

STATEMENT OF ESTIMATED CAPITAL AND REVENUE RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF THE DELHI STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD FOR 1957-58.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI J. S. L. HATHI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table under sub-section (3) of section 61 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, a copy of the statement of estimated capital and revenue receipts and expenditure of the Delhi State Electricity Board for the year 1957-58. [Placed in Library. See No. S-98/57.]

TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (1956-57)

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, on behalf of Shri R. M. Deshmukh, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Twenty-Fourth Report of the Public Accounts Committee (1956-57) on the Central (Civil) Appropriation Accounts showing excesses over the grants and charged appropriations for the year 1953-54.

MOTION ON INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up the Motion by the Prime Minister. I should like to tell you that the Debate should conclude today and at 4-15 Mr. Krishna Menon will reply. We will sit through the lunch hour.

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

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

Only a few days ago this House considered or rather debated on the President's Address and the debate consisted largely of questions relating to international affairs. There have

been other debates too in the other House and it is rather difficult to cover new ground within such a short space of time. Nevertheless, I am glad that this House, which takes so much of interest in international affairs, should have frequent opportunities of considering this question. I think it is important not only that Parliament but our country also should take this interest in international affairs, not at the expense, of course, of our domestic problems, which are and must always remain our primary consideration, but even the domestic problems are affected so much by international events that it helps to have this larger perspective. I shall endeavour not to say too much at this stage because I think it is due to Members of the House that they should have as much time as possible to express their own opinions and other suggestions and advice for Government's consideration.

One problem which often comes up before hon. Members—and it is no doubt in their minds—is that of Kashmir. Much has been said about that in the course of the last few days, and hon. Members know that Dr. Jarring has been here for some days at the instance of the Security Council of which he was President last month. And we have had talks with him, frank and friendly talks, in which we have endeavoured to place before him the views of the Government of India in regard to this matter. Those views are not secret; they are well known. More I do not wish to say about Kashmir itself.

In considering foreign affairs, naturally we consider specific problems, specially those problems that affect us or that might affect us, and yet the situation all over the world becomes more and more an involved one, each problem leading to the other—it is very difficult to separate them. In the old days people talked about roaming about from China to Peru, presumably considering China and Peru as two remote outposts of the world. Well, neither of them is very

remote either politically or even, if I may say so, geographically. In some sense Peru might be, but even geography has altered its outlook so much because of the development of communications. China of course is our neighbour, and China is something more than a mere neighbour. It has grown into a great country with great influence and increasing capacity to influence affairs. Peru may be on the other side of the world, but even Peru to-day, as every other country, is a kind of neighbour. Every country is a neighbour of the other to-day, we cannot ignore that. It happens in South America or anywhere, but I mention China just now. The House knows that the question of China has exercised us, that is to say, the position of China in regard to the United Nations more especially. It has exercised us a great deal because we have felt that in this after-war world in which we are living, one of the major things that has happened is the changes in China, where a great united powerful country has arisen. They follow a policy which is not our policy; we follow our policy. But it would be as wrong for us to interfere with their policy as it would be wrong for them to interfere with our policy and the way we function here. That is the only way in which I feel that nations can function without coming into conflict and unnecessary conflict. Therefore we have developed friendly relations with China and we co-operate in some ways and I hope we will co-operate in more ways, each following its own way. But the fact that there has been this difficulty about China's representatives finding a place in the United Nations has undoubtedly added greatly to the tensions in East Asia and to some extent in the world, because obviously China is a country which counts in the world, whether we like it or dislike it. We have often said this before in this House and elsewhere, but unfortunately for various reasons this question is postponed, put off in the United Nations year after year, and I do not think that this postponement helps in easing the situation

at all. We continue to think that it is of the highest importance that China, that is, the real and legitimate representatives of China should find their place in the United Nations. In a sense it is there and if you look at the United Nations list you will find that China is represented. Of course China is; it is not a question of China being taken into the United Nations; it is there. Only somebody else is called China, which seems rather peculiar. So here on this occasion again I should like to lay stress on this point, on the importance of it, not only from China's point of view, not only from our point of view but from the world's point of view, that facts should be faced. One cannot solve problems if one started on an artificial basis or if one closed one's eyes to the real objective facts of the situation. No one, I take it, anywhere, in any country can imagine that China, as it is to-day, will fade away or the People's Government of China will cease to function there. If that is so, it is inevitable that that has to be recognised, if not to-day, then tomorrow, or the day after; it seems to follow naturally. If it has to be recognised in that sense by other countries, as we do, and if everybody knows this has to be done, then what purpose is served in delaying it and thereby helping to add to the tension or continue the existing tension? I submit, Sir, that this is important. The issue is not being argued hotly to-day as sometimes, but it comes up from time to time and it is a basic issue in regard not only to South-East Asia but the world and the United Nations. Whatever step the United Nations may take, if it ignores a vast country like China with a tremendous population, that step cannot be very effective—let us say, a step relating to disarmament. Suppose the United Nations comes to some agreement, as we hope it will, and suppose the great powers come to some agreement about disarmament and China is left out. Well, it will be a dangerous kind of disarmament in which one of the biggest powers with the largest population in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

the world is left out, where possibly it may be free to arm itself as much as it likes while other countries seek to disarm. In fact that very thing would prevent others from disarming. So we go round and round.

Take another question which has nothing to do with normal political matters—atomic energy. There is the Atomic Energy Commission, which I am glad to say has resulted in the formation of the Atomic Energy Agency on which our representatives have played some part. Now again this Atomic Energy Agency wants to know facts, scientific data about the world, about uranium and other atomic minerals all over the world, about power resources and a hundred and one things, and China just does not know what is happening there. So every day we face these difficulties arising from this incongruous position. I hope therefore that other countries will consider this matter from the strictly practical point of view. I am not making any appeal from any sentimental point of view; there is no question of sentiment about this. Sentiment may sometimes be good, but it does not help in considering political problems. Unfortunately it is sentiment that comes into the picture, which prevents reality being looked at. Now we may consider our problems here and there in the world, but it does help a little perhaps to try to think of the broad world picture, this dynamic revolutionary picture, which has arisen out of the last World war. All kinds of big changes have happened including our own independence. We tend to think of countries or groups of countries, a great country like the United States of America, another very great power, the Soviet Union, and other great countries, the United Kingdom. France, China, Japan and so on, and we tend to think of each country as some solid body which is this way or that way. Of course that is not a fact with regard to any country. Every country has different types of opinion coursing through it, some clashing with each

other, and we normally consider the opinion of a country, the one which is represented by the Government of the day. Naturally that is so but it is rather misleading to think of these countries as solid individuals having this view or that view and that is apt to mislead us whatever country it may be, the biggest or the smallest, the most authoritarian or the most democratic. We see in all these countries progressive forces at work, reactionary forces at work and, well, just negative inertia at work and it is as well to recognise this because this prevents us from falling a victim to disliking a country as a whole or in the alternative to liking a country and swallowing everything that country has to offer. Both are not very correct attitudes because every country has these various forces at work, fine human beings, idealistic human beings working for noble objectives, others tied up with vested interests, others again, maybe, having some peculiar approach of their own. Here is this jigsaw puzzle of humanity spread out all over the world represented by Governments here and there, but nevertheless gradually changing the pattern of things. Therefore one should avoid thinking of a country as bad because one dislikes its present policy, or as wholly good in the sense of thinking that everything they do is right. That may not be very helpful to us because that would be a kind of approach for which—whether Members of this House and I are fitted for it or not, I do not know—but for which our Chairman is peculiarly fitted, being a philosopher and a thinker who is not swept away by momentary gusts of sentiment. Nevertheless one should try to do that and not be led away in this way in this rapidly changing world. Now, in this changing world again where do we come in? Yesterday, if I may be permitted to say so, you, Sir, Mr. Chairman, made a reference in another place to what happened 17 or 18 years ago when Poland was invaded by the Nazi forces. And the matter I think was that Gandhiji was asked about it, what his opinion was and what India should do

about it, and you reminded us of what he said. I do not exactly remember the words but I think more or less he said that a fallen and subject nation cannot serve humanity. India or any other country can only serve humanity or any cause if it is free enough to serve it. Now of course when that is said it sounds an obvious statement, though many people do not see the obvious in these things. Well, we became free and independent and in a sense our capacity to serve ourselves and others increased. Naturally, it is limited; there are many conditioning factors to it. We are involved in innumerable economic and other problems. We tend to get involved in international issues however much we may keep away and we tend to get involved in these international issues partly because of the circumstances of the case and partly because of our own inheritance of thought and of how we had considered these problems in a different context in the past, and so we get involved. Apart from that, no country can escape involvement when we have international organisations like the United Nations or its many subsidiary bodies. In the old days a country's involvement usually was through its neighbours or through a country with which it might have an alliance. Today, first of all we are all neighbours, as I said, and secondly in these international organisations we have to deal with every country in the world. This was involvement enough for us and so we decided, also in keeping with our own thinking, not to get further involved or in any way involved with military alliances and pacts. Every military alliance or pact is not only an involvement but it is a promise to do something under certain circumstances, and thereby a certain commitment and thereby a certain limitation of your freedom of choice when an occasion to decide that question arises because you have become committed to it. However, for a variety of reasons we adopted this policy of non-involvement, of not entering into any pacts, military or the like. We have friendly pacts and treaties about trade and

other matters for our mutual advantage but none has anything to do with the military aspect, with defence or offence. To some extent of course we are involved in the United Nations, in the broad policy laid down by the Charter of the U.N. This policy of ours is called sometimes a neutral policy. I have often said that it is not neutral. Of course, it is an independent policy of non-involvement and it means that we decide issues in so far as we can on the merits as they appear to us. But apart from that it also means that in this world of ours today when there is so much tension and fear of war and nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons round the corner all the time, what basic policy should a country pursue in order to avoid a catastrophe happening? Whatever policy a country may pursue, inevitably it must be a policy to its interest. Well, no country pursues a policy against its own interest, against its own national interest, and national interests can be viewed in a longer perspective or a shorter one. One may think of some immediate gain that the country may get and yet that immediate gain may result in some ultimate harm. Or one may think more of building up a country so that it may go step by step in the right direction, even though the process may be slow and even though there might be some injury or harm for the time being, apparent injury—it is not real injury. Now, in the present context of the world when we are so much intimately allied with other countries, any policy, first of all that obviously leads to war, and secondly which leads to an atmosphere which might create war and, if I may add to it, any policy which leads to continuing hatred, tension and fear between nations is a policy, well, always in the short run which is bad; but certainly it is bad in the long run obviously. Now, this is a statement with which I imagine everybody will agree, not everybody here only but in any country, and yet the fact is that policies are pursued apparently in the national interest which tend to push the world in a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

direction where disaster may overwhelm it. There is something wrong about the logic or the reason. It is thought, I suppose, that by the addition to a country's military might it might control other countries which might misbehave, and so this process of adding to armaments and all these nuclear explosions, experimental tests and others go on. Yet it is very well known that we have arrived at a stage, more specially in regard to some of the major countries, the very few which are in possession of these nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, a stage when no country can even wipe out the other without suffering grievous injury itself and the world suffering it. So that leads us nowhere, and almost everyone is satisfied that we should not go in for doing anything which would lead to a major war. If that is so, why then is everything done which creates an atmosphere for it, which it does today? All these questions arise.

Some people say, it has been said elsewhere the other day, that we, that is the Government of India, should not adopt a sanctimonious attitude. Well I do not know what a sanctimonious attitude in regard to foreign affairs is. I dislike a sanctimonious attitude in regard to everything, foreign, domestic or personal. It is an irritating attitude. There is no question of the Government of India doing that. We are further reminded that we must remember the type of world we live in, that it is not a world of Gandhiji's creation or a world which Gandhiji would have liked. That is perfectly true. In fact few of us like this type of world, and therefore one cannot follow in this world as it is the policy which one might follow in a better world, which is perfectly true. Nevertheless I hope and try to follow a policy which might lead to a better world. We are not pacifists in the Government of India. We may talk about peace and non-violence. We maintain an army, a navy, an air force, etc., police force, because no responsible Government, so far as I can see

can do otherwise, but nevertheless we dislike these trends to war. We think that they are dangerous. We think that these experimental explosions, nuclear and thermonuclear, are not only bad in the sense that they take us in the wrong direction but they actually, according to scientists, do tremendous injury—tremendous, I am sorry for the use of the word—anyhow they would do injury to the whole of mankind today, gradually. But if that is considered moralising, well, I do not know what to say. It is the hard fact that we have to consider. I think that many of our friends in other countries, and may be in this country, who consider that they are following a practical policy, are as far from following anything practical as anybody can be. It is not a practical policy if you are going on a journey just looking at the tip of your nose. You have to look further ahead, otherwise you would stumble and fall. But there is another aspect to this question of what India can do and should not do. Many hon. Members often tell us that the Government of India must do this or that, whatever it may be, whether in the world, whether in regard to Kashmir, whether in regard to Goa, things which on the face of it may be desirable or not. But we can only say things and do things which we are capable of doing. It is no good striking up brave attitudes which may elicit applause from our people or elsewhere, and then we are unable to follow them or, if we try to follow them, we get involved in putting greater difficulties.

Take this question of Goa which those people imagine should be very easy of solution because Goa is a very small area, tiny area in India, because even the so-called metropolitan power behind Goa, that is Portugal, well, by any manner of reckoning, is not a strong power. That is so. Nevertheless this question becomes involved in all kinds of international issues. It gets involved there and therefore to do something wrong there involves us in many other things and creates difficulties for us. Quite apart from the

major issue that if we adopt a policy in regard to Goa which is in opposition to our broad approach in the world and in India, that is the broad approach which I would call a non-military approach, well that broad approach of course ends. Then of course we are neither here nor there in regard to our major policies. I am not for the moment defending what we have done or not done in Goa—that is a separate issue. But I should like hon. Members to realise that the question is not a question of that little tract of territory, important as it is, but it involves all kinds of international issues and our broad policies.

The other day I said in the other House that we feel that this whole policy of Goa, not the broad policy but rather the narrower interpretation of this broad policy should be given careful consideration, and I further said that in this matter we should like to consult with Members of Parliament not only of one particular party but all parties. I do not wish people to go away with the idea that we have evolved some big weapon to be wielded by us in the near future. That would be a wrong notion. All I said was that this matter is a national issue of course, and it is an irritating issue, and it is a human issue. A Member of the other House who spent two or three years in Goa prisons gave a horrifying account of the Goa prisons—he has just been released a little while ago—and that applied to the Indian nationals who were prisoners there, because the condition of the Goans themselves who have been there—hundreds of them are there in prison and thousands have passed through prison—is much worse. All this human aspect and national aspect is important for us, and yet the major policies that we have pursued are also important, and we do not think that by giving up that major approach we will be doing the right thing by India or Goa. Nevertheless, as I said, this is a matter requiring careful consideration and, as far as possible, consultation with others so that we may have the advantage of other people's

advice and opinion. We propose to proceed on those lines. What exactly we shall do and how far it would produce any kind of results I cannot say at this stage. To quote, Sir, you referred yesterday to what Gandhiji said in connection with the invasion of Poland—a fallen and subject nation cannot serve humanity. That idea may be extended somewhat. A country which has tied itself up to powerful nations even though it may get help from them, has not only reduced its capacity for independent action and any service that it may render, but is also strictly limited in scope. To that extent, it becomes a projection of some other country's policy. It may vary in small matters slightly, but in the major things in the world it is merely a projection of some other country's policy, and that is not, I think, a kind of thing which I should like India ever to do—to project some other country's policy. We have seen this happening in Europe and in Asia. I do not wish to criticise any countries, but many a country which is called independent, so far as its foreign policy is concerned, hardly follows or can follow a policy of its own choice. I admit that no country can follow a policy of its own choice completely. It is conditioned by events, it is conditioned by its own strength or weakness. That is true. But nevertheless to give up the right to follow one's policy by being tied up in this way, and just to spell a shadow of somebody else's policy, is not my idea of independence or of developing the capacity to serve ourselves or humanity. That is why we have regretted this development of military pacts in the world. They may have been necessary somewhere. I am not here to judge as to what fears and apprehensions of the countries might lead them to, because after the last war there was a great deal of fear and apprehension, and that fear and apprehension continues in Europe. The whole of the question of German unity is hung up because of that.

I suppose only a few persons can oppose the idea of German unity. And

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

yet, while everybody in theory agrees with it, the consequences of it make people afraid, and make people on every side afraid, whether it is the so-called West or the so-called East, because Germany is not a country which can be trifled with. It is a very great country, great in its capacity in war and peace both. And so, many people are afraid that if in a new context German unity is achieved, as I hope it will be, in the context in which it is achieved, many results may follow which may not be desirable to this side or that. Now the future of the German people, therefore, is governed, not so much by what the German people want, but by the fears of others. The whole of Eastern Europe including the Soviet Union remembers very vividly those repeated invasions by Germany. The whole of Eastern Europe and Southern Russia were reduced almost to ruin by those invasions, twice at least in our lifetime. The whole of Western Europe is afraid that the great strength of the Soviet Union might be exercised against it, and so they go in for military alliances, and each tries to protect itself against the other, with the result that a greater insecurity takes place, and there is a greater race in building up nuclear and other types of armaments, which, of course, leads again to greater fear; and so, you get into this vicious circle. The way of military pacts, one against the other, surely is not the way out. It might have been a way out if one side was so powerful that the other would collapse. Not that we want any side to collapse, but when, both sides are strong enough to do injury to each other—whatever happens—and a vital injury, then some other way has to be found and facts have to be accepted. And the only other way can be that of peaceful co-existence and the prevention of any aggression. Well, we tried to put these four or five principles in the Panchsheel which still seem to us to be a good code of international behaviour. But then unfortunately, however good the words that are used or the phrases

that are used may be, gradually they become hackneyed and are used for wrong purposes. A good word and a good phrase is used for something entirely different. Peace is bandied about in accents, in tones and in looks of war, which changes its very nature. Security, which is a good thing—countries should have security—becomes a reason for armed alliances which threaten somebody else's security, and so we debase our fine words and phrases. Then we have to search some new words which might not have been so debased.

There is this Middle-Eastern situation which is perhaps a little better than it was, and we hope that in the near future the Suez Canal will be functioning again. I cannot be definite about the precise date or the precise conditions in which it will function. But we are all interested—India is even more interested than many Western countries—in the proper functioning of the Suez Canal and in free navigation through that canal. We have tried, in our own small and humble way, to help by sorting out these difficulties, and all I can say is that I hope that those difficulties will be overcome in the near future. But the whole situation in this Middle-Eastern region has been governed by two major factors. One, of course, is oil. Oil is a very necessary thing in this world, and a very wicked thing. It has created a great deal of trouble. Now there is no reason why peaceful settlements about the supply of oil should not be made, and why a country is required to dominate over another country in order to have oil. In fact, in the final analysis, it will not get the oil if it has a hostile population there. We have tried all the time, but this rather novel argument, not novel perhaps, but anyhow, it has been given a novel turn of vacuums which have to be filled, appears to be really a repetition of the old approach to these questions of spheres of influence—the world being divided up into the spheres of influence of some countries. Long ago, many hundreds of years

ago, the then Pope issued a Bull dividing up the world between Spain and Portugal; some kind of line or parallel was set; "You have this part of the world and the others will have the rest". Of course, that ignored certain factors, and it was not given effect to, although even a few years ago, I should say some five, six or seven years ago, the Portuguese Government reminded us of that as part of the origin of their authority in Goa. This sphere of influence is obviously an extension or part of the colonial idea, whether it is a colony of the old type or the new type. Sphere of influence necessarily means a kind of domination, indirect if you like. Sometimes indirect domination is as bad as direct domination over a country. So, we are opposed to that vacuum idea or these power alignments.

I am not venturing to say much about specific problems, because much has been said already, but only one thing should like to say about our neighbour, Pakistan. We talk about Kashmir, talk about other issues too, and the world talks about some of them too without knowing what the facts are, but the real difficulty—difficulties are there of course; I am not going into them—but the basic difficulty about our relations with Pakistan is the attitude of Pakistan. They have not yet apparently got over that basic attitude which some of them, the people and leaders, had even before the partition. How can there be any settlement of any problem at the point of the sword or threats which are all the time being hurled at us? It is a simple fact. If people want to settle any problem, they should be in the mood for settlement, they should use the language of settlement and peace. They should approach us as friends and not with threats. Any country, even a small country, would react strongly against such an approach, and India is neither a small nor an ignoble country to submit to threats and bullying. It may have been thought that recent developments in which very strong language has been used, in Pakistan of course—and it

continues to be used—but even in some Western countries, would tend, well, to frighten us. They forget that normally speaking it has the opposite effect, and it has had that opposite effect. It surprised us that people should think of India in this way, that they could use such language to us and hold out such indirect threats as to what might happen. That is not the way to settle problems. I do not pretend that we are always in the right; I do not pretend that there are no people in this country who tend to use wrong language or make the wrong approaches, but I do submit that, so far as the Government of India is concerned, ever since independence and partition, it has been our definite aim and policy to have friendly relations with Pakistan, not of course giving up our vital interests, because giving up vital interests does not promote friendly relations; it only encourages the other party to open its mouth wider, claim more and shout more. It has been our policy to have friendly relations with Pakistan—we have of course accepted Pakistan and accepted partition—and to proceed on the basis of two independent nations having friendly relations, co-operative relations, with each other. We are neighbours; we have a history in common; we have a hundred and one things in common; we have thousands of persons whose families are split up, and it will be a tragedy for us to aim at anything but friendly relations. We have done that in spite of some misguided persons in this country who come in the way of such a friendly policy. Why have we done that? Surely I need not say why, because any person who at all thinks about the future must come to this conclusion that there is no other valid policy. That policy, friendly policy, does not naturally mean our giving up our vital interests or our submitting to something that we consider wrong. Subject to these two conditions, we have pursued a friendly policy, because it can only harm us and harm Pakistan, if we continue this conflict, psychological conflict, and take it into the future. It is totally

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
 immaterial whether we are stronger than Pakistan or not. That can be considered in another context. The very weakness of Pakistan is injurious to us. I do not want Pakistan to be militarily armed so much that it becomes very strong and threatens us. That is why we have not taken kindly to the vast military equipment and help that is coming to Pakistan from the United States of America; but I am not talking about that. But we want Pakistan to be a healthy, flourishing and progressive country. Even for our own safety, even for our own good, you must have this. The more you succeed with your Five Year Plans and the less Pakistan succeeds with her Five Year Plans—it is a danger to our own Plans, to our own progress. You cannot keep these walls between countries, so that apart from the historical, cultural and other reasons, practical reasons lead us to seek good relations with Pakistan as with other countries, and in fact more so with Pakistan. But unfortunately during these past years, we have had a continuous current of ill-will in Pakistan, sometimes at a somewhat lower level and sometimes breaking out into extraordinary threats of war and denunciation of India, based on excessive hatred. It is a most painful thing to have to face all this, and yet to maintain one's calm and composure which one must, because the moment we do not, we are doing exactly what others want us to do, those who do not wish good to India. We cannot give way, whatever the strain and stress might be. We have pursued that proper policy, always protecting our interests and, I hope, maintaining decent standards of behaviour. We have done so in the hope that the people of Pakistan whom I can never forget—they have been our people in the past, have taken part in our freedom movements, they certainly helped us in gaining the freedom of our country although they separated from us—will react to this, in the hope that ultimately our goodwill will create a good, friendly atmosphere in Pakistan among the

people and among others. I believe it has basically, but unfortunately it is covered up and swept away by appeals, by the spread first of all, if I may use the word, of falsehood and appeals to narrow-minded bigotry and hatred. It is fear on which our neighbours have been fed. It does not produce health in nations, apart from their relationship with India. So, whatever happens, I hope that we shall continue that broad policy. Again I repeat that this should not be understood to mean—and we have made that perfectly clear—that we follow that policy through weakness or that it is a prelude to any kind of surrender on any vital issue. It is not that. We have made that perfectly clear. Maybe, it is a bit difficult to distinguish between the two, but we have to do it. On no account are we going to surrender because surrendering to what we consider wrong is bad because surrender again creates a position of future demands for surrender and so it goes on step by step. Where are we? All these questions between Pakistan and us are really parts of this major approach to each other, however big these questions may be. I am quite certain that if any one of these questions were solved or apparently solved without that major background changing, it will not improve the situation at all. That may be just used as a jumping-off ground to something else.

