, when she absolves herself of the position of being a third class security armed to the teeth, and what is more, by her behaviour earns our goodwill, then only she would have created a commitment and commitment would rise upon us . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What commitment?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: The commitment to deal with the situation as it arises. And at the present moment my commitment is not to tell you beforehand what I should not say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would not pursue this matter. I request the hon. Minister to think whether sometimes we do not mar our case by making too legalistic an approach which has no meaning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendments.

fAmendments Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 were, by leave, withdrawn.

tFor texts of amendments See cols. 4209-4212 *Supra*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House, while generally supporting the fundamental principles of world peace and coexistence based on Panchsheel, regrets to note that in carrying out that policy, the said principles are not uniformly applied by the Government of India, in particular,—

(i) in continuing to be a member of the Commonwealth, when one of its principal member has interfered in the internal affairs of sovereign countries like Egypt and Oman,

(ii) in permitting Portugal to continue colonisation in the soil of India by the possession of Goa, etc.

(iii) in allowing Pakistan to occupy parts of the territories of India,

(iv) in permitting Pakistan to interfere with the free use by India of the waters of Sutlej, Beas and Ravi,

(v) in not settling partition debts due to India by Pakistan, and

(vi) in not protesting strongly about the interference by Soviet troops in the affairs of Hungary.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the policy that the Government is pursuing in The regard to Goa has not only failed to secure the liberation of this colonial outpost on our soil, but has, in effect embold-

ened the Portuguese to resort to frequent firing into the territory of our Republic, thereby violating it'."

The House divided.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Sir, there is no light. The voting machine is not working in my seat.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then how do you vote? Are you in favour of the amendment?

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: I am for the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will be counted.

The result is: Ayes—11; Noes—72.

AYES Bodra, Shri

T. Deshmukh, Shri N. B. Dhage, Shri

V. K. Gour, Dr. R. B. Gupta, Shri

Bhupesh Kishen Chand, Shri

Kunhambu, Shri A. V. Nair, Shri

Perath Narayanan Sekhar, Shri N. C.

Singh, Shri Jaswant Sinha, Shri

Rajendra Pratap.

NOES Akhtar

Husain, Shri Amolakh Chand, Shri

Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati

Bharathi, Shrimati K. Bisht, Shri J. S.

Chatterjee, Shri J. C. Chauhan, Shri

Nawab Singh Dave, Shri S. P.

4371 *Motion re*

[9 SEI

Deb, Shri S. C. Deogirikar, Shri T. R. Deokinandan Narayan, Shri Dharam Das, Shri A. Doogar, Shri R. S. Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan Gilder, Dr. M. D. D. Himatsingka, Shri P. D. Jain, Shri Shriyans Prasad Jalali, Aga S. M. Kapoor, Shri Jaspat Roy Khan, Shri Akbar Ali Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand Lakhamshi, Shri Lavji Lall, Shri Kailash Bihari Mahapatra, Shri Bhagirathi Mahesh Saran, Shri Mirza, Shri D. A. Misra, Shri S. D. Mukerjee, Shri B. K. Naidu, Shri P. S. Rajagopal Nallamuthu Ramamurti, Shrimati T Onkar Nath, Shri Panigrahi, Shri S. Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh Parikh, Shri C. P. Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing Pattabiraman, Shri T. S. Pawar, Shri D. Y. Pushpalata Das, Shrimati Raghavendrarao, Shri Raghubir Sinh, Dr. Rajabhoj, Shri P. N. Rajagopalan, Shri G. Raju, Shri A. S. Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava

IR 1957 J *International Situation* ^qjz Ray,

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Reddy, Shri A. Balarami Samuel, Shri M. H. Sapru, Shri P. N. Savitry Devi Nigam, Shrimati Shah, Shri M. C. Sharma, Shri B. B. Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob Shastri, Pandit Algu Rai Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa Shrimali, Dr. K. L. Singh, Sardar Budh Singh, Babu Gopinath Singh, Shri Ram Kripal Singh, Shri Vijay Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad Sinha, Shri B. K. P. Sinha, Shri R. B. Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D. Tankha, Pandit S. S. N. Tripathi, Shri H. V. Venkataraman, Shri S. Venkataramana, Shri V. Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna Violet Alva, Shrimati Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra

Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati The

motion was nagatived.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will put the amended motion.

The question is:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration and •having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have some announcements to make. There are two Messages.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

I. THE DHOTIES (ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTY) AMENDMENT BILL, 1957

II. THE COTTON FABRICS (ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTY) BILL, 1957

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

I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Dhoties (Additional Excise Duty) Amendment Bill, 1957, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th September, 1957.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the

meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

II

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Cotton Fabrics (Additional Excise Duty) Bill, 1957, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th September, 1957.

"The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay the Bills on the Table.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE EXTENSION OF SESSION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to announce to the House that the current session of the Rajya Sabha will be extended by one day, and the House will, therefore, also sit on Saturday, September 14, for the transaction of Government business.

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

The House then adjourned at forty-six minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 10th September, 1957.