Sir, I have ventured to say these few words about our relations with Pakistan because I do not wish people to look at one problem, even the Kashmir problem, in its isolation and imagine that there is nothing else. It is the other things that count. It is amazing that in this context here we see, the Security Council dealing with the Kashmir issue. Even in the Security Council and a great deal outside, continuous threats are being used: 'If this does not happen, armies will march into India and then it is war' without any thought of what this kind of talk would produce or what kind of reaction it would produce in India, because normally it produces an angry

reaction in people. The national reaction is there. It so happens that in our country, to a large extent, we have been conditioned in trying to restrain these reactions, conditioned for a long period under Gandhiji. We try to restrain them but the reactions are there. We restrain them no doubt and do not allow ourselves to be swept away.

So I would like this House and this country to consider these in this broader aspect—these problems and others too outside this House in our country and in Pakistan also, because it is a tragedy that when so much has got to be done in our country by us and so much in Pakistan by the people of Pakistan, that our energies should be wasted in this kind of continuous ill-will and conflict and this propaganda of hatred from Pakistan.

Sir, I move.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

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

There is one amendment. Dr. Anup Singh.

Dr. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Sir I move:

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

‘and having considered the same, this House fully agrees with and approves the said policy.’”

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Motion and the amendment are before the House now for discussion. As I find you have only four hours and I have on my list 18 speakers, you will have to impose restraint on your own reactions as the Prime Minister said, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—not more than 20 minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, you have applied the restriction.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister has made a statement in this

House with regard to the situation in the world today. Earlier he had also given us an exposition of the world situation in the other House. I am much in agreement with what he had said here and in the other House. Equally I must say that I am also in agreement with the very able and clear reply to the debate that Shri Krishna Menon gave in the other House yesterday. Generally, we are in agreement with the line the Government of India is pursuing in the matter of foreign policy. I entirely share the sentiments expressed by the Government on the advent of freedom in Ghana. We wish them all success and I have no doubt in my mind that the Government of India will be always with them in their endeavour to build up on that freedom. Equally I share the sentiment the Prime Minister expressed about how the relations between India and Pakistan should be conducted. While we should not at all submit to any kind of threat or bullying it should be our constant endeavour even unilaterally to uphold the cause of friendly relations between our two peoples. I have again no doubt in my mind that there are people in Pakistan who are seeing to it that those people who believe in war and war-like threats do not have a long lease of political life.

Then hopes have been expressed about the functioning of Suez Canal. I hope the Suez Canal will begin to function soon and without impinging on the independence and sovereignty of Egypt. That is of vital concern to all of us but I regret here the fact that while the matter of foreign affairs was debated in the other House, none of the Members of our Party participated. From the Opposition Benches the main speech was made by the leader of another opposition party. In the absence of our speech there or participation there and because of what he had said it might give some wrong impressions with regard to what the Opposition feels about the foreign policy of the Government of India; therefore, I would take this opportunity of dissociating myself as

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]
a Member of one of the leading ~~of~~ Opposition Parties in this Parliament, from many of the things that he had said in regard to foreign policy. I am very sorry that he took that line of argument which, I think, is not in conformity either with facts or with the traditions of our country. He thinks that the foreign policy of the Government of India has been a failure whereas the fact is that India's foreign policy has been a success.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Is it correct for him to refer to the speech of an hon. Member in the other House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may develop your argument independently without answering any reference there or without any reference to any speech in the other House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is a controversy that I am dealing with. If in this matter there is no controversy between me and the Prime Minister, I cannot help. I have to deal with such controversy. He says that India stands isolated as a result of our foreign policy whereas the fact is that we have won more allies than before. We are stronger than ever before. That goes to the credit of India's foreign policy and that policy should not be derided by anyone in this country. One-third of the humanity that lives in the socialist world stands solidly behind us and even in the capitalist countries, there are many people who admire the foreign policy that the Government of India is pursuing. In particular we have won the sympathy, support and friendship of the Asian and African countries as a result of the foreign policy and the policy of Panchsheel which is no small gain either to the honour of our country or to the cause of world peace. Politically and morally, we are stronger and today India is happily in the front-line of mass world forces that are struggling for world peace. It requires a closed or a highly prejudiced mind not to see

these shining realities, the realities that radiate hope for all mankind. I must also say that his unkind reference to our delegate to the United Nations is something which I did not expect from him. One may or may not agree with everything that Shri Menon said in the Security Council; but it must be admitted in all fairness that Shri Menon has handled India's case with statesmanship, with patriotism and with admirable skill and care. He deserves a word of cheer from all of us and not discouragement, much less unwarranted remarks and criticism.

(Interruptions.)

Those who share my sentiments, those who feel like this on this matter, should have realised that Shri Menon was not confronted with the task of convincing the Anglo-American imperialist powers or their stooges. He was confronted with the task of presenting the just case of India at its best and I have no hesitation in saying that he has, on the whole done his job well. Sir, people refer to and speak in terms of persuasive logic. I do not know what exactly people mean by saying that he does not have persuasive logic. But we must realise that those who are trading in war, who pile up armaments and atomic weapons and who want to plunge the world into a war, as in the case of Egypt, do not merit persuasion. If Mr. Menon did not use the so-called persuasive skill, he has done the right thing and I suppose he has kept this skill in reserve, for a better occasion. You cannot win the hearts of imperialist aggressors with forensic skill or sweet words. You can only beat them into surrender. You can never woo them into good sense. This is what I would like to tell those people who want some kind of persuasive logic and forensic ability, when they deal with such customers like the Anglo-American imperialists. I regret such a reference should have been made.

Let me now turn to the world situation. With much of what the hon.

Prime Minister has said, we are in entire agreement, as I have already said. On the whole, he has given us a somewhat objective picture of the world situation. I would only like to stress certain aspects of that situation.

For a long time, America has been operating in the West Asian countries, trying to retain its colonial domination or advance its colonial interests. In fact, West Asia was turned into a cockpit of imperial rivalries and intrigues and the rights of the people of those lands were being constantly and consistently violated. But today new forces have come into operation there and that is why the imperialist powers are a little panicky. Now America wants to impose its colonial domination and step into the place of Britain and France and that is why they are talking of filling up the power vacuum. It has nothing to do either with the freedom or with the interests of the people who inhabit those lands. That is the object of their intrigues and their interference in their internal affairs. Though their plans are supposed to be against the Soviet Union, their plans are really for the enslavement of those countries which they are supposed to help. That is the crux of the problem. That is what we must understand. The problem is there. All these imperialist powers want to re-establish or to maintain their colonial domination in that region. And the latest development is, of course, the Eisenhower doctrine and I think the Government of India has been very right in strongly criticising that doctrine which goes against the interest of all those countries which are supposed to be embraced by that plan and which is also directed against the security and independence of the Asian and African countries. It is said that this assistance is intended to safeguard the national interests of those countries against the threat of international communism. Sir, the serpents are talking like doves in this matter. It is the U.S.A. and the imperialist powers who are now threatening the independence and the security of other

countries. The U.S.A. is instigating war against even India today by its assistance to Pakistan. It was Britain that launched the aggression in Egypt. It is Britain which threatens Syria. It is Britain again which has attacked Yemen; but we are told that international communism threatens the security and safety of these countries. We have heard this stock argument before. Before the second World War, we were told that the Communists, their international organisation was a threat and we know that anti-Commintern blocs were formed and we also know that the result has been the Second World War. Therefore, we know that America wants to exploit this old argument about anti-communism and that is only a cover for advancing their imperialistic aims and for imperial domination and for preparing for a war against the people who are not ready to line up with the imperialists.

It is a matter to be noted that even in those countries which are supposed to be aided by the U.S.A. there is a strong opinion against the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. In one of the important Middle Eastern papers, they have come out strongly against this so-called Eisenhower doctrine. I think the Syrian Government has made it clear that their region is not threatened either by communism or by any of the communist countries. This is what the Syrian Foreign Minister—Al Bitar—has said on January, 19th. He said:

“The Soviet Union had no ambition in West Asia and was not seeking any privilege there.”

I am quoting from the *Times of India* of the 20th January. So this is how they view this matter. But these imperialists say that these countries are being threatened and they offer assistance when nobody is asking for such assistance from them. Obviously, the very object is to get a foothold there so that they could operate against our country and other countries which do not line up behind this imperialist policy. That is the entire plan.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

They say they are willing to give economic assistance to those countries. But we have seen how they behaved in the case of the Aswan Dam. Foreign assistance was offered, but the moment Egypt refused to submit to the Americans, the foreign assistance was withdrawn, and then followed other things, this aggression and all that we have seen. Therefore, nobody will be taken in by this kind of propaganda, that these imperialist powers are interested in the development of these countries, in giving them real economic assistance in order to ensure their prosperity and in order to reconstruct these underdeveloped or undeveloped countries. This is all a hoax.

Therefore, I think we are right in coming out very sharply against the Eisenhower doctrine and India should do everything in her power to meet this challenge. She should mobilise world public opinion, especially of the peoples of Asian and African countries, against this new scheme of aggression and plunder and colonial domination.

In this connection, I would venture to suggest that the time has come for considering the proposition of having a second Bandung Conference. I know that some of the powers that met at the first Bandung Conference are not behaving well, at least the Pakistan Government is not. But that does not mean that we should not have a meeting of the Bandung Powers. They should meet and in the light of the Bandung Declaration, we should work out practical steps to meet the present situation. Again, it is also important that there should be some kind of a mechanism for very speedy consultations between these powers, those powers who, like those at the Bandung Conference, adhere to the principles of Panch-sheel. This is necessary, because we find that the imperialist powers are meeting time and again, sometimes in Canberra, sometimes in Bermuda and sometimes in Baghdad. They are constantly meeting and hatching plot after plot against other countries.

And I do not see any reason why we, representing such millions of people in the Asian-African Continent, should not meet from time to time to review the situation and take such actions, political, moral or otherwise in order to rebuff these aggressive designs on the part of the imperialists. In this connection, I appreciate the Prime Minister's broad support of the Shepilov plan because I think that requires a little consideration. I do not say that this plan should be accepted as it is but I think it is along these lines that the question has to be approached. We must first of all make clear that no power has any right to interfere in the internal affairs of the countries of West Asia; they must keep off if they are not interested in helping the development of those countries. If they are interested in the development of those countries, they are welcome to do so but in terms laid down by the West Asian powers themselves and not by anybody else and in every case, the independence and sovereignty of the West Asian powers must be fully respected and they must not be directly or indirectly embroiled in war or themselves be subjected to foreign nations. We stand for full independence and the whole thing should be conducted in the spirit of Panchsheel. I think, Sir, this is the only approach to this question.

I would now like to say something about the Baghdad Pact but before saying anything, I would like to tell the hon. Prime Minister that he at one time was thinking that the Baghdad Pact was dead. If I may use his words, he said, "Where is the Baghdad Pact?" It looks as if the Baghdad Pact is very much alive. We said that Pakistan was being constantly activated by the Anglo-American powers. Now, Sir, I am glad that the Prime Minister also recognises the danger and he has spoken ably on this Pact. I entirely agree with him but only I would like his Government to devise measures so that we can really effectively rebuff such plans. America had been taking

great and growing interest in the Baghdad Pact and now, with the Bermuda Conference, a decision has been taken to admit America into the Military Council of the Baghdad Pact. Even before this decision, the U.S. representatives were invited to the committee meetings of the Baghdad Pact Council. The U.S.A. has equipped Pakistan and other Baghdad Pact nations with American equipment and thus had become the instigator of the Baghdad alignment.

(Time bell rings.)

I want another fifteen minutes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have got eighteen speakers. Take another two minutes and finish the speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We did not speak in the other House. I would like to make up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot make up for the loss of time there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Congress Party speeches are there. I would request you to still grant me some more time; otherwise, there is no point in continuing.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): He may have some five or ten minutes more. Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have put up only a few speakers. We cannot deal with this subject in such a short time.

I was, Sir, referring to the U.S. complicity in the Baghdad Pact. Now, what has happened is that what has been taking place has been given formal recognition. All that has been done is that what was being done secretly and from behind the scene would be done openly after the U.S. joining the Pact. The Baghdad Pact with Pakistan as its main active partner shows how America mobilises and is directed against India. It is not a coincidence that they have moved the Kashmir issue simultaneously with the activation of the Baghdad Pact. If Panchsheel is the sheet anchor of our foreign policy, for Pakistan Baghdad Pact has become

the sheet anchor. This becomes understandable with the military, and moral backing which the Pakistani Government is receiving from the United States of America and Britain. The Anglo-American Resolution which was vetoed by the Soviet Union was an attempt to introduce imperialist armies in Kashmir. If this did not succeed, it does not mean that the other plans are not in operation. Sir, I would like particularly to appreciate what the Prime Minister said. He characterised the Anglo-American resolution as a collective aggression or an approach to collective aggression but I would only like to stress here that even if this resolution has been vetoed, we are not out of the danger by such collective approach to aggression or aggression. Military assistance to Pakistan has been stepped up and the Pakistani Army and Air Force are holding combined exercises in Pakistan, the North-West Frontier of Pakistan, from December 14. They held it up to the 17th December. These reports appeared in the Press and even the Pakistani Commander-in-Chief, General Ayub Khan made it clear that they were being given certain training or exercise in the use of atomic weapons. Now, recently, we find that Mr. Bunker, U.S. Ambassador, has denied that Pakistan is being supplied with atomic weapons but then when he was asked a question as to what the U.S. could do if Pakistan used American weapons against India, he gave an evasive answer and said that India could take it to the Security Council, the U.N.O.,—the normal procedure. Now, Sir, I would particularly stress this point in order only to emphasise that we must take serious note of the kind of assistance that is being given to Pakistan by the U.S.A. No doubt the U.S.A. is building up the Pakistani Armed Forces only with dangerously aggressive aims. That is what I would like to emphasise in this House but there are good and redeeming features in this situation because the people of Pakistan, especially in East Pakistan, are rising against military alliances and

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

the foreign policy of Mr. Suhrawardy. East Pakistan, as you know, is the biggest unit of Pakistan and I am sure the same feelings are also there in West Pakistan. The Kashmir issue is raised to keep themselves in power through diversionist tactics and hence runs counter to the interests of the democratic movement of Pakistan. We may, therefore, give support and sympathy to the democratic people of Pakistan in our approach to this matter and I have no doubt in my mind that sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister will be reciprocated by those people in Pakistan who want to get out of military alignments and build up their own independence on the basis of friendly and fraternal relations with our country.

I would like to refer to the N.A.T.O. The Prime Minister referred to it earlier but the most alarming thing of the recent conference is this that they are now devising ways and means of interfering in the internal affairs of the countries even though nobody asked them for special protection. That spells danger to the independence and security of those countries. Sir, the Prime Minister has referred to the military pacts. I make a declaration here that we stand for no military pact. We are opposed to all kinds of military pacts no matter what they are and which countries are involved but, at the same time, we must recognise that it is the N.A.T.O. powers which started this thing and it is they who got together and these powers into a military alignment with professed aggressive aims and they adopted the tactics of nuclear war and all that. We have seen that as a result of this, the Warsaw Pact came into existence. We stand for neither of these pacts. We would like all these pacts to go but you must remember—and I would like to impress upon this House this point—that unless and until these aggressive pacts are nullified, it comes difficult to come out with a general line. In this connection I would refer to the speech made yesterday under your Chairmanship at

another place by the Polish Prime Minister when he said that he was also opposed to all military pacts. We have seen how the Soviet Union in the countries of socialist lands have time and again expressed their desire to do away with the pacts provided N.A.T.O. also goes. In its place, they had suggested collective security. I think, Sir, we should build up a system of collective security and we should be free of this kind of pact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to refer to one thing, with regard to Kashmir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no, you have got so many opportunities.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would not have any opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here or elsewhere.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nowhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want only two minutes more, Sir, on Kashmir. I am very sorry, Sir, that somehow or other we do not get the chance to adequately express our views. Only I would speak about Kashmir, Sir. You should remember that we have got so far, by counting, 12 million votes in the country. I speak for those 12 million votes and you will please give me a little more time today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member who has just sat down has put that life into the debate which the Prime Minister failed to do; nevertheless I should like to discuss the question of foreign policy in the atmosphere created by the Prime Minister and I should therefore like to ask the House to revert to the spirit in which the Prime Minister spoke.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

He referred to many questions but he made only a passing reference to the problem in which, for the time being, we are most interested, namely, the Kashmir question. I suppose, not wanting to repeat what he said in another place only two days ago, he contented himself merely by saying that the position of India with regard to Kashmir had been made repeatedly clear beyond all doubt.

Sir, many things have been said about this Kashmir problem. Nevertheless I should like to remind the House of a few recent facts which, I think, have not received attention. India referred the question of Pakistani aggression in Kashmir to the United Nations in 1948. The question, as the Prime Minister has repeatedly said, was a simple one. Nevertheless the Security Council said nothing on the issue that was placed before it by our country. Indeed the representatives of the bigger powers on the Security Council not merely tried to put Pakistan on a footing of equality with India in this matter but expressed the opinion that the tribesmen were also a party to the question that was under consideration. The British delegate, I think, several times expressed the belief that the tribesmen were entitled to be considered as a party to the Kashmir dispute. The American representative also expressed the same view. "How is it possible", he said, "to induce the tribesmen to retire from Jammu and Kashmir without warfare and without driving them out? That is the only way it can be done unless the tribesmen are satisfied that there is to be a fair plebiscite assured through an interim Government that is in fact, and that has the appearance of being non-partisan." It is quite clear, Sir, that this view had nothing to do with the merits of the question. It was probably concerned with the interests of England and America, as their representatives saw them, and this happened, Sir, long before the SEATO and the Baghdad Pact had been thought of. Evidently America and Great Britain thought that it would be advantageous to them if they fol-

lowed a policy that could make Pakistan dependent on them for ever.

Take another question, Sir, the deliberations on another point, namely, the deliberations and decisions of the UNCIP. Now it has been repeatedly said by our spokesmen that the Resolutions of the UNCIP were accepted subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions. But this is never referred to by those who want to put us in the wrong and who have so cleverly manoeuvred things as to give us a bad name virtually throughout the world. In the discussions that have very recently taken place in the Security Council the representative of Columbia brought this to light in a way that ought not to be ignored by the world. Speaking in the Security Council he said—I am referring to this, Sir, because the speech of the Columbian delegate, which was extremely important, has been very inadequately reported by the press. This shows, Sir, how the reporting agencies are affected by the views of the greater powers. Speaking in the Security Council the Columbian delegate said, "The Commission did achieve an unexpected success since it managed to convince the Indian Government to accept with conditions the submission of the question of Kashmir to a plebiscite so that the people of Kashmir could decide upon it." Again he said, "Because the Commission recognised India's *de facto* sovereignty over Jammu and Kashmir, the Commission was able to obtain India's agreement to the following procedure. After certain conditions had been fulfilled," etc. Referring to the reply of the Chairman of the UNCIP, Dr. Lozano, he said,—I mean the reply of Dr. Lozano to the Prime Minister's letter—he said, "It was understood that there would be no commitment on India's side if parts I and II of the August Resolution were not implemented." He also referred to one other important point in his speech, namely, the appointment of Admiral Nimitz, as the plebiscite administrator. "In the UNCIP" he said, "the representative of Colum-

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

bia insisted that the plebiscite administrator should be a neutral, but other representatives had specific instructions to press for the nomination of a United States citizen as plebiscite administrator. My delegation suggested in private conversations that the idea of the representative of India should be accepted, namely, that the President of the International Red Cross should be appointed plebiscite administrator. I think that, had that suggestion been accepted, the plebiscite would already have been held. Instead, Admiral Nimitz was appointed."

1 P.M.

Sir, I have referred to this because only one Delhi daily has published the Columbian delegate's speech and it is quite possible that there may be some Members who have not read the full text of the Columbian delegate's speech.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): It has been published in other papers also.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: No; it was not published in other papers.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): No; it was not.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Only a very inadequate summary of it was published in the other papers, a summary which gave no idea whatsoever of its real contents.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I read the entire speech in two or three papers.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Well, not in Delhi. Anyway, Sir, the Columbian delegate's speech should reveal to the whole world the spirit in which the most important members of the Security Council have acted in dealing with the Kashmir question. The SEATO was thought of, I believe, only in 1954 but from 1948 to 1953 the Security Council never once discussed the Kashmir question in a spirit of complete impartiality and fairness. It may suit the Pakistan Government to delude its people into

thinking that it is the participation of Pakistan in the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO that enabled it to win its point in the Security Council a few weeks ago but I doubt whether this propaganda will succeed in deluding the people of Pakistan, particularly the people of East Bengal.

Sir, I should just like to refer to only one point more in connection with the Kashmir question before I deal with other issues. It has now been proposed that in order to assure the parties concerned that a plebiscite, if it is held will be impartial, the UNEF should be allowed to come to Kashmir. Well, here again, we see the effort of the Security Council to treat Pakistan on a footing of equality with India. If the Security Council deals with the aggressors and victims in this way, it can hardly achieve the reputation of being an impartial body. I mean, it is quite clear from the discussion that has taken place on the Kashmir question that the Security Council's decisions are political decisions based on the view taken by the bigger countries of their larger interests.

Now, Sir, I should like just to say a word or two about the reopening of the Suez Canal and the Middle East question. We are glad to be reassured that the Suez Canal will soon be reopened to free navigation. That question has not yet been settled and I hope that the Prime Minister's wish that navigation through the Canal should be free will soon be realised. The friends of Egypt, like India and Yugoslavia, have advised it to follow a policy of moderation and it appears that Egypt has no desire to create a crisis. One hopes therefore that given the goodwill that at present exists both on the side of the U.N. and on that of Egypt, a result will be achieved which while giving satisfaction to Egypt will also lead to a lasting solution from the international point of view.

As regards Middle East, I was glad to hear the Prime Minister say that both America and the Soviet Union had made important suggestions with

regard to the maintenance of peace there in the future, that it was desirable in the interest both of the Middle East and of the rest of the world that the higher representatives of these two countries should meet and discuss the question in such a way as to take into account the interests of the people of the Middle East without making any other party feel that its position was being weakened. I was very glad to hear this because so far as I remember, he said some time ago that the suggestion made by Russia that all countries should decide to leave the Middle East alone deserved to be accepted. This seemed to me to be a rather one-sided view for the reason that I am just going to explain.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I say that the words used by me were that that suggestion as well as President Eisenhower's deserved to be considered. I did not say 'accepted'.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Quite so but I am speaking of an earlier statement made by you.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I said 'considered'; I did not say 'accepted'.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am quite prepared to accept what the Prime Minister has said. His memory in this matter, I gladly admit, would be stronger than mine. Well, it gives me great pleasure to know this because it is well known that when Mr. Shepilov succeeded Mr. Molotov as Foreign Minister he tried, while carrying on negotiations with America in the interests of world peace, to enhance Soviet influence in the Middle East. That policy failed and as a result of it, Mr. Shepilov was dismissed. After this Russia put forward the proposal that both America and Russia should agree not to interfere in matters relating to the Middle East. Obviously America could not agree to a proposal which was a sort of propaganda and would have given the Soviet Union an

advantage in the eyes of the world. What the Prime Minister has said seems to be eminently reasonable. If an agreement is arrived at after discussion between the important powers, no one will be able to claim that the solution that was arrived at was the result of the policy of any one country, and I think the Middle East will welcome it, and so will the whole world.

Sir, how much time have I?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Twenty minutes are over.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Will you allow me to say one word more before I sit down? The Prime Minister has often explained the Indian policy to us. We have been told that it was a policy of non-involvement, that it was based on the 'Panchsheel'. We understand that, and there can be no question that this policy is at the present stage in the best interests of India. Nevertheless, it is desirable to discuss the question of foreign policy from the point of view of India's National interests also, that is, her security and her economic welfare. But unfortunately the Prime Minister, though he has spoken several times on the question of India's foreign policy, has, I am afraid, never once tried to relate it to its own interests. The people of India do not realise the intimate connection between the national interests of a country and its foreign policy. I think that this has become urgently necessary. No doubt, as I have said more than once in this House, world peace is one of the things that is most in the interests of India, but India has its own special interests too, and a nation can no more stand alone than an individual can without friends. I think, therefore, Sir, that we should actively consider the question whether without giving up the principles of our foreign policy we can so conduct it as to gain friends in those circles where we have none at the present time. To be isolated, Sir, is not a very pleasant thing, and I feel that

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

at this juncture when India has an immense task before it, an immense task both politically and socially, in order to strengthen the country and to raise the standard of living of the masses, it is more than ever necessary that we should not think that the pursuit of our foreign policy in its essentials is inconsistent with the gaining of friendship of other countries. It is quite possible that if we give adequate thought to this matter, we may come to the conclusion that we change our manner a little. Perhaps if we remain silent on some occasions instead of expressing our opinion on all points always, it may be that this will be more in the interests of India than what we call frankness at the present time. It seems to me, Sir—I have not got all the facts before me, no man in my position can therefore speak with absolute confidence—it seems to me, Sir, after giving such thought to the matter as I have done, that it should be possible for us, without appearing to be afraid of any nation or without being too nervous about the susceptibilities of other countries, to express our views in such a way as to make the principles that we follow clear and at the same time gain friends for the satisfaction of our vital interests.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, while heartily associating myself with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in paying tribute to Mr. Krishna Menon for the work he has done in the Security Council, I am happy to observe, Sir, that our opponents, particularly the Communist friends, have come back to realism.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is what we have been preaching all these years.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I find that neither has Dr. Kunzru put life into the debate. I will try to do it, may be I may fail, and if I fail, I

will leave it to the succeeding man to do it.

Sir, the policy that our Government has been following in External Affairs is, according to me, very sound.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU) in the Chair.]

It is nonetheless so in spite of the aspersions that have been cast on India by some of the powerful nations of the Security Council. The attitude, Sir, taken by these powers towards India in the matter of Kashmir has been one which creates insecurity in the minds of a large number of people in this world, and particularly in the minds of Indians who have reposed confidence in the Security Council. The attitude of these powers in passing the resolution that they have done in respect of Kashmir has been, Sir, logically absurd and self-contradictory. It has contradicted many of the resolutions of the Security Council itself. Looked at from the point of view of statesmanship it is sheer bankruptcy because they have displayed no foresight in passing the resolution which is contrary to facts, which is contrary to truth and which is contrary to the interests of peace itself. Looked at from the point of view of solving conflicts and easing tensions in this world, and from the point of view of promoting peace, I have no doubt that it is a tragedy. Looked at from the point of view of Indian interests, I have no doubt that it is nothing but treachery. They have attempted, Sir, to disguise the pangs of envy that they feel towards the popularity that the Indian policy has been gaining ground in the world. If they have made any attempt, they have failed in that attempt certainly. It is undisguised antagonism towards India and towards the Indian interests. Sir, if tensions are to be eased in this world, powers which count powers which can help in easing tensions and which profess to ease tensions, must essen-

tially follow on ethical code. We find from the attitude that these nations have adopted in the matter of Kashmir that their policy is bereft of any ethical doctrine. Why are they feeling so antagonistic towards India, it can be easily seen. India has been gaining followers to its policy of non-involvement in the international affairs. Is it the fault of India, I ask, Sir, if it has placed before itself the doctrines contained in the 'Panchsheel' or the doctrine of peaceful co-existence? Is it the fault of India if nations which really believe in peace follow this course, support this doctrine and really behind India? Is it the fault of India again that it has been able fortunately to influence the course of affairs in the matter of independence of Indonesia, in the matter of easing tensions in Indo-China, in putting an end to the war in Korea, in persuading influential powers to enable fourteen nations to enter into the United Nations, and in convincing Egypt to submit to a reasonable course of conduct? Sir, there is a long catalogue of events in which India has brought its good influence to bear upon nations. Is it India's fault? Is it India's fault that India was able to persuade China to confer with the United States to solve the question of releasing prisoners and other problems? Is it the fault of India that it has persuaded the Soviet Union to lift its iron curtain and to liberalise its policy? Well, if India has been able to do this, Sir, it is all to be thanked for, not to be envied. What short-sightedness is there, Sir, in the proverbial British statesmanship, I cannot imagine it. They were known to be ~~a~~ ^{wise} statesmen. ~~Is it~~ in the interest of Great Britain to antagonise 360 millions of people in India, people who are essentially religious, people who believe in democracy and people who are basically opposed to totalitarianism? Is it not in the interest of either the U.K. or the U.S.A. or any country which believes in the promotion of peace to win over and to strengthen the country which believes in democracy? But what have they been doing? They are encouraging

countries which are known for instability of Government in their own countries and which have not honoured their own commitments with other countries—a country like Pakistan with India which has also flouted the United Nations' resolutions themselves. Do they gain in their objective, if they begin to help this country and antagonise India which believes in promoting peace and easing tensions? What a short-sightedness is it on the part of the U.S.A. to come to the aid of that country and to supply countless armaments and in season and out of season to support that country, when that country has definitely not been following a policy of peace and that country has unleashed dogs of hatred, in the words of Mr. Krishna Menon, against India! I ask: Where is the foresight of these nations and where is their statesmanship? They are envious of the influence that India is gaining in this world. It is open for them to influence other nations in the same peaceful way as India has done, in the same beneficial way as India has done. For instance, Sir, why should not Britain, which is casting aspersions on us that we are not observing international commitments, get off the back of Cyprus? There is no answer to that. She has, after great trouble, agreed to take hands off Malaya. Why should not America try to influence England and South Africa to cease to follow the barbarous course that they have been taking at the end of this twentieth century? They are following the course of middle ages. They are indulging in anti-social activities, treating human beings as a flock of sheep and doing such savage things. If they follow such a course, certainly other countries of the world will have respect for them. But while professing peace, while professing brotherhood, while professing amity and friendship with all nations, they are trying to divide nations, and divide nations by having military alliances. Is it consistent with the spirit of the United Nations Charter to have these military pacts? Is it consistent with the spirit

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] of the United Nations Charter for the United States and other countries to refuse to recognise the Peoples' Republic of China? Sir, this is an illogical course which these big countries are following, and I am very sorry to say that they have not been able to see that they are taking away the very foundation of the United Nations by behaving in a manner which is prejudicial to the interests of the peace-loving countries, and in a manner which is inconsistent with the spirit and the essence of the United Nations Charter. Well, Sir, it is open for them to retrieve their steps. They have done a wrong towards India by passing this Resolution. India does not mind. But, Sir, they should at the same time see the repercussions that this step will be producing in the matter of promoting conflicts in the world. The United States, while professing to keep clear of the Baghdad Pact, is now trying to enter the Baghdad Pact by a side door. It says that it is prepared to serve in the military section of the Baghdad Pact.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is front door.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: No. It is a side door. If it were the front door, one could have honestly appreciated it, although one differed from it. It is trying to enter by the side door. Maybe, it may occupy the whole house. That may be the object.

Well, Sir, these are certain actions which are calculated, not to promote peace, but to jeopardise the amity and friendship among the nations of the world. If India relentlessly follows the policy of peace and friendship with other nations, well, it is in the interests of these nations themselves to strengthen India. Will not Britain admit that the continuance of India in the Commonwealth has strengthened her? Supposing, Sir, after gaining independence we had left the Commonwealth, it would not have been to the disadvantage of India, but it would certainly have been to the disadvantage of

Great Britain, because India, with a population of 360 millions, added to the weight of the Commonwealth. And when other nations like Nigeria, Malaya and the Gold Coast (Ghana) are trying to enter into the Commonwealth, Britain is behaving in a way tending to dissuade India from remaining in the Commonwealth. These are things which, I submit, are not in the interests either of the U.K. or the U.S.A. The honest course for them now is to retrace their position. Dr. Jarring has come and he will submit a report. The result of that report can easily be guessed. It will go nowhere. The honest course for them is to go back to the 1948 Resolution, when India submitted to them that they decide upon the then existing situation, and not a dispute. If they want to follow the right path in this affair of Kashmir and if they want to inspire confidence in the people of the world, they have got to take up the basic issue of invasion by Pakistan and adjudge on that. If they do not do it, certainly they will be failing in their duty, and they will be doing a disservice to the Security Council itself, and they will be endangering the cause of peace.

DR. ANUP SINGH: Sir, the foreign policy of our country has been discussed in Parliament and in the country at large so often that there is hardly anything new to say about it, but one thing is quite clear that the foreign policy that has been pursued by our Government up till now commands the overwhelming support and sympathy of the people of this country. I venture to say that now outside India it is better understood, although the corresponding appreciation is still lacking. The foreign policy of any country, as the Prime Minister has very properly pointed out so many times, must be based on certain considerations. In the past, it was the interest of the king or the monarch or the emperor or the relationship of one country with its next-door neighbour. Today, there are some new ideas, new principles, new urges, among the people, and we have

to base and judge our policy in terms of these new forces and see how far we are in tune with what is happening in the world today. I may very roughly point out that some of the basic ideas of the modern world are democracy, self-determination of people and—to preserve those two—non-aggression and finally a world forum, the United Nations or any other kind of superstructure that we might have. Within that framework, I would say that without any question the foreign policy of our country has not only been consistent but has been vindicated by events one after the other. As for the right of people to self-determination and democracy, our people even in subjection were speaking out fearlessly for the freedom of everybody, and we have continued this policy right up till now. As for non-aggression, I am sure, Sir, you will recall that when Japan launched her attack on China—a friendly country Japan was then—the Indian National Congress advocated the boycott of Japanese goods as a protest against that aggression and as a token of our sympathy for the Chinese people. I recall reading those eloquent letters between Naguchi, the great Japanese poet and our illustrious Rabindranath Tagore. Mr. Naguchi came and stayed here then. In his letter he said that he was afraid that the Indian people did not understand what the real policy of Japan was, that that policy was based on Asia for the Asian people, to liberate the whole of Asia from the Western yoke. Rabindranath Tagore—I speak from memory—said something to this effect that he was afraid that, although he subscribed to the idea of Asia for the Asians, his conception of it was not the same as that of the Japanese, that they had started building that new Asia on the skulls of the Chinese and who knew that it would not finish on the skulls of the Indians if they came to India. Those were our sentiments about aggression. The same was the case in Ethiopia; the same was the case about the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression in Egypt.

Thirdly, about democracy, here again our stand has been very consistent. We are a democratic country; we have evolved, formulated and implemented a Constitution which is democratic and secular. We have recently finished our second general elections. Unfortunately most people outside India do not realise that our electorate are 200 millions, which means more than the population of the U.S.A. or the Soviet Union, and the election have been free absolutely. During the Second World War, our leaders who were then behind prison bars said that they were for democracy as a matter of principle but that they must have democracy and freedom before they could crusade for democracy abroad.

Then, Sir, about the United Nations. I have had the privilege of being associated with our delegations once or twice. I also had the occasion to be in Korea as a member of the U.N. Commission for Korea. My mind goes back to Korea when the Security Council passed a resolution giving sanction to the U.N. Forces to cross the 38th Parallel. Our Prime Minister advised against it. Our distinguished late Sir B. N. Rau, while speaking there, said—I happened to be present there at the time—I request the Members to think carefully about the implications of this resolution. Our delegation voted for the first Resolution which characterised North Korea as the aggressor, but this Resolution is something which will spread the conflict. The United Nations forces are on the march now, but do not indulge in any precipitate action, give the North Koreans a chance to review the situation and perhaps come to some agreement. He quoted these words—I speak from memory—"In war resolution, in defeat defiance, in victory magnanimity, in peace goodwill." But unfortunately this friendly counsel was not heeded. I also recall—I may be forgiven for some of the personal references, because they are very vivid to me—the interview that the Members of the U.N. Commission had with General MacArthur in Tokyo.

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

General MacArthur was a great soldier and was in a very happy mood because the U.N. Forces were on the march. We drew his attention to the Indian point of view, and I took the opportunity of drawing his attention to what our Prime Minister had said. He said, "Mr. Singh, I, as a soldier, can assure you that the Chinese have missed the bus. They will not dare come into Korea. Furthermore, I have destroyed all the bridges, etc. and they cannot even bring their equipment and armaments."

Unfortunately the very next day, early in the morning we got the news that over 40,000 Chinese volunteers, so called at the time, had poured into North Korea and the U.N. Forces had to be on the run. I recall one of my colleagues from Turkey calling me up early in the morning and saying 'Mr. Singh, could you do me a favour? Could you arrange for an interview with General MacArthur? I want to see how he feels now.' I am not relating this incident to indicate that since our advice was not followed, subsequent happenings deteriorated but it goes to show that invariably we have tried to judge the issues according to our best light, incurring the pleasure or displeasure of different camps on different occasions. Since then our role in bringing about truce in Korea and Indo-China has been referred to. So within this frame-work and keeping in view these larger concepts, which I think are the issues of our modern world, India's policy will compare favourably with the policy of any other country and I would venture to say that it has been completely vindicated so far as we are concerned.

I think we should keep this total picture in mind because there is always a tendency, sometimes unconscious tendency, to concentrate more on the specific issues with which we are dealing at the moment, it may be Kashmir or it may be Goa, and if we get a critical press either here or abroad, we immediately run to the

conclusion 'Behold! India's foreign policy has failed'. But if we keep the larger things in mind and what our record has been uptill now, I think we should be grateful that this policy has been adopted and enunciated and ~~persuaded~~ without any fear or favour. That is why I was rather surprised at the remarks that Dr. Kunzru made. I am quite sure that Mr. Krishna Menon or somebody else will be in a better position to answer him but I cannot help saying that that remark that we are friendless in the world today is a very large order and it does not conform to the facts. Merely because there has been some adverse criticism about our attitude in Kashmir and some of the big powers have deliberately chosen to blackmail India, that does not necessarily mean that we are without friends. The whole of Asia without any exception, so far as the people of Asia are concerned, are with us. In a moment I will tell you what I have seen in Egypt. The people of South America and their delegates, off the record in the lobbies of the United Nations Assembly, will tell you that they are not in a position to side with India because they are under obligation to the United States and so many other pressures are there but I am yet to come across any delegate in the U.N. lobby who did not appreciate our stand not because we are infallible or we are always right but I speak from experience when I say that millions of people in Europe, in Germany and all the Eastern countries and I dare say the people of England, that very large section represented by the Labour Party, are with us. All the liberal forces in Europe and South America and North America are with us.

I should like to say just one word here about America. I have lived there for a number of years I regret this tendency of our people sometimes to characterise that the whole of America, as the Prime Minister has said, or the American country is against us. Nothing of the kind. When we were fighting for our freedom—

and I say this to the credit of the American people—whereas they curtailed the liberty of some of their own American citizens, they allowed all the Indians to speak freely against Britain for our freedom and to write freely and gave us time over their radio, all the time during the war when American soldiers were dying in the trenches. We should keep those larger things in mind and not be upset by the exigencies of any Resolution that might have been passed. We are not friendless.

I was equally surprised when Dr. Kunzru said that it may be advisable sometimes—I am not sure about the exact words—to keep quiet in our own national interests. Coming from Dr. Kunzru, it certainly sounds very strange to me. During the fight for freedom, would we have served our national purposes better if we had kept quiet? Could we afford to keep quiet when there is naked aggression as it happened in Egypt, I am afraid that if we accepted Dr. Kunzru's advice, we would be betraying everything that we have stood for. We would rather speak out, not with a view to hurt anyone but to express our feelings clearly and unmistakably and take the chances. If we don't do that, I think we lose, as I have said, everything we have stood for, all the ideals, all our background and the urges and the innermost feelings of our people. That is all that we have. We are not a big power either with reference to economic resources or military strength. Our only stock is that we do have a feeling and that we speak out our hearts and minds without fear or favour.

Now I would like to say just one or two words with your permission, about Kashmir and the Middle East. About Kashmir enough has been said about the unassailable position that we have there legally, morally, politically and from every other point of view but I would just like to draw the attention of the Members of this House to the situation in Azad Kashmir, so-called. This is a quota-

tion from the *Hindustan Times* and from their correspondent in Srinagar. According to this, one Khwaja Sana Ullah, Editor of *Haftroza Kashmir* since 1953 who was expelled from Azad Kashmir because he revealed the rigid conditions to two British M.P.s, Mr. F. B. Bennett and Mr. Frank Tomney said this. I am not going to quote the whole thing. This is what he told these two gentlemen:

“President Mirza paid a visit to Muzaffarabad in 1956 and in the meeting of Editors of Azad Kashmir papers, he heard their complaints and visibly irritated by these open remarks, he said:

‘Azad Kashmir Government had been set up in 1947 to hood-wink the world and now it had become a liability of Pakistan. He surprised the Editors by telling them that Sardar Ibrahim, the Azad Kashmir Chief, was being spoken of in high Pakistan Government circles as ‘His Excellency by Accidency.’

He further revealed the extent of atrocities committed by the Punjab Armed Constabulary and the Pakistan Army in their operations against the people of Poonch when they rose in revolt. Several houses were bombed and a number of women raped. One of the leaders of the armed rebellion in Poonch, Captain Khan Mohammad was put to death and a rumour was set afloat that he had crossed into Indian territory.”

There are various other quotations but I will not burden the House. I wanted to bring this to the attention of the Members to give an idea of what type of regime, what type of civil liberties are there and what are the economic conditions in this so-called Azad Kashmir and the Pakistan Government, with its own regrettable record at home, has now the audacity to suggest that not only she be allowed this ill-gotten territory but she should be allowed to have the

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

sway throughout Kashmir. As far as this cry of Jihad is concerned, again I relate a personal experience. I was in Karachi on my way to Egypt and I stayed overnight in a hotel. I asked the bearer who was a Punjabi from Lyallpur, my own district, about the conditions in Pakistan. I drew his attention to a little document in one of the local papers which, though it did not say so in so many words, did by implication say that the people of Pakistan should get ready for marching on to Delhi. Speaking to him I asked him, "कब देहली आओगे?" And he replied

"माहब बड़ो मुश्किल है, यहाँ खुफिया पुलिस बहुत है, बात नहीं कर सकता"।

"There are so many policemen here and I cannot speak to you freely." A little later he came back to my room and pointing to that newspaper he said,

"वह जो लिखते हैं कम्बख्त वह देहली नहीं जायेंगे। हमारे जैसे बेवकूफ मरेंगे"।

"It is not these people who write these things, it is not the people who are writing these head lines who will march to Delhi. It is fools like myself who will be slaughtered."

So much, Sir, about Kashmir.

I would like next to say a few words, with your permission, about the situation in the Middle East. Recently, I returned from the Middle East, spending about three weeks in Egypt. I am very happy at the return of the prospects of a settlement over the Suez and I do not wish to say anything which would in any sense whatsoever, revive the old controversy. Let the dead past be buried. But I do want to mention just a few things to show how senseless and stupid any military adventure has become in our modern age. Egypt under the leadership of President Nasser, has been steadily going forward. I have seen with my own eyes a colony of about 18,000 acres with about 40,000 people, blossoming in the desert, with plenty of things, vegetables, fruits gardens and roses.

There were small projects of construction and reconstruction all over the country. And the people told us almost everywhere we went, that the British and French game was to dislodge Nasser and install a puppet government. I am merely repeating what they told us. They said, however, that the game has failed, because the people of Egypt are behind Nasser. Wherever we went, in the schools and colleges, at the meetings and the rallies that we attended, at the meeting where lands were being distributed to the landless, we heard the same cry—"Asha, Asha, Kamaal." People from every place spontaneously at the very mention of his name will get up and repeat "Long live Nasser. Long live Nasser." And that was not a kind of thing which was improvised for our benefit. We felt it was absolutely spontaneous. And what is far more significant, out of the 200 communists who have been put in jail by Nasser and who are still there, some of the poet communists, have been sending to the newspapers and to President Nasser poems eulogising him for the heroic resistance that he put up against the aggressors. My colleagues and I of this small mission, came back fully convinced that any attempt to dislodge Nasser, either by some insurrection from within or plot from outside is definitely doomed to failure. I do not know what will happen some time later, but this is the situation today. If you even casually refer to somebody that according to the foreign press, Nasser is a dictator, the people get terribly annoyed and they say, "He is no dictator." He has the full support of the country. He is very anxious to hold the elections on the very first opportunity that we can get." In fact, they say, it was announced and plans for the holding of a national election were already under preparation when this attack came.

(Time bell rings.)

Just two minutes more and I will finish. According to the people there, President Nasser was now facing two

kinds of warfare, as they put it. One is the psychological warfare and the other the economic one. The psychological warfare, according to these people, was that the British and the French had installed some eight or nine secret radio broadcasting stations in and around Egypt which are trying to discredit Nasser and his regime. Among other things, they say Nasser is not a Mohammadan, because he sympathises with Nehru on the issue of Kashmir rather than with the Government of Pakistan. But the people are fully alive to this kind of propaganda. They do not seem to be worried about the economic warfare either, because they say, "Ours is an agricultural country and our economy cannot be so easily crippled as that of the industrial countries. We have starved and we can manage to starve a little more." So the people are very confident.

Lastly, with your permission, I would like to say just one or two words about Pakistan's propaganda. This propaganda is very lavish, very abusive and very provocative. Whenever there is any criticism of our foreign publicity, I want hon. Members to keep this in mind. Though it may appear inadequate, under instructions from the Prime Minister and the Ministry of External Affairs, these people are not in a position and are not expected to meet this kind of a propaganda in the same tone and in the same language. But in spite of that, I can assure the House that Pakistan's attitude on the Suez issue has, for the time being at least—and I use the words "for the time being" deliberately—more than nullified all the lavish propaganda that they had poured out. I will just give you one instance. I was walking in Cairo and a young college student, recognising me as somebody from India or Pakistan, seeing my *achkan*, walked up to me and asked, "Sir, Would you forgive me a personal question?" I said, "Please ask me." And he asked, "Are you from India or Pakistan?" I replied, "From India". He said, "Thank God, I was afraid you might be from

Pakistan." Sir, this is the attitude. One of the editors told me at a luncheon that before this aggression, he used to be personally faced with a dilemma, sometimes, "whether to choose India or Pakistan" as he put it. He said, "India is our best friend and Pakistan is our brother." But after the aggression he said he did not have any such dilemma. His associate editor said, "I do not recognise the validity of this kind of a dilemma, because a good friend is always better than a bad brother." So, this is the feeling there.

I would wind up my rather general remarks by saying that we are not friendless, I say this with due respect to Dr. Kunzru, who is not here. We have friends throughout the world. We have some people in the foreign countries who are not friendly to us. But I think our record is unassailable and it has been consistent. It has been for the good of our country and I for one would like it to continue and there should be no deviation whatsoever.

2 P.M.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think we should all feel grateful to the Prime Minister for the very lucid and reasonable exposition that he has given us about the foreign policy of the Government of India. At the same time, Sir, I wish that this happy gift of lucid and reasonable exposition was possessed by all his lieutenants and it is because this has not been the case that there is considerable reason in the statement made by my friend, Pandit Kunzru, in spite of the contradictions offered by Dr. Anup Singh, that India today is really friendless. When we use that word "friendless" we do not mean that we have no friends at all in the world but we mean friends who count, people whose friendship would be an advantage to India and that is what I feel Pandit Kunzru had in his mind.

In a debate on foreign affairs, there is a certain healthy convention and

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

that convention is to be observed all the more by an infant democracy like ours that the Opposition or anybody should say nothing which would embarrass the Government or present to the world the figure of a dis-united country. I would certainly not be a party to any such idea and that is the reason why the debate on foreign affairs suffers under one particular disadvantage that we cannot always afford to speak out openly what we have in our mind. There is considerable political wisdom in Pandit Kunzru's statement that there are occasions when it would be better to keep silent. Keeping within these limitations, I should like to venture to offer a few remarks on some of the questions which afflict the world today.

I should not like to say anything about Kashmir. There have been mistakes and I am sure no exponent on behalf of the Government itself would deny that there have been mistakes but, on the whole, our case is sound and if we have failed to convince the world of the soundness of the case, it is our misfortune. Still, we can trust that time will do its work and India's case will be accepted to be correct by all the parties concerned. I do hope that the shadows which overcloud both Pakistan and India as well as Kashmir will soon disperse and we can come to some sort of workable arrangement.

There is another little matter to which I should like to refer and I find that time and again in discussions on the foreign affairs there is hardly any reference made to a small country and yet which is of considerable importance especially in the present conditions and that is the State of Israel. Well, Sir, we know that the immediate cause of the Suez trouble was the aggression by Israel which gave an opportunity to Britain and France rightly or wrongly to butt into the dispute and make it a huge affair. I believe Col. Nasser did not deny that even if Britain and France were

wrong in attacking Egypt on the Suez Issue, Israel had a case because Israel was at war with Egypt. Now, I am just wondering whether India cannot play a very important part in putting an end to this state of war between Israel and Egypt. Israel is a very small country but it has been a wonderful country. The people of Israel have dreamt of that State for centuries and it is that faith that has helped them to survive in the midst of terrible persecutions practically all over Europe and if, as a result of the Jewish assistance, the Allies promised them a homeland after the end of the first World War and if that promise was fulfilled by Lord Balfour's declaration and Israel has come into existence, I think it would be graceful on the part of all concerned to accept that as a *fait accompli* and not try to dis-establish this established State. One can understand the feelings of the Arabs but at the same time one has to accept that in the history of mankind certain facts happen and when these facts happen it is wisdom to take them at their face value. Israel has been constituted into an independent State. It has converted a desert into a very smiling garden and the people of Israel by their wonderful resources, both financial and intellectual, have been able to set a very good example to the rest of Arabia and if the Arab States are in a position to follow the example of Israel, I am perfectly certain that the Arab States would benefit by that example. By keeping this sore open it is not going to help matters. In spite of our friendship for Col. Nasser, I wonder if he was right in preventing ships of Israel from making use of the Suez Canal or the waters on the shores of Israel. It is quite an interesting question. I am not criticising but I should like to enquire in a very humble manner as to what exactly our Government is doing in this connection. Dr. Anup Singh has made it very clear and of course there is not the slightest reason to doubt that Egypt and India are on the very friendliest of terms. Col. Nasser has expressed his admiration for India and so has our Government expressed

their admiration for Col. Nasser. One can admire Col. Nasser for all that he has done, is doing and will do for his own country but I wonder whether it is right on the part of India to be a party to this boycott of Israel. I think that is a very dangerous phenomenon and we have very narrowly missed a major war just in the recent past and that wound still subsists. I do not find any reference to this in the Prime Minister's speech nor do I find any reference to it in the discussions that have happened in the other House. Yet, it seems to me that it is a very vital point because this little wound may fester and may cause other diseases in the countries round about. We are assured by the Prime Minister that the Suez Canal problem is going to be solved, that the Suez Canal will be opened to traffic and I believe the words used are "as before". What exactly does this "as before" mean? Does it mean before the nationalisation of the Suez Canal or before the aggression by Israel, Britain and France? This makes a difference. Now, the constitution which brought the Suez Canal into existence gives the right to every nation to use the waters of the Suez Canal, Israel included, but with the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, Col. Nasser has been very very hostile to Israel in this matter. Even assuming that he is going to throw open the waters of the Canal, will he do so to Israel as well? If he is not going to do it, it means that there will be a *casus belli* left open and that does not make for the peace of the world especially when we find that both the great powerful blocs have their eye on Middle East and are anxious to have their own power accepted in one form or another in that region. Unfortunately, a small weak State often becomes the cause of a great catastrophe. That happened in the case of the first World War and I am not sure that the immediate cause of the second World War was not of a similar character. We are all anxious to avoid a third World War. We are genuinely sick of war and yet if we keep a little sore point in the

middle of Asia or in the middle of Europe it may develop into a definite tragedy. I feel that India is in a position to make her influence felt in this connection. India can put a certain amount of pressure on Egypt to take a more reasonable attitude towards Israel, to recognise the right of Israel to exist once it has been brought into existence and to do all that it can to develop friendly relations with this little State, and if India does perform this service,—I shall not say that she will have solved all the problems of foreign affairs, but—she will have taken a very important step towards a solution of the one possibility that might flare up into a third World War.

Well, Sir, India has been priding herself on her foreign policy, which has been usually described as neutralism. I noticed, this morning, that the Prime Minister did not like that expression 'neutralism'; he preferred the use of the words "an independent foreign policy". Well, Sir, I shall not quarrel about words. Anyway, even if it is neutral, one thing is certain, that our independent foreign policy is not passively neutral, not passively neutral in the sense that India just wants to be left alone and does not want to say anything about what is happening in the other parts of the world; on the contrary, India is making herself felt; that means that, if she is neutral at all, she is very actively neutral; she is independent enough to express her views, which may be palatable or unpalatable to this block or that block, and to that extent India has gained a great reputation in the world at large, though it may be that on particular issues she may lose friends. Anyway one hopeful thing that I see in the foreign affairs of the world today is the influence that India wields over Egypt, and I am anxious to see that this influence is used in the interests of world peace by making Egypt agreed to a very peaceful solution of her problems with Israel. I am perfectly certain that Israel with her genius has yet some contribution to make to the peace of the world and to the civilisation of the

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

world, and if that is done India can take a prouder position and be proud that she has contributed to the solution of one of the most difficult problems at the present moment in our foreign affairs.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are grateful to the Prime Minister for his very lucid survey of the international situation. One of the great things, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we have witnessed during the last ten years is the rise in importance of this great country in Asian and world affairs. We feel often depressed or sometimes depressed by the thought that we are in a way an isolated or friendless country. Expression was given by Dr. Kunzru to this feeling. I confess that I do not share that view. We have not consciously worked for leadership in the United Nations, but the peoples of Asia and the peoples of Africa look to us for help and support, often guidance, and we have never been grudging in our support of Asian and Arab causes and African causes. We have in some ways pursued a policy of moderation. Take the question of Algeria. Some of us feel very strongly about the question of Algeria, but if you will examine the records of the United Nations you will find that our role in regard to the Algerian matter was on the whole a moderate role. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we should not feel unduly depressed at the fact that on a particular question a number of countries supposed to be members of the Security Council are not with us. I have no means, Mr. Vice-Chairman, of finding out what the world opinion is; even there are no gallup polls of world opinions. We only hear of world opinion as voiced by certain circles in the U.S.A. or the U.K. As I stated the other day, I have very great regard for U.K. opinion, for U.S.A. opinion, but it does not exhaust the entire opinion of the world. The World is a place which consists of many nations, and there are some

nations which do not belong to their particular bloc.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I dealt with the question of Kashmir in my speech the other day while moving a vote of thanks to the President, and I would not like to go over the ground that was covered by me. Mr. Jarring is here, a welcome visitor, but let there be no mistake about our attitude towards the Kashmir issue. That issue is a settled issue so far as we are concerned, and if Mr. Krishna Menon, with all the ability that he commanded, was not able to convince the Security Council, the fault certainly is not his. There is a publication of the External Affairs Ministry containing his entire speech. I had the pleasure of reading it, but I would like that document to be circulated to the Members of this House. I was told by some Members of the House that they had not seen that document.

Now Mr. Suhrawardy has been talking as if the entire world was supporting him. He has not given up the old childlike habit of looking to one's father for support in trouble. In days when the British were functioning here, the Muslim League, of which Mr. Suhrawardy was a pillar, had discovered that by supporting the British in season and out of season or by blackmailing them in season and out of season you could get your way. Well, it is a different world in which he is living. The race of Mir Jafars is not over and he comes from that State from which Mir Jafar hailed. I hope that he would not like it to be written in the pages of history that he proved to be the Mir Jafar of Asia.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is assumed in our discussions that there is some very great merit about a plebiscite, that a plebiscite is always a faithful mirror of public opinion. Political theorists who have busied themselves with psychology tell us that plebiscites and referendums are often taken in periods of emotion; they cannot reflect the permanent as distinguished from the

temporary will of a people, and what you want to find out is what the permanent will of the Kashmir people is. That will be reflected in their way of life, in their way of looking at things, in their history and culture which go back centuries in the past. Kashmir is a model State so far as communal unity is concerned. We do not wish the communal harmony of this great sub-continent to be disturbed. We saw it disturbed in 1947. The scenes of 1947 are still fresh in our mind and we do not wish to see this sub-continent plunged into communal disharmony again. That is a reason which no wise statesman may ignore in finding a solution of the Kashmir problem.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, from Kashmir I shall pass on to some wider problems. When I read of these military pacts and military bases and about the offer of aid by one nation or the other to countries to resist Communism or any other 'ism', I am reminded of the days of Warren Hastings and Wellesley in this country. We had in those days the evolution of the doctrine of paramountcy in this country and we had a system of subsidiary pacts. How can we, Asian people, with memories going back to those times forget—whatever the intention of the statesmen sponsoring these pacts—the dangers that are inherent in these military pacts and military bases? And what are these military pacts?

Let me just refer to the SEATO. The Prime Minister did not refer to it but Mr. Dulles has been advertising the virtues of SEATO. He thinks that SEATO is going to have a very very long life. This SEATO consists of seven nations, three of which are Asian nations. And two of them—I mean Thailand and Pakistan—can hardly be called democracies. In Pakistan they have not had an election, for goodness knows how long and in Thailand we know that they have a legislature which is only half elected. Britain joined the SEATO because she was left out of the ANZUS. Do you think that a pact like the SEATO is going to bring security, peace, con-

tentment and harmony to the peoples of Asia who are hungry and who want a decent life for themselves.

Take again this question of the Middle East. Now, in the Middle East what is the position? It is a region rich in oil and we can very well appreciate the interest of the West in this region but if the West is entitled to have an interest in the Middle East, how can we as men of commonsense deny to the Soviet Union which is a close neighbour of these Middle East countries an interest in the Middle East? Obviously, the way to deal with the question is for both the blocs to leave the peoples of the Middle East alone and not to try to fill the vacuum that has been created in the Middle East by the waning of British influence. I heard what Mr. Kunzru had to say about Mr. Shepilov and his offer and all that, but commonsense tells me that the way to promote peace in the Middle East is for the Great Powers to meet together and invite the Arab and Asian countries and have a discussion. You cannot talk from New York or Moscow. The big powers must come together and meet and discuss these questions with the peoples of these regions.

Take again the question of Israel to which reference was made by Mr. Wadia. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have a genuine sympathy for the Jewish people. However, I do not think that it was a wise move to create Palestine in the heart of Arabia. That is a dead issue now but I do not see what we can do to bring Egypt and Israel together. We would like this Egyptian-Israeli issue to be settled peacefully and I am sure that we are exerting our influence in a moderate way. On the Suez Canal issue before the Anglo-French invasion I found that even some British Conservative papers too were rather sympathetic to our plan. I read an article in the Conservative paper—*The Spectator*—saying that the plan which we had put forward of a Consultative Committee with certain provisions for

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

arbitration in disputed matters regarding tolls and other things was a good plan and that it should be considered by Britain and the United Nations. But we cannot go out of our way to advise a country to surrender its sovereign rights. We have to play a moderating role within the limits of certain moral principles and it will not be proper for us to advise any country to part with its legitimate sovereign rights. That I think is something basic about our foreign policy. We have in our own country a democratic way of life. Look at our elections; some of our big men were defeated by huge majorities and we submitted cheerfully to the verdict of the electorate. We have a democratic way of life and the democratic way of life is this—tolerate the other fellow. Where there is no toleration there is no democracy and this is what I would say to the great peoples of the West.

The Prime Minister referred to the question of the recognition of China. Frankly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have never been able, with all the respect that I have for the State Department, to understand the State Department's case against China's inclusion after the Korean episode is over in the United Nations. You recognise a *de facto* regime, a *de facto* Government, but what you are really doing is to continue giving recognition at the United Nations to a Government that has ceased to operate on the mainland, and that Government has the veto power in its hands. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not call that a moral attitude. Mr. Dulles said that the question of the admission of China raises some moral issues. When you analyse those issues, you will find that they come to this that the prestige of the United States is involved in this matter. Now you cannot look at these questions from the point of view of pure prestige. After all the 600 million people of China have a right to choose their own form of Government, and if they were to interfere with the right of this country to choose its own Government, that would be something very

wrong and reprehensible. They are not doing that sort of thing. Therefore, it is a matter of some consequence and it is a matter on which we cannot remain silent, we dare not remain silent. We should be false to our ideals if we were to remain silent. It is a matter of some consequence to the people of Asia that the only Asian country which has the veto power in the Security Council, which is a member of the Security Council, comes to be represented by a Government representative of the people of China.

(Time bell rings.)

I will be very short. On these basic issues, therefore, there can be no departure from the principles of our foreign policy. That foreign policy is a policy of friendliness to all the peoples of the world, and we condemn aggression in Egypt just as we condemn atrocities or aggression in Hungary.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Not in the same words.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The same words do not matter. My friend was trained in the school of diplomacy in Rajputana where I thought that they knew how to conceal their thoughts. We do not know how to conceal our thoughts. We know how to give expression to ours. The other day my friend referred to the fact that I had after 1947 discovered a love for the Congress or for leftist ideals. He knows nothing about Indian politics. I am not interested in the family heritage of people. My family heritage is quite good. I may tell him that for thirteen years I was a Member of this Council and there was no occasion when I did not support labour. In fact I constituted myself in those days as a champion of socialism here in the Council of State. I may also tell him that I then disliked the princely order, and I gave expression to that dislike on the floor of this House and I gave expression to that dislike in my public utterances. I do

not want myself to be accused of things for which I think I cannot be accused. I am not a turncoat and therefore I would like my friend to know his facts before he criticises me or any other person.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I got rather diverted a little by my friend's interruption, but I think I owe it to the House that I should explain my position.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Prime Minister was listened to with very great interest, as of course he is always listened to wherever he speaks and on whatever subject he speaks. As far as the principles of India's foreign policy are concerned nobody can have two opinions about them. We know that our country stands for peace, stands against colonialism, and stands for non-alignment with power blocs. Sir, in considering all these things we know that our foreign policy is being directed by a personality of the stature of Mr. Nehru, who is a world figure, and through his efforts India in the course of ten years has attained a position in the international world which is really enviable. As far as theory is concerned this policy is admirable and it has of course played a very great part in world affairs during the last ten years. But, for us laymen, we would not be satisfied if we only looked to the theory but shut our eyes to the results of the policy and the manner in which it was implemented and pursued. In a nation's foreign policy there are two sides, as in any other thing. One is the national interest in pursuing the policy and the other is the international point of view. I would first take up our national interest in pursuing that policy. First of all, Sir, I will take the question of Pakistan. I need not go into the details of it because only the other day in reply to the President's Address I had spoken on the subject quite at length, but this morning the Prime Minister was pleased to tell us that it was a matter

of regret that Pakistan was so aggressive in everything in dealing with India, that if they adopted a conciliatory policy we would meet them more than half way. He has also stated that we can be considerate to Pakistan up to a limit and where our interests are not affected. If we are too lenient, then the expectations will rise on the other side and they will open their mouth wide and will expect more things. Sir, my grievance is that what the Prime Minister stated here this morning in the House is contrary to facts as far as Pakistan is concerned. Soon after partition Pakistan invaded our part of the country which is Kashmir. Full invasion was going on. We had to give Pakistan something like Rs. 55 crores against pre-partition debts. We knew full well that this money will be utilised by Pakistan in hitting us back by purchasing further arms. But we take our stand on moral grounds. Of course, we have become the leader on the grounds of morality in the world, but it has cost the country a very great deal. So, the very first thing that we did was that on these moral grounds we parted with that valuable money to the tune of Rs. 55 crores and gave it to Pakistan. With this money they bought arms and ammunitions to hit us back. Thus, Sir, we have been far too lenient to Pakistan than our interests demanded.

Secondly, Sir, when the fight was going on between us and Pakistan, it is a matter of fact that within two or three days the Pakistan army would have been thrown overboard by our army, and in fact, they were actually on their heels when Pakistan pressed for a ceasefire and we readily agreed. I would now like to know from our spokesmen whether this step was in the interest of our country and whether we have safe-guarded our interests.

Then, Sir, since then what is the policy which we have followed? Of course, I need not go into all those

[Shri Jaswant Singh.] details. But Pakistan, as a practical country, has been actually working for the last seven or eight years, and not wasting time. What has happened in the Security Council? The position is that we went in complaint to the Security Council, and we have been put in the dock crying for our life. And what is the position of Pakistan? There is misrule, misery and so many other faults. Ministry after Ministry is changing there. There is so much instability there. But why has our case gone against us when our case is so crystal clear and when it has been proved to everybody who has the least commonsense that Kashmir belongs to us? What did we gain there? Well, it is a matter of pride that at least in one thing we got the better of Pakistan. So far, in filibustering or marathon speaking, Pakistan held a record in the Security Council. But this time we have broken that record. This is no doubt a matter of pride for our country. But beyond that what is it that we have got in so far as our policy in regard to Pakistan is concerned?

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The Prime Minister has stated that we can go only up to a certain limit and beyond that we cannot go, and if the Pakistan Government assumes certain conciliatory attitude, then we are prepared to meet halfway. I do not know how far we can meet the demand of Pakistan on the issue of Kashmir. Not only that, Sir, but the other day, it was reported in the papers that the Ministry of External Affairs was thinking in terms of giving to Pakistan the area which it holds and retaining whatever is in our possession. Sir, I do not know how far it is a fact. But it has not been contradicted. Last time also in the foreign affairs debate I referred to this point and no reply was given to me. But if the Prime Minister is thinking in these terms, then I would say that we are giving more and more to Pakistan and Pakistan would be opening its mouth wider and wider. So in this

way, so far as our national interests are concerned, well, I do not think that our policy towards Pakistan has in any way been successful.

Similarly, Sir, take the case of Goa. In regard to Goa also, for so many years we have not had a clear-cut policy as to what we should do. We are thankful to the Prime Minister that this morning in this House he has given some hint to us that very shortly he would be taking some steps and that he would also be consulting all the Parties and taking some concrete steps. Well, that is a matter which we are looking forward to with very great interest.

Again, Sir, so far as the French Settlements are concerned, everything has been settled. The Settlements have been transferred to us *de facto*. But the things have again taken a turn where it can vitiate the atmosphere of goodwill which was created by the *de facto* transfer, and it is, Sir, an unfortunate development.

Similarly, Sir, here is our friend Ceylon, our next door neighbour. The present Government is extremely friendly to us. But we have to see how the interests of the people of India origin are being affected there. Same is the case with South Africa. As far as the matters relating to our national interest are concerned, our policy, of course, is very pious and very admirable. On moral grounds we stand head and shoulders above any other country, but our national interests so far have not benefited by the policy which we have been pursuing.

Then, Sir, there is one thing more. Soon after we emerged from colonialism and became independent, we made it public that our policy will be that of non-alignment with any of the power blocs and we would consider each issue on its merits. Our policy was put to a test at the very start on the question of Korea and of Tibet, and we expressed our views very

strongly. But what was the result? The result was that we got a rebuff from the totalitarian States which we can never forget. And since then our tone against that bloc has completely changed.

Then, Sir, the second test came on the issues of Middle East and Hungary. Much has been said about these things already and I need not repeat all those things. But as far as the Suez Canal is concerned and Egypt is concerned, at every stage whenever the question came up, we were very strong in our condemnation of the Western Powers. Nobody would lag behind in condemning them. But if we take each case on its merits, then our policy will have to be balanced. We have to take the points as they arise and whichever may be the Party concerned, we have to express our views without fear or favour. We went the whole hog in supporting the case of Egypt, but desperately we tried to hold our horses back on the issue of Hungary. Just now Mr. Sapru was speaking on this issue. Therefore I need not go into any details. But when this question of Hungary first came before the Security Council, our representative, Mr. Krishna Menon stated—I read it in the papers and I don't know how far it is true, but, of course, he will verify it—that the question of Hungary was an internal matter. Sir, from the very start we spoiled our case and the moral stand which he had taken all along fell flat there. Why? If Hungary could be an internal affair, where Russian tanks were crushing the innocent men, women and children of Hungary to pieces, how could the question of Algeria and that of South Africa be taken to the United Nations, because they also could be treated as internal matters? Naturally, Sir, our position on that issue was compromised.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But we condemned them.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We condemned them at a very late stage. We were thinking as to what the other

bloc would think of us. We were more considerate about their feelings. We did not call it aggression even. We called it only intervention, while the other was a naked and full-fledged aggression.

Now, a word about Israel. Prof. Wadia has spoken on this. This morning the Prime Minister with great emphasis asked why China should not be admitted as a member of the United Nations. As far as that is concerned, there can be no two opinions. But so far as Israel is concerned, because it is a small power, because it has no pull, we have even refused to exchange diplomatic missions with them. We do not recognise it as of sufficient status for this purpose. Israel is a full-fledged member of the United Nations, but so far as we are concerned, we consider it too small for us to give her recognition. Here is Israel which is fighting for its very existence, surrounded by enemies all round, which want to remove it out of existence. It is not even being given the right of free passage through an international waterway. What has been our attitude? Because it is a small power, because it is not powerful, because it has not got any pull, we do not support it. Not only we are not supporting it, but we are encouraging President Nasser to adopt an impossible attitude towards her. President Nasser would like to wipe it out of existence but that dream can never be realised. All that I want to point out is that so far as Israel is concerned our policy is not what we are proclaiming it to be.

Sir, I am very glad that the Prime Minister after all has realised that his Panchsheel has come to grief. This morning he pointedly said that this word 'Panchsheel' has been debased. It was very clear who had debased it. It is a matter of real satisfaction that this Panchsheel which was unrealistic, which could never have existed, has come to grief. Some of the subscribers to this concept were people who could never have stood by it. After all, it has been realised by the

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

Prime Minister that this word has been debased.

Finally, I only want to say that our foreign policy has come to mean that we, a democracy, equate the totalitarian system with the democratic system, we make no distinction between totalitarian and democratic values. This clouded and confused thinking has led us into a position from which we now find it difficult to extricate ourselves. In this way, our foreign policy has brought India into the vortex of the cold war. It was said in the other house that we had been left without friends. Mr. Menon's reply was that we were having streams of guests. What kind of friends they are has been proved by the fact that even in a just cause like Kashmir we have been left high and dry.

To sum up, we are of course great moralists and idealists but not practical realists. Our policy bearing on national interests has brought us no dividend, and our policy bearing on international affairs has left us without any real friends and helped to undermine the very foundations of our own ideals and values.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pir Mohammed Khan. Ten minutes only.

شہزیاد پیر محمد خان (جہلم ایجنڈہ)

کشمیر) : جناب ڈپٹی چیئرمین صاحب۔
فاران افیسر کے متعلق اس ڈپٹی۔
میں میں کشمیر کے بارے میں
کچھ کہونگا۔ جب سے پاکستان بنا
ہے تب سے آج تک لگاتار اس چیز کا
ثبوت ملتا رہا ہے اور مل رہا ہے کہ
جب ایک ملک میں انتظامی گڑبڑ۔
انتظامی گڑبڑ۔ اس قسم کی چیزیں
شروع ہوتی ہیں یا جب کوئی پرائم
منسٹر بدلتا ہے اور ملک میں کچھ

گڑبڑ ہوتی ہے اور جتنی وہاں کی
اندرونی حالت بگڑتی جاتی ہے اتنا
ہی کشمیر کا تذکرہ وہاں زیادہ زور
سے ہوتا ہے۔ چنانچہ اس وقت
کشمیر کا بخار وہاں بہت زوروں پر
ہے اور وہ اس واسطے کہ ویسٹ
پاکستان میں جو کچھ ہوا وہ سامنے
ہے اور ایسٹ پاکستان میں جو کچھ
ہونیوالا ہے وہ بھی ہم سمجھ رہے
ہیں۔

کشمیر میں جیسا کہ آپ کو
معلوم ہے مسلمان اکثریت میں ہیں
اور اس واسطے پاکستان چاہتا ہے کہ
چونکہ وہاں مسلمان زیادہ ہیں اسلئے
اسکو پاکستان میں آنا چاہئے۔
کچھ ایسی چیزیں بھی کہی جاتی
ہیں کہ جن سے کشمیر کے مسلمان یہ
سمجھیں کہ واقعی بدعقیدت مسلمان
کے ہم کو پاکستان میں جانا چاہئے۔
پاکستان کو ایک چیز معلوم ہونی
چاہئے کہ مسلمان کو اس کا مذہب
اجازت دینا ہے کہ وہ جس طرح
پاکستان میں رہ سکتا ہے اسی طرح
سے انڈیا میں رہ سکتا ہے۔ اس کا
مذہب اس کو ہرگز نہیں روکتا ہے
انڈیا میں رہنے سے۔ اب جب
ایک مسلمان کو اس کا مذہب بھی
ایک ملک میں رہنے سے نہیں روکتا
تو اس کو دیکھنا کیا ہے کہ اقتصادی
طور پر اور انتظامی طور پر وہ کس
جگہ اچھی طرح رہ سکتا ہے اور اس

بات سے اس کو فیصلہ کرنا ہے کہ اس کو کہاں رہنا ہے - کس کے ساتھ جانا ہے - چنانچہ یہ چیزیں اچھی طرح سوچ سمجھ کر کشمیر نے یہ فیصلہ کیا ہے وہ انڈیا کے ساتھ رہے گا اور اس فیصلہ کی تصدیق اس اسمبلی نے کی جو کہ وہاں کے لوگوں کی نمائندہ ہے - اب پاکستان خود اس چیز کو سمجھے کہ وہ کس چیز کے پیچھے ہوا ہوا ہے - سیکورٹی کونسل میں ہمارے نمائندہ مسٹر کرشنا میٹن نے بڑے مدلل اور واضح طور پر ہمارا کیس پلید کیا اور دنیا کے سامنے ایک حقیقت دکھی - اب پاکستان کو یہ چیز سمجھ لینی چاہئے کہ ہماری ریاست کا جو حصہ ابھی اس کے پاس ہے وہاں کیا ہو رہا ہے - اور ہماری طرف کیا ہو رہا ہے - جو حصہ انڈیا کے ساتھ ہے اقتصادی طور پر اس کی حالت بہت اچھی ہو گئی ہے وہاں بیروزگاری نہیں ہے، ایجوکیشن فری ہے وہاں بڑی بڑی ذمہ داریوں کو ختم کر کے زمین تھرس کو دے دی گئی ہے اور اس کے علاوہ سولڈ فائیو ایر پلان کے تحت طرح طرح کے کام ہوئے ہیں - میں یہ تھیک کہہ رہا ہوں ہمارے ملک میں ایک آدمی بھی اس وقت بے روزگار نہیں ہے - فرسٹ فائیو ایر پلان میں ہمیں دس کروڑ روپیہ ملا - سیکلڈ فائیو ایر پلان میں جیسا آپ کو معلوم

ہے قریب ۴۹ کروڑ روپیہ ہے - آخر یہ سب وہیں خیر ہوا ہے وہیں کے لوگوں کو اس کا فائدہ پہونچنا ہے اور ہمارے طرف کسٹم بھی معاف ہو گیا ہے - دوسری طرف دیکھئے کیا ہے - میں کوئی سلی سنائی باتیں نہیں کہہ رہا ہوں - اس طرف سے جو آدمی تلگ ہو کر آتے ہیں، بھوکے ننگے اور تکلیف زدہ آتے ہیں تو ان لوگوں کے لئے قانون یہ ہے کہ اگر وہ بغیر جائز پرمت کے ہماری طرف آئیں تو ان پر مقدمہ بھی چل سکتا ہے ان کو سزا بھی مل سکتی ہے اور پھر ان کو واپس کرنا ہے جہاں سے وہ آئے ہیں -

3 P.M.

تو میری آنکھوں نے دیکھا ہے میرے کانوں نے سنا ہے کہ میرے ملک کے جو آدمی گئے ہیں وہ روتے ہیں، چلاتے ہیں اور یہ کہتے ہیں کہ ہمیں شوت کر دو مگر وہاں نہ بھیجیو - تو اس سے طبیعت پر ایک بڑا عجیب سا اثر پوتا ہے جب ہم وہاں کے بارے میں کیفیت سنتے ہیں - ایک معمولی بات ہے کہ آج سے قریب دس سال ہوئے، ہمارے جموں پوائنس سے کشمیر کی ریاست سے قریب چار پانچ لاکھ آدمی وہاں گئے - یہ لوگ پاکستان کو اپنا ملک یا گھر سمجھکر وہاں نہیں گئے - یہ بات سمجھنے کی ہے کہ اس وقت

[شری پیو محمد خان]

جو گریز اور کمیونل ڈسٹرینس ہوئے تھے اس کی وجہ سے وہ لوگ جان بچا کر ادھر چلے گئے تھے۔ اس وقت سے وہ لوگ ابھی تک کیمپوں میں پڑے ہوئے ہیں۔ ان لوگوں کو ابھی تک پرمائنٹلی سیٹل نہیں کیا گیا ہے۔ اب ہم کبھی یہ آواز سلتے ہیں کہ ان لوگوں کو اب ٹیمپوری طور پر ری ہیبیلیٹیٹ کیا جائے گا۔ لیکن ایسا ابھی کیا نہیں گیا ہے تو اس طرح کے حالات میں بھوک سب کچھ سکھا دیتی ہے، چوری بھی سکھا دیتی ہے، قاکہ بھی سکھا دیتی ہے، بددیانتی بھی سکھا دیتی ہے اور کئی طرح کی چیزیں سکھا دیتی ہے۔ بھوک کی وجہ سے اس علاقہ میں سب چیزیں ہو رہی ہیں۔ میرے خیال کے مطابق اگر پاکستان کے نیتاؤں کو سمجھ ہے تو وہ اس چیز کو ہوا نہ دیں یعنی یہ کہ خواہ مخواہ بلاوجہ کسی دلیل سے دو ملکوں کے باشندوں کو ایک دوسرے کے دشمن نہ بنائیں۔ اس چیز کا نتیجہ شاید ان ہی کے حق میں زیادہ خراب ہوگا۔ اور پھر جیسا کہ میں نے عرض کیا کہ ہم سب لوگوں نے بہت سوچ سمجھ کر ایک فیصلہ کیا ہے اور اس فیصلہ کو اسمبلی کی تائید حاصل ہے جو عوام کی چلی ہوئی ہے۔ اب جب اسمبلی نے الحاق کی بات کی تائید کر دی ہے

تو یہ ہماری طرف سے آخری چیز ہے اور اس کے بعد ایکسیشن اور شمولیت کی بات کرنا یا سوچنا بالکل لاپیکار ہے اور غلط ہے۔ ہمیں جو کچھ کرنا تھا کر دیا ہے۔ ہمارا الحاق ہندوستان کے ساتھ مکمل ہے۔ اب چاہے سکھورتی کونسل میں کچھ ہو یا یہاں پر کوئی مشن آئے اس سے ہمارے فیصلہ میں کوئی تبدیلی نہیں ہو سکتی۔ ہم نے جو ایک بار سٹیٹ لے لیا ہے اس میں کسی طرح کی کوئی تبدیلی نہیں ہو سکتی اور نہ ہمارے فیصلہ میں کوئی اثر انداز ہو سکتا ہے۔

(Time bell rings.)

ایک چیز میں اور ضرور عرض کرونگا کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا بجائے اس کے کہ اس چیز پر اور آگے بحث کرے اب اس کو ختم کر دے بلکہ جو اس نے سکھورتی کونسل میں سٹیٹ لے لیا ہے اس پر قائم رہے اور جو صاحب یہاں آئے ہوئے ہیں ان سے بھی کہہ دیا جائے کہ ہم نے سکھورتی کونسل میں جو باتیں کہی ہیں اور جو سٹیٹ لے لیا ہے وہی آخری ہے۔ میرے خیال میں اس بارے میں کوئی مزید بات چیت نہیں ہو سکتی۔ لہذا میں انہی چند الفاظ کے ساتھ اس موشن کی تائید کرتا ہوں۔

†[شری پیو موہम्मد خان (جम्मू وکٹر کاشرمیر) : جناب ڈپٹی چیئرمین ساہب،

†Hindi transliteration.

फ्रीरेन एकेयर्न के मृतल्लिक इस डिबेट में मैं काश्मीर के बारे में कुछ कहूंगा। जब से पाकिस्तान बना है तब से आज तक लगातार इस चीज का सबूत मिलता रहा है और मिल रहा है कि जब उनके मुल्क में इंजामी गड़बड़, इक्तसादी गड़बड़, इस किस्म की चीजें होती हैं या जब कोई प्राइम मिनिस्टर बदलता है और मुल्क में कोई गड़बड़ होती है और जितनी वहां की अन्दरूनी हालत बिगड़ती जाती है उतना ही काश्मीर का तज़करा वहां ज्यादा और से होता है। चुनावों इस वक़्त काश्मीर का बुखार वहां बहुत जोरों पर है और वह इसी वास्ते कि वेस्ट पाकिस्तान में जो कुछ हुआ वह सामने है और ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में जो कुछ होने वाला है वह भी हम समझ रहे हैं।

काश्मीर में जैसा कि आपको मालूम है मुसलमान अक्सरियत में हैं और इसी वास्ते पाकिस्तान चाहता है कि चूंकि वहां मुसलमान ज्यादा हैं इसलिए इसको पाकिस्तान में आना चाहिये। कुछ ऐसी चीजें भी कही जाती हैं कि जिनसे काश्मीर के मुसलमान यह समझें कि वाकई बहैसियत मुसलमान के हमको पाकिस्तान में जाना चाहिये। पाकिस्तान को एक चीज मालूम होनी चाहिये कि मुसलमान को उसका मज़हब इजाजत देता है कि वह जिस तरह पाकिस्तान में रह सकता है उसी तरह से इंडिया में रह सकता है। उसका मज़हब उसको हरगिज़ नहीं रोकता है इंडिया में रहने से। अब जब एक मुसलमान को उसका मज़हब भी एक मुल्क में रहने से नहीं रोकता तो इसको देखना क्या है कि इक्तसादी तौर पर और इंजामी तौर पर वह किस जगह अच्छी तरह रह सकता है और इसी बात से उसको फ़ैसला करना है कि उसको कहां रहना है। किसके नांवा जाता है। चुनावों ये चीजें अच्छी तरह सोच समझ कर काश्मीर ने यह फ़ैसला किया कि वह इंडिया के साथ रहेगा और उस फ़ैसले की तसदीक उस असेम्बली ने की जो कि वहां के लोगों की नुमाइन्दा है। अब पाकिस्तान खुद इस चीज को समझे कि वह किस चीज

के पीछे पड़ा हुआ है। सिन्धुट्री कौंसिल में हमारे नुमाइन्दे मिस्टर कृष्णा मेनन ने बड़े मुदल्लल और वाजेया तौर पर हमारा केस प्लीड किया और दुनिया के सामने एक हकीकत रखी। अब पाकिस्तान को यह चीज समझ लेनी चाहिये कि हमारी रियासत का जो हिस्सा अभी उसके पास है वहां क्या हो रहा है। और हमारी तरफ क्या हो रहा है। जो हिस्सा इंडिया के साथ है इक्तसादी तौर पर उसकी हालत बहुत अच्छी हो गई है। वहां बेरोज़गारी नहीं है, एनूकेशन फ्री है। वहां बड़ी बड़ी ज़िम्दारियों को ख़त्म करके ज़मीन टिलरम् को दे दी गई है और इसके अलावा सैकड़ फ़ाइव इयर प्लान के तहत तरह तरह के काम होने हैं। मैं यह ठीक कह रहा हूं हमारे मुल्क में एक आदमी भी इस वक़्त बेरोज़गार नहीं है। फ़र्ट फाइव इयर प्लान में हमें दस करोड़ रुपया मिला। सैकड़ फाइव इयर प्लान में जैसा कि आपको मालूम है करीब ४६ करोड़ रुपया है। आखिर ये सब वहीं खर्च होना है, वहीं के लोगों को इसका फ़ायदा पहुंचना है और फिर हमारी तरफ कस्टम भी माफ हो गया है। दूसरी तरफ देखिये क्या है। मैं कोई सुनी सुनाई बातें नहीं कह रहा हूं। उस तरफ से जो आदमी तंग होकर आते हैं, भुबे तंग और तकलीफ़ ज़दा आते हैं तो उन लोगों के लिये कानून यह है कि अगर वह बगैर जायज़ परमिट के हमारी तरफ आयें तो उन पर मुकदमा भी चल सकता है, उनको सज़ा भी मिल सकती है और फिर उनको वापिस करना है जहां से वो आये हैं।

तो मेरी आंखों ने देखा है, मेरे कानों ने सुना है कि मेरे मुल्क के जो आदमी गये हैं, वह रोते हैं, चिल्लाते हैं और ये कहते हैं कि हमें शर कर दो मगर वहां न भेजो। तो इससे तबीयत पर एक बड़ा अजीब सा असर पड़ता है जब हम वहां के बारे में कैफियत सुनते हैं। एक मामूली बात है कि आज से करीब दस साल हुए, हमारे जम्मू प्रांविंस से, काश्मीर की रियासत से करीब चार पांच लाख आदमी

[श्री पीर मोहम्मद खान]

वहां गये। ये लोग पाकिस्तान को अपना मुल्क या घर समझ कर वहां नहीं गये। यह बात समझने की है कि इस वक्त जो गड़बड़ और कम्यूनल डिस्टर्बेंस हुए थे उसीकी वजह से वह लोग जान बचा कर उधर चले गये थे। उस वक्त से वह लोग अभी तक कैम्पों में पड़े हुये हैं। उन लोगों को अभी तक पर्मानेंटली सैटिल नहीं किया गया है। अब हम कभी यह आवाज सुनते हैं कि उन लोगों को अब टैम्पेरी तौर पर रिहैबिलिटेड किया जायेगा। लेकिन ऐसा अभी किया नहीं गया है। तो इस तरह की हालत में भूख सब कुछ सिखा देती है, चोरी भी सिखा देती है, डाका भी सिखा देती है, बद दयान्ती भी सिखा देती है और कई तरह की चीजें सिखा देती है। भूख की वजह से उस इलाके में सब चीजें हो रही हैं। मेरे ख्याल के मुताबिक अगर पाकिस्तान के नेताओं को समझ है तो वह इस चीज को हवा न दें यानी यह कि खामखाह बिलावजह किसी दलील से दो मुल्कों के बाशिन्दों को एक दूसरे के दुश्मन न बनाये। इस चीज का नतीजा शायद उन्हीं के हक में ज्यादा खराब होगा। और फिर जैसा कि मैंने अर्ज किया कि हम सब लोगों ने बहुत सोच समझ कर एक फ़ैसला किया है और उस फ़ैसले को असेम्बली की ताइद ह.सिल है जो अवाम की चुनी हुई है। अब जब असेम्बली ने इल्हाक की बात की ताइद कर दी है तो यह हमारी तरफ से आखिरी चोइ है और इसके बाद अक्सेशन और शामिलयत की बात करना या सोचना बिल्कुल बेकार है और ग़लत है।

हमें जो कुछ करना था कर दिया है। हमारा इल्हाक हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मुकम्मल है। अब चाहे सिक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में कुछ हो या यहां पर कोई मिशन आये उससे हमारे फ़ैसले में कोई तब्दीली नहीं हो सकती। हमने जो एक बार स्टैंड लिया है इसमें किसी तरह की कोई तब्दीली नहीं हो सकती और न हमारे फ़ैसले में कोई असर अन्दाज हो सकता है।

(Time bell rings.)

एक चीज मैं और जरूर अर्ज करूंगा कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया बजाय इसके कि इस चीज पर और आगे बहस करे अब इसको खत्म कर दे बल्कि जो उसने सिक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में स्टैंड लिया है उसी पर कायम रहे और जो साहब यहां आये हुए हैं उनसे भी कह दिया जाय कि हमने सिक्यूरिटी कौंसिल में जो बातें कहीं हैं और जो स्टैंड लिया है वही आखिरी है। मेरे ख्याल में इस बारे में कोई मज़ीद बातचीत नहीं हो सकती। लिहाजा मैं इन्हीं चन्द इल्फाज के साथ इस मोशन की ताइद करता हूं।]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kishen Chand, 10 minutes.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): Could you not give fifteen minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard a very fine exposition of our foreign policy by the Prime Minister and although we support him as far as external matters are concerned, when we are talking among ourselves, we must carefully examine whether that policy has been effective, whether it has brought us credit among the nations of the world. The Leader of the Communist Party in this House, this morning gave the fullest possible support to the hon. Prime Minister's foreign policy simply because there was support for the Communist countries. I submit that there are no two opinions in our country, as a matter of fact in any other country, regarding the representation of China. We all agree and we all believe that the representatives of free China, of the mainland, should find a place in the Security Council and that the representatives of the small island off the mainland have no status.

The Prime Minister pointed out that ours is a policy of non-alignment. I submit that he went a little further and said, it is of non-involvement and of neutrality. I submit that in the present situation of the world, though

a country can remain non-aligned with other countries, we may have a policy of non-alignment, it is quite different from non-involvement and neutrality. It is not possible for any country in the world at the present moment to be non-involved. We must have relations with other countries in trade matters, in cultural matters etc. Possibly there will be sort of difference of opinion between neighbouring countries and that will lead to continuous or series of involvements and to say that we are going to follow a policy of non-involvement, is really a negation of our foreign policy.

Sir, there are two main blocs in this cold war which is going on in the world—the Eastern Bloc and the Western Bloc, and to frame our foreign policy it is very essential that we clearly understand the economic ideologies behind these two blocs and see which way the world is moving. I submit that the recent events in Poland, Hungary and in many other Eastern European countries have proved that those countries do not want to remain in the sphere of influence of the Soviet Socialist Republics. They want to have their own economic policies and their own foreign policies, not to align themselves to the Soviet Bloc in this cold war that is raging in the world. If we carefully see the future events, we will be forced to come to the conclusion that the Communist idea of world domination may not come true, that the world is moving towards a type of socialism which is based on mixed economy.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): Socialism with capitalists in it. Is it?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: You may think otherwise but the events are slowly and gradually proving it before you.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member seems to have the idea of Eisenhower Doctrine.....

(Interruptions.)

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary—they are all getting out of the Soviet Bloc. They are making their own economic policy. Let us not be poor imitators, let us not be led away by mere slogans. So this is the future before the world and in this future, if we try to give some sort of indirect support to the Soviet Bloc, by not saying as loudly or protesting as loudly against their policies and their actions in Hungary, the action of China in Tibet on the one hand, and on the other very vociferously and vehemently criticise the actions of the western bloc, we are following not a policy of non-alignment, but a partial policy of alignment with the Soviet bloc and of non-alignment with the western bloc. We should really stick to our policy of non-alignment. One hon. Member has pointed out this morning that this policy has made us friendless in the world. No country can remain completely isolated in this world and if we cannot make friends, let us not make enemies in the world. We have made enemies both in the western bloc and in the eastern bloc. The result is that we are a friendless country.

I agree that our representative on the U.N. the hon. Minister without Portfolio, is a very great orator and he has got very great forensic abilities. He has presented our case exhaustively and extensively in the U.N. Security Council. But it is said that in spite of this great effort, the members of the Security Council had made up their minds beforehand and that they would not therefore, listen to his arguments. When we talk of the great services rendered by our country in the councils of the world and in the Security Council, how we have influenced the members in the matter of Korea, in the matter of Indo-China and in the matter of the summit conference at Geneva, how in all these cases the voice of our representative has been heard, may I ask why is it that suddenly in the matter of Kashmir before

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

the Security Council, in spite of the very able presentation of the case by our delegate, not even one voice was raised in our favour? I submit that Sir Feroze Khan Noon, the representative of Pakistan, knew full well that his case was a weak one. He had no arguments. Therefore he adopted the policy of diverting the attention of the members by raising all sorts of extraneous issues, all kinds of irrelevant matters, and our delegate was trapped into the mistake of answering all those irrelevant matters. He spoke for eight hours about irrelevant matters. He did not devote even a few minutes to the main matter of Kashmir, which was a very simple affair. After all, Kashmir is an internal matter. When we agreed to a plebiscite, we did not say that the question of plebiscite was to be settled between India and Pakistan. We went to the United Nations and we were trying to be extremely moral. Kashmir had acceded to India and had become part of India. We only suggested that we might take a plebiscite in order to further satisfy ourselves, to further boost up our moral stand. That does not mean that we agreed to a plebiscite under a U.N. Administrator, that we agreed to hand over the whole State to the administration of a U.N. representative. We have satisfied ourselves by other means, by the holding of elections and by the Resolution of the National Conference, that the people of Kashmir have acceded to India. Now there is no question of a plebiscite and we need not wait for a plebiscite. But our delegate did not lay stress on this point as much as he should have done. He went on answering irrelevant matters.

(Time bell rings.)

I will say one word about Goa. The hon. the Prime Minister has stated today that the Government of India is going to take certain suitable steps for the early integration of Goa with the Indian Union. Sir, if the same thing had been done some five years ago when there was the national urge of the people, you could have

got Goa freed from Portugal's domination and integrated it with India. That was a very proper time. But our Government waited for five years. There is this continuous policy of procrastination and delay and postponement in our foreign policy and the result is that things are not done at the proper time, and by this delay we spoil our case.

SYED MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar):
Mr. Deputy Chairman,.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not more than ten minutes, if less, much better.

سید مظہر امام (بہار) : اس

قبیعت میں حصہ لینے کی مہم
بہت زیادہ خواہش نہیں تھی مگر
میں نے یہ ضروری سمجھا کہ اس
وقت دنیا میں جو سنجویشن ہے
اس پر میں بھی کچھ عرض کروں -
قبل اس کے کہ میں کچھ عرض
کروں میں اپنا یہ فرض سمجھتا
ہوں کہ میں اپنے پرائم منسٹر کو
مبارکباد دوں - ہمارے پرائم منسٹر
کی جو پالیسی برابر رہی ہے وہ ایک
ایسی پالیسی رہی ہے جس پر اتنا
ہی نہیں ہے کہ ان کو صرف مبارکباد
دی جائے بلکہ اس پر ہر ایک
ہندوستانی کو فخر ہے -

دنیا میں ہندوستان کی ایک
ایسی پالیسی رہی ہے کہ آج جتنی
بھی کمزور قومیں ہیں ان کی نگاہیں
ہندوستان کی طرف لگی ہوئی ہیں -
میں آپ کو یاد دلاؤں کہ جب
یونائیٹڈ نیشنس کی فورس غازہ سٹریپ
میں پہنچی تو سب سے پہلے وہاں
کی جنگ نے نہرو زندہ باد کے نعرے

لگائے۔ یہ ایک ایسی بات ہے جس سے ہم پتہ چلتا ہے کہ آج کمزور قومیں یہ سمجھ رہی ہیں کہ اگر کوئی شخص ہمارا ساتھ دے سکتا ہے تو وہ بھارت کا پرائم منسٹر نہ رہے گا۔ یہ ایک ایسی چیز ہے جس پر ہم جتنا بھی فخر کریں کم ہے۔

اسکے ساتھ ساتھ میں یہ بھی ضروری سمجھتا ہوں کہ میں ہندوستان کے ریپریزینٹٹیو منسٹر، رشنا مینن کو بھی مبارکباد دوں کہ انہوں نے جس خوبی سے ہمارے کیس کو یونائٹڈ نیشنس میں پیش کیا ہے اس کے لئے وہ مبارکباد کے مستحق ہیں اور ہر ایک ہندوستانی کو ان پر فخر ہے۔ اس میں شک نہیں کہ اس سلسلہ میں بعض دوستوں نے شکایت کی ہے۔ لیکن میرا یہ خیال ہے کہ سکیورٹی کونسل کی ایک جج کی حیثیت تھی اور آج تک آپ نے یہ نہیں دیکھا ہوگا کہ جج کا فیصلہ آرگیمینٹ سے پہلے آ جائے جیسا کہ ہمارے کیس میں سکیورٹی کونسل نے کیا ہے۔ ایسے فیصلے کے بارے میں یہ آسانی سے سمجھا جاسکتا ہے کہ ان کا فیصلہ کہاں تک صحیح ہے۔ ابھی ہمارے ایک دوست نے کہا کہ یہ ایک پولیٹیکل فیصلہ ہے۔ پولیٹیکل فیصلہ تو وہاں ہوتا ہی ہے یہ کوئی نئی بات نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہماری حکومت

کے لئے اور ہمارے پرائم منسٹر کے لئے یہ ضروری ہے اور انہیں یہ سوچنا چاہئے کہ بھارت کی تنہا نیوٹرل پالیسی سے ہم دنیا میں امن قائم رکھنے میں کہاں تک فائدہ اٹھا سکتے ہیں۔ آج ایک طرف روس ہے اور دوسری طرف امریکہ ہے۔ اور جتنی بھی چھوٹی قومیں ہیں وہ لالچ کی بنا پر یا قہر و خوف کی بنا پر ایک دوسرے کے ساتھ ہوتی جا رہی ہیں۔ اس لئے میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ بھارت کی یہ پالیسی ہونی چاہئے اور ہمارے یہ پالیسی صاف صاف دنیا کے سامنے آنی چاہئے کہ دنیا کی تمام چھوٹی قومیں خواہ وہ مڈل ایسٹ کی ہوں یا افریقہ کی یا ساؤتھ ایسٹ ایشیا کی ہوں انکو ہم دعوت دیں ان کے ساتھ ہمارا ایک پیکٹ ہو اور ہم ایک دوسرے کو ایکو نامک اور مارل مدد دیں۔ تاکہ ان کی انڈیپینڈنس دنیا میں قائم رہے۔ یہ صرف آپ کے بل بوتے اور آپ کے سہارے پر ہی ممکن ہے کہ وہ کسی بلاک میں نہ شامل ہوں۔ اگر ہم نے کوئی ایسی صورت نہ اختیار کی یا ایسا کوئی تھوڑے فورس ورلڈ میں قائم کرنے کی کوشش نہ کی تو میں آپکو یقین دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ تمام چھوٹی چھوٹی قومیں چھوٹے چھوٹے کمنٹریز، روس کے ساتھ یا امریکہ کے ساتھ مجبور ہو کر چلے جائیں گے اور دنیا کے امن کو سخت خطرہ

[سید مظہر امام]

ہوگا - اس کے ساتھ ساتھ میں یہ بھی کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جیسی آج دنیا کی حالت ہے اور جیسی ریاستوں طاقتوں کی پالیسی چل رہی ہے اس سے متنبہ ہو کر مڈل ایسٹ افریقہ اور ساؤتھ ایسٹ ایشیا کے ملکوں کو روس کے ہلاک میں چلا جانا پڑیگا - اور اس کو کوئی طاقت روک نہیں سکتی - میں یہ بھی کہوں گا کہ یہ جو تھوڑے فوری ہو وہ پینچ شہل کی بنا پر ہو تاکہ تمام ملکوں کی آزادی مستقل قائم رہے اور اس کی گارنٹی ہو - اس کے لئے اگر کوئی لیڈر ہو سکتا ہے اور لیڈری کر سکتا ہے تو وہ صرف بھارت ہے اور اس کے پرائم منسٹر مسٹر نہرو ہیں - اس لئے اس لائن پر ہماری گورنمنٹ کو سوچنا چاہئے اور ان تمام طاقتوں کے ساتھ بیٹھ کر جو کہ کسی گروپ میں نہیں ہیں ایک کانفرنس ہونی چاہئے اور ان سے یہ بات کرنی چاہئے کہ کسی صورت میں ہملوگ انٹرنیشنل پالیسی کو چلائیں اور ایک دوسرے کی مدد کریں - اس لائن پر ہماری گورنمنٹ کو سوچنا چاہئے - یہ ہمارا سنجیشن ہے -

آخر میں میں کشمیر کے متعلق کہنا چاہتا ہوں - کشمیر کے مسئلہ کے متعلق ہماری گورنمنٹ نے جو اسٹیپ لیا ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ اسٹیپ اس کو اور پہلے لہنا تھا -

پاکستان کا یہ کہنا کہ مسلمان ہونے کی بنا پر اور چونکہ اس ایریا میں مسلمان مہجرتی میں ہیں اس لئے ان کو پاکستان میں آنا چاہئے غلط ہے - یہ ان کو پاکستان بلانے کے وقت کہنا تھا اور اس وقت ان کو یہ چیزیں طے کرنی تھیں - مگر انہوں نے اس وقت کہا نہیں اور ایسا کوئی مسئلہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے بیچ میں نہیں تھا - جیسے کہ سلیم کا معاملہ آیا، نارٹھ ویسٹ فرنٹیر پرائونس کا معاملہ آیا اور وہاں پلیمہسٹنٹ کہا گیا اور چو وہاں کے لوگوں کا فیصلہ تھا وہ منظور کیا گیا - کشمیر کے متعلق جو لیگل پوزیشن ہے وہ بہت صاف ہے - تمام راجاؤں کو یہ حق تھا کہ وہ جس کے ساتھ جانا چاہیں جائیں اور وہاں کے راجا نے ہندوستان کے ساتھ جوائن کیا - یہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر کی مہربانی تھی کہ انہوں نے وہاں کی جلنا کی رائے کے لئے بھی وچار کیا اور ایک کانسٹیٹیوٹیوٹ اسمبلی بنانے کا انہوں نے حق دیا کہ تم کانسٹیٹیوٹیوٹ اسمبلی بنا کر ہمیں رائے دو اور وہ اپنی رائے دے چکے ہیں - اس لئے میرا یہ خیال ہے کہ پرائم منسٹر نے جو اسٹیپ لیا ہے وہ بہت صحیح ہے اور بھارت متنبہ ہے مارل گروئنڈ پر اس لئے کہ ہم نے اس علاقہ کو یقین دلایا اور ہم نے وعدہ کیا کہ چونکہ

تم ہمارے ساتھ آئے ہو اس لئے ہم تمہاری مدد کریں گے۔ تو اب اگر یونائیٹڈ نیشنس اور سکیورٹی کونسل اس طرح کی کوئی چیز کرنا چاہتے ہیں اور کشمیر کی جلتا کی خواہش کے خلاف کوئی فیصلہ کرنا چاہتے ہیں تو مارل گراؤنڈ اور لیگل گراؤنڈ دونوں کی بنا پر ہم کسی طرح کی گفتگو ایسے لوگوں کے ساتھ کرنا نہیں چاہتے اور نہ کرنی ہے۔ اگر وہاں کے لوگ اس طرح کا کوئی ریزولوشن پاس کرتے تو البتہ یہ سوچنے کی چیز ہو سکتی تھی اور ہم سکیورٹی کونسل سے بات کر سکتے تھے لیکن وہاں کے لوگوں نے وہاں کے پرائم منسٹر نے ایسا نہیں کہا ہے۔ میں اس ہاؤس سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم نے چھ سو ریاستوں کو ملایا اور کوئی ریاست قائم نہیں ہے۔ آج کشمیر میں بھی ایک پرائم منسٹر ہے اور اس کی ایک الگ شخصیت ہم مانتے ہیں۔ اس لئے کہ وہاں کی جلتا نے یہ چاہا اور وہاں کی کانستی ٹیویٹ اسمبلی نے یہ پاس کیا۔ ورنہ ہم دوسری اسٹیٹس کی طرح سے اس کو بھی اپنے میں ملا سکتے تھے۔ لیکن ہندوستان نے ایسا نہیں کیا۔ اس سے یہ بات صاف ظاہر ہے کہ جو جلتا کی خواہش ہے اس کا ہماری حکومت نے احترام کیا۔ اس لئے یہ کہنا کہ

ان کے ریپریزینٹیتوز نے جو پاس کیا ہے اس میں ان کا صحیح ریپریزینٹیشن نہیں ہوا ہے یہ مہرے خدشہ میں غلط ہے۔ اور آئندہ کوئی رائے لینے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے۔

(Time bell rings.)

دوسری چیز یہ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ پاکستان اکثر جہاد کا نعرہ لگاتا ہے۔ میں اس ہاؤس سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جہاد اسلام میں آریشن کے لئے کبھی نہیں رہا ہے۔ ہم اس طرح سے اسلام کو بدنام کرتے ہیں۔ جہاد کے لئے ہمیشہ کہا گیا ہے کہ وہ ڈیفینس و لائن پر ہو۔ اگر مسلمانوں پر مسلمانوں کی حکومت پر کوئی شخص اٹیک کرے تو اس کے لئے جہاد کرنا اسلام میں ہے۔ مگر اسلام میں کبھی بھی یہ نہیں کہا گیا ہے کہ ہم کسی ملک پر اٹیک کریں اور اس کو جہاد کہیں۔ ایگریشن جہاد میں نہیں آتا۔ اس لئے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ اسلام کے اس لفظ کو بدنام نہ کریں اور چاہے جو ان کے جی میں آئے وہ کریں۔

آخر میں میں انہیں یقین دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر جنگ کا کبھی موقع آیا تو ہندوستان کے مسلمان کا ایک ایک بچہ ان کے خلاف لڑنا اپنے لئے ایک فخر سمجھے گا۔

ان الفاظ کے ساتھ میں ہندوستان کی فارن پالیسی کی تائید کرتا ہوں۔

†[संयद मजहर इमाम (बिहार) : इस डिबेट में हिस्सा लेने की मेरी बहुत ज्यादा इच्छा नहीं थी मगर मैंने यह जरूरी समझा कि इस वक्त दुनियां में जो सिचुएशन है इस पर मैं भी कुछ अर्ज करूं। कबल इसके कि मैं कुछ अर्ज करूं मैं अपना यह फर्ज समझता हूं कि मैं अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को मुबारकबाद दूं। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर की जो पॉलिसी बराबर रही है वह एक ऐसी पॉलिसी रही है जिस पर इतना ही नहीं कि उनको सिर्फ मुबारकबाद दी जाय बल्कि उस पर हर एक हिन्दुस्तानी को फर्र है।

दुनियां में हिन्दुस्तान की एक ऐसी पालिसी रही है कि आज जितनी भी कमजोर कौमें हैं उनकी निगाहें हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ लगी हुई हैं। मैं आपको याद दिलाऊं कि जब यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की फौर्स गाजा स्ट्रिप में पहुंची तो सबसे पहले वहां की जनता ने नेहरू जिन्दाबाद के नारे लगाये। यह एक ऐसी बात है जिससे यह पता चलता है कि आज कमजोर कौमें यह समझ रही हैं कि अगर कोई शरूस हमारा साथ दे सकता है तो वह भारत का प्राइम मिनिस्टर मिस्टर नेहरू ही है। यह एक ऐसी चीज है जिस पर हम जितना भी फर्र करें कम है।

इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी जरूरी समझता हूं कि मैं हिन्दुस्तान के प्रिजेडेंटिव मिस्टर कृष्णा मेनन को भी मुबारकबाद दूं कि उन्होंने जिस खूबी से हमारे केस को यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में पेश किया उसके लिये वह मुबारकबाद के मुस्तहक हैं और हर एक हिन्दुस्तानी को उन पर फर्र है इसमें शक नहीं कि इस मिलरिले में बाज दोस्तों ने शिकायत की है। लेकिन मेरा यह खयाल है कि सिक्यूरिटी काँसिल की एक जज की हैसियत थी और आज तक आपने यह नहीं देखा होगा कि जज का फैसला आरगुमेंट से पहले आ जाये जैसा कि हमारे केस में सिक्यूरिटी काँसिल ने किया है। ऐसे फ़ैसले के बारे में यह आसानी से समझा जा सकता है कि इनका फ़ैसला कहां तक सही है।

अभी हमारे एक दोस्त ने कहा कि यह एक पोलिटिकल फैसला है। पोलिटिकल फैसला तो वहां होता ही है यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। इसलिये मैं यह समझता हूं कि हमारी हुकूमत के लिये और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर के लिये यह जरूरी है और उन्हें यह मोचना चाहिये कि भारत की तन्हा न्यूट्रल पॉलिसी से हम दुनियां में अमन कायम रखने में कहां तक फ़ायदा उठा सकते हैं। आज एक तरफ़ रूस है और दूसरी तरफ़ अमरीका है। और जितनी भी छोटी कौमें हैं वह लालच की बिना पर या डर व खोफ की बिना पर एक दूसरे के साथ होती जा रही हैं। इसलिये मैं यह समझता हूं कि भारत की यह पॉलिसी होनी चाहिये और हमारी यह पॉलिसी साफ़ साफ़ दुनियां के सामने आनी चाहिये कि दुनियां की तमाम छोटी कौमें ख़वाह वह मिडिल ईस्ट की हों या अफ्रीका की या साउथ ईस्ट एशिया की हों उनको हम दावत दें उनके साथ हमारा एक पैकट हो और हम एक दूसरे को इकनोमिक और मोरल मदद दें। ताकि उनकी इंडिपेंडन्स दुनियां में कायम रहे। यह सिर्फ़ आपके बल बूते और आपके सहारे पर ही मुमकिन है कि वह किसी ब्लाक में न शामिल हों अगर हमने कोई ऐसी सुरत ना अस्तियार की या ऐसा कोई थर्ड फ़ोर्स वर्ल्ड में कायम न करने की कोशिश की तो मैं आपको यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूं कि ये तमाम छोटी छोटी कौमें छोटे कंट्रीज, रूस के साथ या अमरीका के साथ मजबूर होकर चले जायेंगे और दुनियां के अमन को सख्त खतरा होगा। इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि जैसी आज दुनियां की हालत है और जैसी वैस्टर्न ताकतों की पॉलिसी चल रही है उसमें मजबूर होकर मिडिल ईस्ट अफ्रीका और साउथ ईस्ट एशिया के मुल्कों को रूस के ब्लॉक में चला जाना पड़ेगा। और उसको कोई ताकत रोक नहीं सकती। मैं यह भी कहूंगा यह जो थर्ड फ़ोर्स हो वह पंचशील के बिना पर हो ताकि तमाम मुल्कों की आजादी मुस्तकिल कायम रहे और

उसकी गारंटी हो। इसके लिये अगर कोई लीडर हो सकता है और लीडरी कर सकता है तो वह सिर्फ़ भारत है और इसके प्राइम मिनिस्टर मिस्टर नेहरू हैं। इसलिये इस लाइन पर हमारी गवर्नमेंट को मोचना चाहिये और उन तमाम ताकतों के साथ बैठकर जो कि किसी ग्रुप में नहीं हैं एक कान्फ़्रेंस में चाहिये और उनमें यह बात होनी चाहिये कि किस सूरत में हम लोग इंटरनेशनल पॉलिसी को चलाय और एक दूसरे की मदद करें। इस लाइन पर हमारी गवर्नमेंट को मोचना चाहिये। यह हमारा सजेशन है।

आखिर में मैं काश्मीर के मुतल्लिक कहना चाहता हूं। काश्मीर के मामले के मुतल्लिक हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने जो स्टेप लिया है मैं समझता हूं कि यह स्टेप इसको और पहले लेना था। पाकिस्तान का यह कहना कि मुसलमान होने की बिना और चूंकि इस एरिये में मुसलमान मजोरिटी में है इसलिये उनको पाकिस्तान में आना चाहिये, गलत है। ये इनको पाकिस्तान बनने के वक्त कहना था और उस वक्त उनको ये चीजें तय करनी थी। मगर उन्होंने उस वक्त कहा नहीं और ऐसा कोई मामला हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में नहीं था। जैसे कि मिलहट का मामला आया, तब वस्त फ्रंटियर प्रोविंस का मामला आया और वहां प्लैबिसाइड किया गया और जो वहां के लोगों का फ़ैमला था वह मंजूर किया गया। काश्मीर के मुतल्लिक जो लीगल पोजीशन है वह बहुत साफ़ है। तमाम राजाओं को यह हक़ था कि वह जिस के साथ जाना चाहें जायें और वहां के राजा ने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ ज्वाइन किया। यह हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर की मेहरबानी थी कि उन्होंने वहां की जनता की राय के लिये भी विचार किया और एक कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली बनाने का उन्होंने हक़ दिया कि तुम कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली बनाकर हमें राय दो और वह अपनी राय दे चुके हैं। इसलिये मेरा यह ख्याल है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो स्टेप लिया

है वह बहुत सही है और भारत मजबूर है मोरल ग्राउंड पर इसलिये कि हमने इस इलाके को यकीन दिलाया और हमने वादा किया कि चूंकि तुम हमारे साथ आये हो इसलिये हम तुम्हारी मदद करेंगे। तो अब अगर यनाइटेड नेशन्स और सिक्किमिटी कौंसिल इस तरह की कोई चीज करना चाहते हैं और काश्मीर की जनता की स्वाहिश के खिलाफ़ कोई फैसला करना चाहते हैं तो मोरल ग्राउंड और लीगल ग्राउंड दोनों की बिना पर हम किसी तरह की फ़लतू ऐसे लोगों के साथ करना नहीं चाहते और ना करनी है। अगर वहां के लोग इस तरह का कोई रेजोल्यूशन पास करते तो अलबत्ता यह सोचने की चीज हो सकती थी और हम सिक्किमिटी कौंसिल से बात कर सकते हैं लेकिन वहां के लोगों ने, वहां के प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने ऐसा नहीं कहा है। मैं इस हाउस से कहना चाहता हूं कि हमने छैसी रियासतों को मिलाया और कोई रियासत कायम नहीं है। आज काश्मीर में भी एक प्राइम मिनिस्टर है और इसकी एक अलग शक्मियत हम मानते हैं। इसलिये कि वहां की जनता ने यह चाहा और वहां की कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली ने यह पास किया। वरना हम दूसरी स्टेट्स की तरह में इसको भी अपने में मिला सकते थे। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान ने ऐसा नहीं किया। इसी से यह बात साफ़ जाहिर है कि जनता की स्वाहिश है उसका हमारी हुकूमत ने एहतसाम किया। इसलिये यह कहना कि उनके रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स जो ने पास किया है उसमें उनका सही रिप्रेजेंटेशन नहीं हुआ है यह मेरे ख्याल में गलत है। और आइन्दा कोई राय लेने की जरूरत नहीं है।

(Time bell rings).

दूसरी चीज यह मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान अक्सर जहाद का नारा लगाता है। मैं इस हाउस से कहना चाहता हूं कि जहाद इस्लाम में एप्रेशन के लिये कभी नहीं रहा है। हम इस तरह से इस्लाम को बदनाम करते हैं। जहाद के लिये हमेशा कहा गया है

[सैयद मजहर इमाम]

कि वह डिफेंसिव लाइन पर हो। अगर मुसलमानों पर, मुसलमानों की हुकूमत पर कोई शस्त्र अटैक करे तो उसके लिये जहाद करना इस्लाम में है। मगर इस्लाम में कभी भी यह नहीं कहा गया है कि हम किसी मुल्क पर अटैक करें और उसको जहाद कहें। अग्रेशन जहाद में नहीं आता। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस्लाम के इस लफ्ज को बदनाम न करें और चाहे जो उनके जी में आये वह करें।

आखिर में मैं इन्हें यकीन दिखाना चाहता हूँ कि अगर जंग का कभी मौका आया तो हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान का एक एक बच्चा उनके खिलाफ लड़ना अपने लिये एक फर्ज समझेगा।

इन अलफाज के साथ मैं हिन्दुस्तान की कौरिन पॉलिसी की ताईद करता हूँ।]

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a recognised fact that India has won a very significant place in the comity of nations in less than a decade and this is due partly to the sagacious statesmanship of our Prime Minister and to the energies and abilities of our diplomatic agents abroad. If we have to find the real reason for the success of the Indian foreign policy, I say we should seek it in the broad objectives of our national movement. It is a great tribute to our political consciousness and national leadership that we Indians developed a sound international outlook even before we attained our independence. Some-time back there was a great agitation that we should sever the Commonwealth link. First of all, Sir, I would like to submit to the House that this Commonwealth relationship does not imply any legal or judicial limits on the external or internal sovereignty of any nation. Moreover, we believe that it will be possible to work ami-

cably with those from whom we might differ fundamentally in outlook and method. That is possible because we have a common humanity and common interest. It is no doubt very difficult.....

DR. R. B. GOUR: What is that common interest?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I will reply outside, not now.

It is no doubt very difficult to build institutions of peace and substitute them for those of war but we do need lots of tolerance and patience. It is no doubt very surprising that India's association with the Commonwealth has survived in spite of the great provocations the other side has given us. It has been continuously noted that U.K. has been aiding the adversaries of India in all the major disputes wherever India was interested inside and outside the U.N. and countries like Pakistan and South Africa share a common outlook with other countries like the U.S.A. and U.K. and they have shown an equal readiness to join the anti-Soviet alliances of the Western powers. Moreover, these countries have developed some dispute with India which have defied any reasonable solution. In spite of these grave provocations, in spite of all these, if India still insists on staying within the Commonwealth, it is due entirely to the fact that we believe in the principle of peaceful co-existence and we believe that we should settle our disputes in an amicable manner and that we do not believe in dividing the nations. We believe in having a world united than a world divided; of course, once Churchill has said that it is better to have a world divided than a world destroyed. No doubt, if circumstances do come to that, our Prime Minister has assured us that this is not a closed chapter and that he will think about severance of the Commonwealth link at some other time but for the present, I do entirely agree that we would better serve our purpose by staying within the Commonwealth than by being out of it.

Coming to the Pakistan affairs, Sir, the relationship between India and Pakistan has been strained and in the last few months the strain has increased. Military aid by the U.S.A. to Pakistan has further deteriorated this position and when Pakistan decided to become a member of the S.E.A.T.O., it implied the complete identification of Pakistan's foreign policy with that of the U.K. and the U.S.A. The recent announcement of America joining the Baghdad Pact is simply deplorable.

Our stand on Kashmir has been very ably advocated by the hon. Mr. Krishna Menon. Of course, some Member said that he had spoiled a very good case by a very long speech. I suppose that he had to say something by way of criticism and this was the only thing that he could say. All the Members would agree with me that even if the speech had been short, he would not have been in a position to convince the nations who had decided much earlier.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The resolution would have been passed earlier.

DR. R. B. GOUR: If the speech had been short, the resolution would have been passed earlier.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: It would not have made any difference.

We all know that this Kashmir question has been pending with the United Nations for about ten years and never did it take it up seriously and give a verdict. Even in spite of Mr. Menon's efforts we know that they have not come to a conclusion. But we are not sorry for that. Though Pakistan might feel that it had gained an apparent victory, I feel that we have not failed either. It is

better to have failed in a just cause that will ultimately succeed than.....

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): We have not failed.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: "Apparently", I said. We have not failed. Even if it be, it is better to fail in a just cause.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not even 'apparently'.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I said that they feel, Pakistan feels that they have gained an 'apparent' victory over us. Kashmir is ours and Kashmir will be always ours. There is no doubt about that. I only want to say that even if some people think that we have failed, it is better to have failed in a good cause which will ultimately triumph, than to have succeeded in a wrong cause that will ultimately fail. One thing is however certain. We will not allow the U.N. or any other body revise the position on the basis of which we have been carrying on or to overrule the lawful accession of Kashmir to India, and we are not going to bow down to the doctrine that nothing can be decided in the East without the overseeing authority of the Western powers. One of the important plans of India's foreign policy has been its consistent opposition to the imposition of western supervision in Asia and Africa. Even in the Middle East, Sir, we have followed this cardinal principle of our foreign policy. Our stand on the question of Egypt, though it caused worry and annoyance to certain foreign powers, has been unambiguous. We have opposed the western policy of coercing the Middle East powers to join the pro-West military alliances.

Regarding Goa I would like to say one word. Though some of us feel that the Indian Government has not

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]

done anything, I would like to submit that we cannot preach one policy elsewhere and practise another policy in our own country. All that we can do for Goa is to settle our disputes in a peaceful manner, and that we are trying to do, and in a short time I am sure we will succeed. Our foreign policy, as I have said, has enhanced the reputation of our country and we are glad we are having a person like Panditji at the helm of our affairs. The policy which our country is following is not a policy which has come to us the other day or has been adopted very recently; nor is it one that we have copied from other countries. It is a policy that has been born out of our soil and from time immemorial India has stood for moral values even at the expense of material benefits. This is a great country, Sir, and this is a country which made great contribution at the very dawn of history, and I hope it will attain that unity and that solidarity and develop that disciplined energy and sustained powers which will make Asia and the world richer. We not only preach this policy outside but we practise it inside our own country also, and it is quite evident from the fact that the Central Government is prepared to give the reins of power to the Communists in Kerala, and that is proof enough, if at all any proof is necessary, that not only we preach it but we practise also the policy of peaceful co-existence everywhere.

مولانا ایم - فاروقی (اتر پردیش) :

جناب ذہنی چیمبرمین صاحب - سب سے پہلے میں اپنے پرائم منسٹر صاحب کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے آج ایک گھنٹہ سے زیادہ دیر تک تکلیف اٹھا کر اپنے خیالات کا اظہار کیا اور یہ موقع اس ایوان کو دیا کہ ہم اس سفر کا پھو سے جائزہ لیں جو آزادی کے ملنے کے بعد سے دنیا میں امن قائم کرنے

کے لئے ہم نے شروع کیا تھا اور یہ دیکھیں کہ ہم نے اب تک مہانما گاندھی کی صلح و آشتی کی تعلیم کو کہاں تک دنیا میں پھیلایا اور کہاں تک پیس ٹائم کرنے میں ہم نے حصہ لیا - آج ہمیں بہت فخر کے ساتھ کہنا پوتا ہے کہ یورپی دنیا میں جب کہ ہر طرف ایک اندھیرا سا چھایا ہوا ہے اور وہ اندھیرا بہت ممکن ہے کہ قہر آتش کی طرح لڑائی کی صورت میں پھٹ جائے - ہر طرف ہر قوم ایک دوسرے سے دست گردیاں ہو رہی ہے اور لڑنے کے لئے تیار ہے - آج اگر ہمیں کوئی روشنی ملتی ہے تو ہم دعوے سے یہ کہہ سکتے ہیں اور دنیا کے سامنے سر بلند کر سکتے ہیں کہ وہ روشنی ہمیں ملتی ہے تو ہمارے مستحکم بزرگ کی اس تقریر میں ملتی ہے چو انہوں نے سیکورٹی کونسل میں 9 گھنٹے تک کی اور اس تقریر میں کشمیر کے پرابلمس کو صاف کیا - اس میں سب سے بڑی اور اونچی چیز انہوں نے بتائی وہ یہ تھی کہ ہم دنیا کے لئے سخت سے سخت وقت میں بھی صلح و آشتی سے پیس کے لئے کام کر سکتے ہیں اور اس کے لئے آخر تک ہم لڑنے کو تیار ہیں - لیکن دنیا اس کا مطلب یہ نہ سمجھے کہ اگر ہندوستان کے ساتھ کوئی نا انصافی کی جائیگی تو بھی وہ کچھ نہ کہے گا بلکہ ایسی صورت میں ہم اسوقت بہادرانہ طور پر اس کا مقابلہ کریں گے -

اس وقت دوسری مرتبہ میں
مبارکباد دوسری کامیابی پر آنریبل
پرائم منسٹر کو اور پورے فارن افسرس
ڈیپارٹمنٹ کو اس بات کے لئے دیتا
ہوں کہ سویز کنال کا مسئلہ بہت امن
کے ساتھ طے ہو گیا ہے - اس کے ساتھ
ساتھ یہ چیز بھی آپ کے سامنے آئی
ہے کہ یہ سویز کنال کا جو مسئلہ تھا
یہ کس کا برہان کیا ہوا ہے - یہ برہان
کیا ہوا ہے اس ملٹری بیگٹ کا اور اس
بغداد پیگٹ کا جو پاکستان نے اور
دوسرے مڈل ایسٹ کنٹریز نے آپس
میں کیا ہے کیونکہ اس نے مسئلہ کو
طاقت دی تھی - آپکو تعجب ہوگا
کہ میں اس مسئلہ پر کیوں یہ الزام
دے رہا ہوں کہ اس نے طاقت دی -
ان پیگٹوں کے ذریعے ان شہنشاہی
ملکوں کے ساتھ مضبوط ہو گئے ہیں
وہ جہاں چاہیں گڑبڑ کرا دیں اور
تباہی لا کر چھڑا قبضہ کر لیں - جس
غریب اور کمزور ملک کو چاہیں اس
پر حملہ کر کے قبضہ کر لیں ذرا سے
بہانے بنا کر - آپ یہ یقین جانئے کہ
پلڈت جواہرلال ہی تھے جملہوں نے
مہاتما گاندھی کے پیغام کو نہایت رسک
اٹھا کر اور اپنے سر کے اوپر ایک بڑا
بھاری بوجھ اٹھا کر دنیا کو سلیا ہے
باوجود اس کے کہ کامن ویلتھ کے ساتھ
برصغیر سے ہمارے جو اچھے تعلقات تھے
ان میں بگاڑ آیا پھر بھی ہم نے سامنے
بڑھ کر ان تمام ظلموں کا مقابلہ کیا

جو ہماری بڑی سے بڑی درست
حکومتوں کی طرف سے ہوئے اور اس
وقت بھی ہم اس کا مقابلہ کرنے کے لئے
تیار ہیں - اس ایک صدا کا یہ نتیجہ
تھا کہ آج ہم مصر ایک باعزت اور
سر بلند ملک دیکھ رہے ہیں اور ہمیں
یقین ہے کہ ہم اٹلندہ بھی اسی طریقہ
پر ہر مظلوم حکومت اور ہر مظلوم
قوم کی مدد کرتے رہیں گے اور سب کو
یہ بتا دیں گے کہ ہم نے جو آزادی
حاصل کی تھی وہ دوسروں پر قبضہ
کرنے کے لئے نہیں حاصل کی تھی -
وہ دوسروں پر حکومت کرنے کے لئے
نہیں کی تھی - وہ اس لئے نہیں
حاصل کی تھی کہ ذرا سے معاملات
کو بہانہ بنا کر پھر دنیا میں لڑائی کا
تھونگ دچیں - بلکہ ہم نے آزادی
اس لئے حاصل کی کہ خود بھی ہم
زندہ رہیں اور دوسروں کو بھی زندہ
رہنے دیں -

اس کے بعد اس سلسلہ میں بغداد
پیگٹ کا دوسرا زمریلا اثر جو اس وقت سامنے
آ رہا ہے یعنی کشمیر کا مسئلہ اس کے
بارے میں میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں -
میں اس کے بارے میں تفصیل میں
نہیں جانا چاہتا کیونکہ وقت اتنا
نہیں ہے لیکن میں آپ کو بتا دینا
چاہتا ہوں کہ ابھی تک کسی قسم
کے بھی ملٹری پیگٹ جو بڑی بڑی
حکومتوں نے چھوٹی چھوٹی حکومتوں
سے کئے ہیں ان ہی کا یہ نتیجہ ہے کہ

[مولانا ایم - فاروقی]

آج ظلم و تشدد کرانے کیلئے طرح طرح کے بہانے تلاش کئے جا رہے ہیں۔ ان میں سے سب سے بڑی چیز کشمیر کا مسئلہ ہے۔ یہ مسئلہ ہمارے ملک کے باہر سے تعلق نہیں رکھتا بلکہ ہمارے اندرونی معاملات سے گہرا تعلق رکھتا ہے۔ اگر کشمیر کا مسئلہ گوبڑے میں منکج ہونا ہے تو یہی نہیں کہ ہندوستان کے باہر کوئی چیز ہوتی ہے بلکہ ہندوستان نے اندر بھی وہ ڈیفیکٹس پیش آ سکتی ہیں جن کا مقابلہ کرنا مشکل ہو جائے گا۔ بلکہ میں کہونگا کہ اس صورت میں دنیا پوری اس آگ میں جل جائے گی۔ آپ کو کشمیر کے مسئلہ کو صرف معمولی طور پر نہیں دیکھنا چاہیئے۔ کشمیر کے مسئلہ کے سلسلے میں مجھے کچھ زائد کہنے کی ضرورت نہیں۔ ۹ گھنٹے کی تقریر جو سیکورٹی کونسل میں مسٹر کرشنا مینن نے کی وہ آپ لوگ تقریباً پڑھ چکے ہوں گے۔ ان کی تقریر میں قریب قریب تمام چیزیں کشمیر کے مسئلہ کے سلسلے میں لائی گئیں۔ خاص طور پر اس تقریر کی ایک چیز مجھے بہت زیادہ پسند آئی جو انہوں نے شیخ عبداللہ کی اس تقریر سے نقل کی جو انہوں نے کشمیر کی کانسٹیٹیوٹ اسمبلی میں دی تھی۔ وہی شیخ عبداللہ جن کا نام آپ کی مخالفت میں آج بہت اُبھارا جاتا ہے انہوں نے کانسٹیٹیوٹ

اسمبلی میں جو تقریر کی تھی وہ خاص طور پر غور کرنے کی ہے۔ انہوں نے کشمیر کو ہندوستان کے ساتھ رکھنے کے لئے جو دلیلیں بیان کی تھیں اور جو سبب بیان کئے تھے ان میں دو طرح کی چیزیں ملتی ہیں۔ انہوں نے یہ کہا تھا کہ ہم اقتصادی حیثیت سے اور مالی حیثیت سے اپنی زندگی بسر کرنے کے لئے یہ ضروری سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ رہیں اور اس کی وجہ انہوں نے یہ بیان کی تھی کہ ہماری زندگی یعنی کشمیر کی زندگی کشمیر کی صنعت و حرفت پر ہے۔ کشمیر کی زندگی وہاں کی صنعت پر ہے۔ وہاں کی ان چیزوں پر جنہیں لوگ اپنے ہاتھ سے بناتے ہیں۔ کشمیر کی لکڑی بڑی مشہور ہوتی ہے وہاں اس کے جنگل کے جنگل پائے جاتے ہیں جہاں سے دوسرے ملکوں کو لکڑی اور لکڑے کا سامان سہلائی کہا جاتا ہے۔ ہندوستان ہی ایک ایسی جگہ ہے جہاں آپ کشمیر کا مال ہر موسم میں سہلائی کر سکتے ہیں چاہے گرمی ہو یا جازا یا برسات۔ سب موسموں میں یہاں کا راستہ کھلا رہتا ہے۔ اب تو آپ نے کشمیر میں ایک تیل بھی بنادی ہے جس سے آپ نے یہ ثابت کر دیا ہے کہ کشمیر کی صنعت و تجارت ہمیشہ کے لئے محفوظ ہے۔ کشمیر کے لئے ہندوستان تجارتی سنٹر ہے۔ یہاں سے تمام دنیا کو کشمیر کا سامان تقسیم

ہوتا ہے - اس لئے کشمیر ہندوستان سے کبھی بھی علیحدہ نہیں ہو سکتا ہے -

دوسری چیز جو بہت اہم ہے اور جس کو پاکستان ہمیشہ پیش کرتا ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ چونکہ پاکستان ایک اسلامی ملک ہے اس لئے اسے حق ہے کہ جتنی بھی مسلم آبادی ہے وہ اس کے سائے کے اندر آئے - پاکستان کہتا ہے کہ کشمیر میں مسلمانوں کی آبادی زیادہ ہے اس لئے کشمیر کو ہمارے ساتھ آنا چاہیئے - یہ ایک عجیب چیز ہے جو لوگ اسلامی ملک کے لفظ کی تاریخ کو جانتے ہیں ان کو معلوم ہے کہ یہ جو اسلامی ملک کا لفظ ہے اسلامی حکومت کا لفظ ہے یہ محمد رسول اللہ صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم نے شروع کیا تھا - مدینہ میں انہوں نے ایک حکومت کی بنیاد رکھی تھی اس حکومت کو اسلامی حکومت کہا جا سکتا ہے - مگر آپ ایک عجیب چیز دیکھیں گے کہ یہودی اور کرشچھن بھی اس میں اسی طرح سے امن کے ساتھ رہتے تھے جس طرح سے مسلمان - ان میں کوئی فرق نہیں تھا - مگر جب ہم پاکستان کی طرف دیکھتے ہیں جو آپ کو ایک اسلامی حکومت کہتا ہے وہاں پر حالت دوسری ہی ہے - آج ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ پاکستان میں جو غیر مسلم آبادی ہے انہیں وہ اپنے اسلامی ملک سے باہر نکال رہا ہے - اس نے ایسٹ

پاکستان سے قریب چالیس اور پچاس لاکھ غیر مسلم لوگوں کو ہندوستان میں ریفوجی بنا کر قال دیا ہے - لیکن وہ اسلامی حکومت صرف پچاس سال تک رہی اسکے بعد خلیفہ بادشاہ ہوئے انہوں نے اپنی حکومت قائم کی - میں بیان پر کسی مروجہ مسئلے کے بارے میں نہیں کہنا چاہتا ہوں بلکہ میرے کہنے کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ جب پاکستان کی سرکار یہ دعویٰ کرتی ہے کہ ان کا ایک اسلامی ملک ہے تو میں ان سے یہ پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ان نے یہاں کس طرح کی اسلامی حکومت ہے - اگر وہ اسلامی حکومت ہے تو اس نے نہر سویز کے معاملہ میں سب سے آگے قدم کیوں نہیں اٹھایا -

جس وقت پورٹ سعید میں پچاس ہزار بے گناہوں کے اوپر انگریزوں اور ان کے سانہیوں نے حملہ کیا اور بمباری کی اسوقت پاکستان کی اسلامی حکومت کہاں تھی جو اپنے مسلمان بھائیوں کی حفاظت کرنے کا دعویٰ کرتی ہے - جب انکی حفاظت کے لئے پاکستان آواز تک نہیں اٹھا سکا تب وہ کیسے کشمیر کے مسلمانوں کی حفاظت کرنے کی فکر کرتا ہے - اسوقت کشمیر میں جو مسلمان ہیں وہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ کافی آرام سے رہیں گے اور ترقی کریں گے -

श्री ह० प्र० स्वमेना : क्या यह फेल पाकिस्तान हुकूमत का गैर इस्लामी नहीं है, मैं यह बात दरियाफ्त करना चाहता हूँ ।

مولانا ایم - فاروقی : میں عرض کر رہا تھا کہ پاکستان کے حکمران اسلامی حکومت کا نام لیکر اس طرح کی چیز کر رہے ہیں جسکو حقیقی اسلام سے کوئی واسطہ نہیں ہے - وہ حب یہ دعویٰ کر رہے ہیں کہ جہاں بھی مسلمان ہیں، ان سب کے وہ چودھری ہیں، ان سب کی جان و مال کی ذمہ داری ان کے اوپر ہے تب انہیں سب سے پہلے سربیز نہر کے معاملہ میں ایذا قدم بڑھانا چاہیئے تھا اور کوئی غیر اسلامی حرکت نہیں کرنی چاہیئے تھی - جب مصر میں لوگ - ارے جا رہے تھے اس وقت پاکستان آرام سے بیٹھ کر بغداد پیکٹ کی بات چلا رہا تھا اور انگریزوں سے مفاہمت کر رہا تھا - غیر اسلامی تو بہت ویسی چیز ہے میں تو کہوں گا کہ وہ غیر انسانیہت کی چیز کر رہا تھا - اس کے بعد بھی وہ برابر اس بات کا دعویٰ کرتے ہیں کہ ہمارے یہاں اسلامی حکومت ہے ہمارے یہاں مسلم سنگیت ہے ہمارے یہاں مسلمانوں کی اکثریت ہے اس کے برعکس اگر آپ اندازہ کریں تو آپ کو معلوم ہوگا کہ پاکستان جو کشمیر کو مغربی پاکستان میں شامل کرنا چاہتا ہے اس میں پچیس ملین سے زیادہ مسلم نہیں ہیں جبکہ ہندوستان میں اس وقت چالیس ملین مسلمان ہیں - اس لئے ہمارا پوری طرح سے حق ہے کہ ہم اپنے ان بھائیوں کو اپنی حفاظت میں لیں - میں تو کہتا ہوں کہ یہ

ہمارا حق ہی نہیں ہے بلکہ ہم اپنے کو مجبور سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہم دوسرے مسلمان بھائیوں کو بھی اپنی حفاظت میں لیں - اس طریقہ سے میں آپ کو بیان دلاتا ہوں کہ خلافت مروجہ کے زمانہ میں گندھی جی نے

श्री उप सभापति : समय हो गया है :

مولانا ایم - فاروقی : میں بس اب ختم کرنے ہی جا رہا ہوں - تو میں کہہ رہا تھا کہ خلافت کے زمانہ میں گندھی جی نے تمام دنیا کو یہ چیلنج دیا تھا کہ ہندوستان کے مسلمان اور ہندو عرب اور مصر کی حفاظت کریں گے - آج بھی ہمارے جاو کروڑ مسلمان اور ۳۶ کروڑ ہندو مل کر یہ دعویٰ کرتے ہیں اور پاکستان سے کہہ سکتے ہیں کہ تم کیسے ہمارے کشمیری بھائیوں کی حفاظت کر سکتے ہو جبکہ تم ابھی تک اپنے یہاں ووٹنگ اور انتخاب کا انتظام نہیں کر سکے ہو .

(Time bell rings.)

میں ان لفظوں کے ساتھ گندھی جی کا ایک جملہ پڑھ کر اپنی سوچ ختم کر دوں گا - گندھی جی کا ایک جملہ ہے جو انہوں نے مرتے وقت بھی کہا تھا -

میں ان گھنٹیوں کو جو کشمیر کی گزائیاں ہیں دیکھ رہا ہوں کہ وہاں سے روحانی مدد آ رہی ہے،

آج ہم چار کروڑ مسلمان اور ۳۶ کروڑ
 ہندوؤں کی طرف سے پھر دیکھ رہے
 ہیں کہ کشمیر ہمارے لئے مدد کا
 سبب ہوگا اور تمام دنیا کے لوگوں کے
 لئے پیس اور امن کا -

†[**مولانا ام ۰ فاروقی** (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
 جताब डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहेब. सबसे पहले
 मैं अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब का शुक्र
 या अदा करते हूँ कि उन्होंने आज एक घंटे
 से ज्यादा देर तक तकलीफ उठाकर अपने
 ख्यालात का इजहार किया और यह मौका
 इस एवान को दिया कि हम इस सफ़र का
 फिर से जायज़ा ले जो आज़ादी के मिलने के
 बाद स दुनियाँ में अमन कायम करने के लिये
 हमने शुक्र किया था और यह देखें कि हमने
 अब तक महात्मा गांधी की सुलाह व आशती
 की तालीम को कहां तक दुनियाँ में फैलाया
 और कहां तक पीस कायम करने में हमने
 हिस्सा लिया। आज हमें बहुत फ़ख के
 साथ यह कहना पड़ता है कि पूरी दुनियाँ में
 जब कि हर तरफ़ एक अधेरा सा छाया हुआ
 है और वह अधेरा बहुत मुमकिन है कहर
 आतिश की तरह लड़ाई की सूरत में फट
 जाय। हर तरफ़ हर कौम एक दूसरे पे दस्त
 गरेबां हो रही है और लड़ने के लिये तैयार
 है। आज अगर हम कोई रोगनी मिलती
 है तो हम दावे से यह कह सकते हैं और दुनियाँ
 के सामने सर बुलन्द कर सकते हैं कि वह
 रोशनी हमें मिलती है तो हमारे मोहतरम
 बज्रग की उस तकरीर में मिलती है जो उन्होंने
 सिक्कूरिटी कौंसिल मे नो धंटे तक की और
 इस तकरीर में काशीर के प्राब्लम्स को
 साफ किया। इसमें सबसे बड़ी और ऊंची
 चीज़ उन्होंने बताई वह यह थी कि हम
 दुनियाँ के लिये सख्त मे सख्त वक्त में भी
 सुलाह व आशती से पीस के लिये काम कर
 सकते हैं और इसके लिये आखिर तक हम
 लड़ने को तैयार हैं। लेकिन दुनियाँ इसका

मतलब यह न समझे कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान के
 साथ कोई ना-इन्साफी की जायगी तो भी
 वह कुछ न कहेगा बल्कि ऐसी सूरत में हम
 उस वक्त बहादुराना तौर पर उमका मुकाबला
 करेंगे।

इस वक्त दूसरी भरतबा मैं मुबारकबाद
 दूसरी कामयाबी पर औनरेबल प्राइम
 मिनिस्टर को और पूरे फ़ौरन एफेयर्स
 डिपार्टमेंट को इस बात के लिये देता हूँ कि
 स्वेज़ कैनाल का मसला बहुत अमन के साथ
 नै हो गया है। इसी के साथ साथ यह चीज़
 भी आपके सामने आती है कि यह स्वेज़ कैनाल
 का जो मसला था यह किसका बरबाद किया
 हुआ है। यह बरबाद किया हुआ है उस
 मिलिटरी पैक्ट का और उस बगदाद पैक्ट
 का जो पाकिस्तान ने और दूसरे मिडिल
 ईस्ट कटरीज़ ने आपस में किया है क्योंकि
 इसने इस मसले को ताकत दी थी। आपको
 ताज्जुब होगा कि मैं इस मसले
 पर क्यों यह इलज़ाम दे रहा हूँ कि उसने
 ताकत दी। इन पैक्टों के जरिये उन शहन-
 शाही मुल्कों के हाथ मजबूत हो गये हैं।
 वो जहां चाहे गड़बड़ करा दें और तबाही
 ला कर जवरन कब्ज़ा कर लें जिस गरीब और
 कमज़ोर मुल्क को चाहे उस पर हमला करके
 कब्ज़ा कर लें जरा जरा से बहाने बनाकर।
 आप यह यकीन जानिये कि पंडित जवाहर
 लाल हो थे जिन्होंने महान्मा गांधी के
 पैगाम को निहायत रिस्क उठाकर और
 अपने सर के ऊपर एक बड़ा भारी बोझ
 उठाकर निगा को सुनाया है। बावजूद इसके
 कि कौमन अश के साथ बरसों से हमारे जो
 अच्छे ताल्लुकात थे उनमें बिगाड़ आया
 फिर भी हमने सामने बढ़कर उन तमाम
 जुल्मों का मुकाबला किया जो हमारी पड़ी
 से बड़ी दोस्त हुकूमतों की तरफ से हुये और
 इस वक्त भी हम इसका मुकाबला करने के
 लिये तैयार हैं। इसी एक सदा का यह
 नतीजा था कि आज हम मिस्र को एक बाइजजत

[मोलाना एम० फरूक]

और सरबुलन्द मुल्क देख रहे हैं और हमें यकीन है कि हम आग्रहा भी इसी तरीके पर हर मजलूम हुकूमत और हर मजलूम कौम की मदद करते रहेंगे और सबको यह बता देंगे कि हमने जो आजादी हासिल की थी वह दूसरों पर कब्जा करने के लिये नहीं हासिल की थी। वह दूसरों पर हुकूमत करने के लिये नहीं हासिल की थी। वह इसलिये नहीं हासिल की थी कि जरा जरा से मुआमलात को बहाना बनाकर फिर दुनिया में लड़ाई का ढोंग रचें। बल्कि हमने आजादी इसलिये हासिल की कि खुद भी हम जिन्दा रहें और दूसरों को भी जिन्दा रहने दें।

इसके बाद इसी सिलसिले में बगदाद पैकट का दूसरा जहरीला असर जो इस वक्त सामने आ रहा है यानी काश्मीर का मसला उसके बारे में मैं अज्ञ करना चाहता हूँ। मैं उसके बारे में तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि वक्त इतना नहीं है लेकिन मैं आपको बता देना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक किसी किस्म के भी मिलिटरी पैकट जो बड़ी बड़ी हुकूमतों ने छोटी छोटी हुकूमतों से किये हैं उन्हीं का यह नतीजा है कि आज जुल्म व तशद्द कराने के लिये तरह तरह के बहाने तलाश किये जा रहे हैं। उनमें से सबसे बड़ी चीज काश्मीर का मसला है यह मसला हमारे मुल्क के गहर से ताल्लुक नहीं रखता बल्कि हमारे गन्दरूनी मुआमलात से गहरा ताल्लुक रखता है। अगर काश्मीर का मसला गड़बड़ में मतिज होता है तो यही नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान के गहर कोई चीज होती है बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर भी वह डिफिकल्टीज पेश आ सकती हैं जिनका मुकाबला करना मुशकिल हो जायेगा। बल्कि मैं कहूंगा कि इस सूरत में दुनिया पूरी इस आग में जल जायेगी। आपका काश्मीर के मसले को सिर्फ मामूली तौर पर नहीं देखना चाहिये। काश्मीर के मसले के सिलसिले में मुझे कुछ जायद

कहने की जरूरत नहीं। नौ घंटे की तकरीर जो सिक्किमिटी कौंसिल में मि० कृष्णा मेनन ने की वह आप लोग तकरीबन पढ़ चुके होंगे। उनकी तकरीर में करीब तमाम चीजें काश्मीर के मसले के सिलसिले में लाई गईं। खासतौर पर उस तकरीर की एक चीज मुझे बहुत ज्यादा पसन्द आई जो उन्होंने शेख अब्दुल्ला की उस तकरीर से रकल की जो उन्होंने काश्मीर की कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली में दी थी। वही शेख अब्दुल्ला जिसका नाम आपकी मखालफत में आज बहुत उभारा जाता है उन्होंने कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली में जो तकरीर की थी वह खासतौर पर गौर करने की है। उन्होंने काश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहने के लिये जो दर्जिले बयान की थी और जो सबब बयान किये थे उनमें दो तरह की चीजें मिलती हैं। उन्हें ने यह कहा था कि हम इक्तासादी हैसियत से और माली हैसियत से अपनी जिन्दगी बसर करने के लिये यह जरूरी समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहें। और उसकी वजह उन्होंने यह बयान की थी कि हमारी जिन्दगी यानी काश्मीर की जिन्दगी काश्मीर की सन्नत व हरफत पर है। काश्मीर की जिन्दगी वहां की सन्नत पर है। वहां की उन चीजों पर जिन्हें लोग अपने हाथ से बनाते हैं। काश्मीर की लकड़ी बड़ी मशहूर होती है वहां उसके जंगल के जंगल पाये जाते हैं। जहां से दूसरे मुल्कों को लकड़ी और लकड़ी का सामान सप्लाई किया जाता है।

हिन्दुस्तान ही एक ऐसी जगह है जहां आप काश्मीर का माल हर मौसम में सप्लाई कर सकते हैं चहे गर्मी हो या ठंडा या बरसात। सब मौसमों में वहां का रास्ता खुला रहता है। अब तो आपने काश्मीर में एक टनल भी बना दी है जिससे आपने यह साबित कर दिया है कि काश्मीर की सन्नत व तिजारत हमेशा के लिये महफूज है। काश्मीर के लिये हिन्दुस्तान तिजारती

सैंटर है। यहाँ से तमाम दुनिया को काश्मीर का सामान तकसीम होता है। इसलिये काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान से कभी भी अलहदा नहीं हो सकता।

दूसरी चीज़ जो बहुत अहम है और जिसको पाकिस्तान हमेशा पेश करता है वह यह है कि चूँकि पाकिस्तान एक इस्लामी मुल्क है इसलिये उसे हक है कि जितनी भी मुस्लिम आबादी है उसके साथे के अन्दर आये। पाकिस्तान कहता है कि काश्मीर में मुसलमानों की आबादी ज्यादा है इसलिये काश्मीर को हमारे साथ आना चाहिये। यह एक अजीब चीज़ है। जो लोग इस्लामी मुल्क के लफ्ज की तारीख को जानते हैं उन को मालूम है कि यह जो इस्लामी मुल्क का लफ्ज है, इस्लामी हुकूमत का लफ्ज है यह मुहम्मद रसूल अल्लाह सल्ल अल्ला अलैहे व सल्ल अल्लाम ने शुरू किया था। मदीना में उन्होंने एक हुकूमत की बुनियाद रखी थी इस हुकूमत को इस्लामी हुकूमत कहा जा सकता है। मगर आप एक अजीब चीज़ देखेंगे कि यहूदी और क्रिस्चन भी उसमें इस तरह से अमन के साथ रहते थे जिस तरह से मुसलमान। उनमें कोई फर्क नहीं था। मगर जब हम पाकिस्तान की तरफ देखते हैं जो अपने को एक इस्लामी हुकूमत कहता है वहाँ पर हालत दूसरी ही है। आज हम देखते हैं कि पाकिस्तान में जो गैर-मुस्लिम आबादी है उन्हें वो अपने इस्लामी मुल्क से बाहर निकाल रहा है। उसने इसमें ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से करीब चालीस और पचास लाख गैर मुस्लिम लोगों को हिन्दुस्तान में रिफ्यूजी बना कर डाल दिया है। लेकिन वह इस्लामी हुकूमत सिर्फ पचास साल तक रही इसके बाद खलीफा बादशाह हुये उन्होंने अपनी हुकूमत कायम की। मैं यहाँ पर किसी मूवमेंट के बारे में नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ बल्कि मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जब पाकिस्तान की सरकार यह दावा करती है कि उनका एक

इस्लामी मुल्क है तो मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उनके यहाँ किस तरह की इस्लामी हुकूमत है। अगर वह इस्लामी हुकूमत है तो उसने स्वेज नहर के मामले में सबसे आगे कदम क्यों नहीं उठाया।

जिस वक्त पोर्ट सैड में पचास हजार बेगुनाहों के ऊपर अंग्रेजों और उनके साथियों ने हमला किया और बम्बारी की उस वक्त पाकिस्तान की इस्लामी हुकूमत कहाँ थी जो अपने मुसलमान भाइयों की हिफाजत करने का दावा करता है। जहाँ उनकी हिफाजत के लिये पाकिस्तान आवाज तक नहीं उठा रहा तब वह कैसे वायुमन के मुसलमानों की हिफाजत करने की फ़िक्क करता है। इस वक्त काश्मीर में जो मुसलमान हैं वह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ काफ़ी आराम से रहेगे और तरक्की करेंगे।

श्री ह० प्र० सक्सेना : क्या यह फेल पाकिस्तान हुकूमत का गैर इस्लामी नहीं है, मैं यह बात दरियाफ्त करना चाहता हूँ।

मौलाना एम० फारूकी : मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि पाकिस्तान के हुकूमरान इस्लामी हुकूमत का नाम लेकर इस तरह की चीज़ कर रहे हैं जिसको हकीकी इस्लाम से कोई वास्ता नहीं है। वह जब यह दावा कर रहे हैं कि जहाँ भी मुसलमान हैं उन सब के वह चौधरी हैं, इन सबके जान व माल की ज़िम्मेदारी इनके ऊपर है, तब इन्हें सबसे पहले स्वेज नहर के मामले में अपना कदम बढ़ाना चाहिये था और कोई गैर इस्लामी हरकत नहीं करनी चाहिये थी। जब मित्र में लोग मारे जा रहे थे उस वक्त पाकिस्तान आराम से बैठकर बग़दाद पेंकट की बात चला रहा था और अंग्रेजों से मुकाहमल कर रहा था। गैर इस्लामी तो बहुत वैसी चीज़ है मैं तो कहूँगा कि वह गैर इन्सानियत की चीज़

[मौलाना एम० फारूकी]

कर रहा था। इनके बाद भी वह बराबर उस बात का दावा करते हैं कि हमारे यहां इस्लामी बहुमत है, हमारे यहां मुस्लिम डेट है, हमारे यहां मुसलमानों की अक्सरेयत है। उसके बरअन्तम अगर आप अन्दाजा करें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि पाकिस्तान जो काश्मीर को मगरीबी पाकिस्तान में शामिल करना चाहता है उसमें पचीस मिलियन से ज्यादा मुस्लिम हैं। हैं जब कि हिन्दुस्तान में इस वक्त अर्धस मिलियन मुसलमान हैं। इसलिये हमारा पूरी तरह से हक है कि हम अपने इन भाइयों को अपनी हिफाजत में लें। मैं तो यह कहता हूं कि हमारा यह हक हो नहीं। बल्कि हम अपने को मजबूर समझते हैं कि हम दूसरे मुसलमान भाइयों को भी हिफाजत में लें। इस तरह से मैं आपको याद दिलाता हूं कि खिलाफत मूवमेंट के जमाने में गांधी जी ने.....

श्री उप सभापति : समय हो गया है।

मौलाना एम० फारूकी : मैं बस अब खत्म करने ही जा रहा हूं, तो मैं कह रहा था कि खिलाफत के जमाने में गांधी जी ने तमाम दुनियां को यह चैलेंज दिया था कि हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान और हिन्दू अरब और मिस्र की हिफाजत करेंगे। आज भी हमारे चार करोड़ मुसलमान और छत्तीस करोड़ हिन्दू मिलकर यह दावा करते हैं और पाकिस्तान से कह सकते हैं कि तुम कैसे हमारे काश्मीरी भाइयों की हिफाजत कर सकते हो जब कि तुम अभी तक अपने यहां वोटिंग और इंतख़ाब का इंतजाम भी नहीं कर सके हो।

(Time bell rings.)

मैं इन लफ्जों के साथ गांधी जी का एक जुमला पढ़ कर अपनी स्पीच खत्म कर दूंगा। गांधी

जी का एक जुमला है जो उन्होंने मरते वक्त भी कहा था.....

“मैं इन घाटियों को जो काश्मीर की घाटियां हैं देख रहा हूं कि वहां से रूहानी मदद आ रहा है” आज हम चार करोड़ मुसलमान और छत्तीस करोड़ हिन्दुओं की तरफ से फिर देख रहे हैं कि काश्मीर हमारे लिये मदद का सबब होगा और तमाम दुनियां के लोगों के लिये पीस और अमन का।]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wilson, just five minutes.

SHRI T. J. M. WILSON (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, out of the so-called Kashmir issue which has revealed the hostility of the majority of the nations that comprise the U.N.O. towards India and their absolute refusal to see the central fact of aggression emerges one basic factor which is important for the nations of the world to see and that is that India believes, and India has respect and faith in the United Nations Organisation and in its Charter. In spite of the wide gap that exists between the purpose and the achievement of the United Nations Organisation we believe that the nations of the world by adhering to the principles of the United Nations Organisation could narrow down and ultimately eliminate that gap. This explains India's attitude to the military pacts because these pacts deny and repudiate that faith in the United Nations Charter. India believes that for that reason the balance of power, which characterised European diplomacy for about a hundred years and which has not avoided major wars, should give place to mutual trust and co-operation among the various nations and with the United Nations Organisation. This is not stating any abstract principles as was contended in the other House, nor expressing an opinion too many times as was said by Pandit Hridaynath Kunzru in the morning but these principles and

adherence to these principles which constitute what we call Panchsheel are alone the guarantee of our security, the security and defence of our motherland, and the criticism that they may go against our national interests or that they are going against our national interests is something which I fail to understand. That is the reason why we continuously and emphatically voice our protest and condemnation of the military pacts—the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO Pact—while we also raise our voice against the NATO and Warsaw Pacts which are chiefly concerned with Europe and that is the reason why we deplore that the United States of America whose President and the Congress laid the foundations for the United Nations Organisation is taking active part in these Pacts and that is also the reason why we resent very much the latest decision of the United States of America to join the Military Committee of the Baghdad Pact. It is for this prime consideration of our security, for the defence of our motherland that we desire to live on the friendliest possible terms with our immediate neighbours, China and Russia, and this has been characterised by Mr. Kishen Chand in the afternoon as partial alignment with the Soviet bloc in violation of our principle of non-alignment, and this is also a matter of, I believe, unwarranted suspicion and displeasure on the part of some nations. I wonder how we can help it.

Besides our tradition of anti-colonialism and our Asian and cultural background, we have commercial relations with Western Asia, and our industrial development is linked in more ways than one with the establishment of peace and stability in that region. While the rich oil resources render it the biggest trouble-spot, the people of Western Asia are jealous of their hard won political freedom and are anxious to raise their standards of living. We are naturally interested in their endeavour, and it is in this context that we view the Eisenhower

doctrine or the Soviet proposals. We therefore express ourselves generally against the projection of external military influence in this area to fill the vacuum in this area. The veiled criticism that we are attempting a bigger role than could be sustained is therefore not in consonance with facts. We are not striving for a position or prestige in the world as perhaps some other nations of the world have done and are doing. Our foreign policy is governed by the two chief considerations of our security and our industrial development, and these two also are closely linked with peace in the world and scrupulous avoidance of cold war in Asia. The prestige therefore that India enjoys in the world today is not of its seeking but is the natural outcome of its uncompromising efforts for peace which, we believe, is essential for our own freedom.

There is also the criticism by some nations and individuals, and it has been voiced here by Mr. Kishen Chand, that we are not strictly neutral and objective on certain issues. But he does not realise that those nations and individuals who have been saying this have themselves realised—and those who have not yet realised would see this perfectly in course of time—that that was not borne out by facts. I ask him, I ask any one, to point out one instance where India has taken a stand that increased tensions and created bad relations among nations and which did not positively contribute to peace. The emergence of an Afro-Asian group in the U.N.O. and the cordiality and understanding that exists among these nations is a significant development for peace, and this has come about largely due to our efforts. The recent appeal of the Prime Minister for a Summit Conference has roused public opinion, and I trust that the discussions on disarmament and the latest offer of Soviet Russia to temporarily suspend nuclear tests in answer to the proposals of the Bermuda Conference will bear fruit.....

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Finish in one minute.

SHRI T. J. M. WILSON:.....and I have no doubt that our nation wishes our Prime Minister to take more interest in these matters, and that the great ambassador in the world of peace-loving India, Mr. Krishna Menon, should help with his unparalleled skill in the solution of these baffling problems.

Regarding India's remaining in the Commonwealth, it is India, I may say, that has wrought a major change in the character of the Commonwealth in its long history by deciding to continue independence with its membership. As a result of this, an association predominantly British became essentially multi-racial in character. It has ceased to be a Crown Commonwealth, and has become more of a functional organisation. Ghana took its own place and within the next few years other Asian and African nations will join and further weaken its British character. With its Asian and African background, I have no doubt that it will become a major international force. Secondly, besides enabling us to keep in touch with other Asian and African nations, it also enables us to come closer to a country like Canada with which we have formed particularly friendly ties which we desire in the interests of our two countries to further strengthen. Thirdly, the Commonwealth became the source of the Colombo Plan for aid and assistance without strings which we so desire. Finally, it is remarkable association which, arising out of history and growing into multi-racial association, has become a pattern for other international associations for frank and free exchange of view points.....(*Time bell rings*)....., for self-restraint and consideration for each other.

(*Time bell rings*).

I would not say much about Kashmir except to say that the nations

which are supposed to be advanced have forgotten that religion had long ceased to confer statehood and determine nationality, that the nations of Europe have emerged long ago. Kashmir will ever remain part of India to remind those nations of that exploded theory that nations can never be separated or divided by religion.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am here not to tread the ground that has already been covered by my friends, but I would only say a few words about Goa, the Commonwealth and the other issues.

Sir, we welcome the statement made by the Prime Minister in the other House that on the question of Goa he is going to consult the opposition parties, that a national policy shall be adopted towards this problem of Goa, and that the question of liberation of Goa shall be tackled. Sir, all the remarks that we have to make we reserve for the moment when we shall have that consultative conference which the Prime Minister has conceived. But we hope that the urgency of the whole issue will be seen in the background of the various imperialistic intrigues that are going on around us, in the background of SEATO, in the background of the Baghdad Pact, in the background of the Kashmir problem, in the background of the fact that Portugal is a member of NATO, in the background of the fact that Portugal is friendly to America and England, in the background of the fact also that Mr. Suhrawardy before he became Prime Minister had been waxing eloquent in favour of Portugal and had also gone to Goa—and we do not know but we can easily see what he must have done there in the Goa in those particular days. Sir, in this background the question of Goa has to be seen not merely as an internal problem of our country, not as a question of merely liberating our own soil, but as a problem which is fraught with serious dangers in view

of the present international situation, particularly the Western Asian situation and the present strained Indo-Pakistan relations.

Coming to the Commonwealth, we are sorry to point out, that we again fail to agree with the insistence of the Prime Minister and the various Congress leaders that remaining in the Commonwealth is paying to us. Sir, Burma is out of the Commonwealth, and surely Burma has not lost anything by quitting the Commonwealth. Today we are imparting moral strength to the Imperialists by remaining in the Commonwealth. Outside the Commonwealth we will be in a far better position, for the simple reason that this Commonwealth instead of being of help to us, of strength to us, is only a chain that is morally binding us to the British imperialism, to the British chariot. The hon. Prime Minister said that the character of the Commonwealth is changing with Ghana and the Asian-African powers joining it. It is not that the character of the Asian-African countries is changing because of the Commonwealth but, I should say, in spite of the Commonwealth. Commonwealth should be replaced by a suitable machinery of Bandung Powers that our leader had suggested at the Bandung Conference. There we have the real machinery for the Asian-African countries to defend and preserve their freedom. It is not the Commonwealth but it is the Bandung machinery that should be the alternative for the Asian-African countries who want to win and preserve their freedom in spite of imperialist threats.

Sir, I would only say one word about the question that Prof. Wadia has raised. It is said that India ought to play some role in trying to bring about an approachment between Israel and the Arab States. I think India has made it clear that she has reconciled to the position that Israel exists. India has also made it clear that India wants the Suez Canal to be free for navigation by every country. Sir, I

would request the Professor to kindly look into one factor that Israel has been created in the teeth of opposition of the Arab countries. That is point one. Point two is that Israel, instead of realising the position that Arab countries have been hostile to it, instead of trying to win their friendship, has been banking upon the support of the western powers and has been further accentuating the hostilities. It devolves on Israel, the leaders of various parties in Israel, to see that they win over the Arab people; they cannot just remain hostile to the Arab people and bank on the support that they have been getting from Anglo-Americans, the support of the far off imperialists.

4 P.M.

In conclusion, Sir, I would like to say something on the Kashmir question. Sir, it has been alleged that we have been doing something that is opposed to the wishes of the people there. I am not going into the legal position of the Kashmir instrument which is amply clear. The same machinery which created India and Pakistan also created the question of accession of the States. It is the Princes who were to decide the accession of their respective States. And we have always been saying that it is the people of Jammu and Kashmir who have to decide the issue of accession of that State, as we have said in the case of other States say, Hyderabad. We were opposed to Princes taking any decision on behalf of the people. The people of Kashmir have been duly consulted in regard to this question. Nobody can say that whatever the Constituent Assembly there had done was against the wishes of the people of that State. The people of Kashmir are surely not going to give up the social gains that they have achieved during the last so many years because of their freedom. On the Kashmir issue, surely, Sir, the policy of the Indian Government is generally supported by the people all over the country, except, of course,

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

a few people here and there, who think in some other direction.

With these few words, Sir, I conclude my speech.

THE MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO (SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the motion introduced by the Prime Minister this morning and the observations that he made in support of it have been followed by a debate which has covered not only all the aspects to which he has referred, but a few others as well. The trend of all these observations has been that Members, speaking in the House as a whole, have reflected what is now the undoubted view of the populations of this country that we stand solidly behind the national foreign policy of the Government. But while that support is offered from every part of the House, there have been observations in regard to particular aspects unsupported by any reasoning that though it is a good policy, it is a bad policy also.

Now, normally speaking, it is not necessary to pursue every detail of this argument, but as it happens that these debates are reported outside this country and there are observations relating to other countries, our Government must, first of all, dissociate itself from the observations that have been made referring to the aggressive intentions of the United States in regard to this country. It is essential that it should do so, because it is far remote from fact. Secondly, we have publicly and privately accepted the motives of the United States in regard to whatever policies it adopts in relation to us. The effect of these may, in our view, be adverse to our interests, but in a foreign affairs debate of this character in the Houses of Parliament, Government could not sit unconcerned when observation of this kind was made. It must therefore dissociate itself from that observation as it is likely

to be misunderstood. The same kind of observation applies to the references to the internal positions of other countries. While in the tradition of Parliament, and in the general, free and frank discussion in this country, no one can restrain any expression of views, Government must again dissociate itself from observations of the kind that Mr. Shepilov was displaced from the Soviet Government. The same thing applies to the references, if I may say so, not of a usual character, to the Head of a State, namely, the President of Egypt. We say all this because it is part of the general approach that we make to our relations with other countries that we take scrupulous care not to injure the susceptibilities of other countries, not to interfere in their internal affairs, and only refer to their policies in as far as they impinge upon us, and where we must.

The general trend of criticism has been that we have been left friendless, and the Government emphatically deny that this is a true estimate of our foreign policy. This country today has links of friendship with the nations of the world in every continent, irrespective of their economic or political systems, which is shown by the large number of economic, cultural and other relations that exist, and which are sought to be fostered by countries from different parts of the world by their invitations to the Head of our Government, to Members of Parliament, to experts and to others to visit their countries, to give them assistance and co-operation. A large number of students come to this country. We think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that ten years ago no foreign student came to this country for studies. We send them abroad. In fact, if anybody had told us ten years ago that foreign students would come to our universities except perhaps to learn some language, we would have been surprised.

Secondly, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are not to expect from other

vereign nations that because they are friendly to us, they would necessarily accept our view of things. We do not do that in relation to others. So far as the work in the international conferences is concerned, whether it be in the United Nations General Assembly or elsewhere in the various organisations to which we send numerous delegations—where close co-operations, co-working and understanding of discussions takes place not merely with one group or another group, but with practically all the countries on a general basis—it is necessary for us to enter into these conversations even if we do not agree with their views. Therefore, with great respect, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would say that for responsible Members of our Parliament, even though those views are sincerely held, to give expression to the idea that this country stands isolated and friendless, is not doing service to the cause of our national security, our national prestige, our economic, social or cultural interest.

It is true—and we must accept the fact—that in a Parliamentary system the minority is more articulate, and that is entirely correct in regard to our domestic affairs. But I think one must hope that as our Parliamentary democracy grows in maturity, we would be a little more charitable to the Government and a little more circumspect in our observations with regard to the estimates we make of the results of our policy. Government welcomes criticisms and does not shirk them, but those criticisms, in as far as they refer to particular aspects, should give concrete instances of policy, and not merely say “I haven’t got the papers, so I do not know; but still this is what I think.” That does not take us very much farther. A request has been made to the Government to take the initiative, to take some steps, for the convening of another Bandung Conference. The convening of another conference at Bandung of Asian-African countries has been entrusted to what are called the Colombo Powers at the previous

Bandung Conference and there it remains. But there have been consultations between these countries from time to time and also between others who are interested but on balance neither the time nor the occasion has been found quite appropriate for everybody coming together, but I would like to assure the House that the kind of contact and exchange of views needed as between these countries continues not only through diplomatic channels but by visiting delegations, in the discussions that take place in international conferences in which these countries are represented, in the Asian-African Group at the United Nations, and they are co-ordinated by instructions from and reports to the External Affairs Ministry.

The hon. Member who spoke on this subject also referred to the setting up of specific channels of communication and also the organisation of what might be called a regional block. Here, if I may say so, this reflects inadequacy of information with regard to the Bandung Conference and its own decisions. The final statement at the Bandung Conference definitely stated that it was not their purpose to aim at any continentalism, or regionalism or the setting up of an organisation which is either a regional organisation of the United Nations or one in rivalry to it. It was merely a forum for Foreign Ministers and Prime Ministers for the exchange of views and to proclaim to the world the degree of agreement which existed as between them. It was more as a symbol of resurgent Asia and Africa, rather than to set up a Secretariat. For consultations the normal channels of communication remain, and it is the experience of Governments that channels extra-neous to the normal diplomatic and governmental organisations are more a hindrance than assistance except in very specific cases.

I would like to take an early opportunity which I forget to avail myself of last time—I would like to do it when the Prime Minister is

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.] present in this House—to say something with regard to the policy that this country has pursued in regard to the Hungarian question, also in regard to the statements that we soon stood corrected, that there have been some somersaults in this policy and so on. I will not analyse each speech; I will just take one of them and that one speech is sufficient to show that great freedom, which is freedom from facts, which dominates these observations. We are told, for example, that India as a Member of the Security Council did this or did not do that. Now, India has not been a member of the Security Council for the last five or six years. This problem, when it came before the Security Council, was voted against by the Soviet Union which was a veto, and under the U.N. Charter, it was referred to the Assembly. Reference was made to my own person as being responsible for the initial position in this matter. While I fully accept collective responsibility, I went to the United Nations after the two Resolutions had been passed. That does not mean that I disown any responsibility whatsoever. In the case of Hungary, what is not known to the House is that it was the Indian delegation that took the initiative in this question being continually seized of by the Assembly. As the Vice-President of the General Assembly, we become a member of what is called the Steering Committee. I myself moved the resolution. When the emergency session was over it was not known—it was all touch and go—whether it would be left over or not, and we thought that this question, having been discussed, must be continued, and it was we who moved that the Hungarian question be transferred to the agenda of the General Assembly. It was not merely a formal motion; it went through a good deal of debate and was finally adopted. In regard to Hungary we have pursued the same policies that we have pursued in regard to others. The same cannot be said of other nations who profess the same principles, because in the case of the resolution on

Hungary, there was an expression of condemnation with regard to foreign troops but no expression of condemnation ever entered into the resolution in regard to the Middle East. I think that the observations on behalf of the Government of India and our criticism of Soviet policy are probably more terse, more factual and more unreserved in regard to the aspects that we knew about than the criticism of any other country. That is probably the negative aspect in this matter, because, Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is another aspect to this. This country is not interested merely in making speeches but in trying in so far as it can in offering concrete solutions. Our delegation tried its best to bring about a position where instead of a mere debate in the General Assembly, some way of reconciliation, some way out of the difficult situation could be brought about, such as the visit of the Secretary General. Some progress was made in this direction, and if the progress was not continued, it was because this problem really became a shuttlecock in the cold war debate. Our position in this has been exactly the same as in regard to others. There has been no somersault, there have been no pressures. We were to a certain extent embarrassed—the delegation was to a certain extent embarrassed—until the Prime Minister's timely intervention in the Parliament, by the views expressed here, which had nothing to do with, which were not relevant to, the statements made on your behalf in the United Nations, and I hope it will be possible for your Secretariat, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to place in the hands of Members the several statements made by us in regard to Hungary, and if any Member can find anywhere any phraseology, any sentiment, any expression of opinion, any submission, which is contrary either to our national tradition or to the policies that have been repeatedly explained in this House, I for one would be prepared to admit that fact and take whatever steps are necessary. I hope this will not be regarded as a personal observation. It is a

the thick for the representatives of the country who are abroad who have to face a vast argumentative opposition from abroad which one expects, have a stab in the back from their own country through this kind of speeches reported by foreign journals and newspapers in a most distorted way, and when it is brought to you in the middle of a debate, you have no idea whether it was a squeak, a voice or a large voice from Parliament, and it is not possible with the small amount of money that we spend in our diplomatic organisations for them to be able to be in touch with Delhi every five minutes. We have not the staff to deal with reports and communications while meetings are going on we can attend to them only when the meetings are over and there is always a time-lag of days in setting communications through between the two countries which makes things difficult. In these circumstances, without any bitterness in this matter and in all sincerity, I would ask that in matters of this kind at least our representatives may be afforded that degree of forbearance and that degree of toleration that we do get from other countries. I had not intended to reopen this matter, but so much has been said about Hungary which has no relation to what happened in the world. In fact, our Ambassadors who have been in Budapest, and our delegation in New York, have been usually regarded, instead of being antagonists of the Hungarian Liberation idea, as being friendly to it. Our difficulty has been to keep outside these demonstrations for obvious reasons. Prof. Wadia referred to our partial or rather unsatisfactory treatment in regard to Israel and particularly he referred to the passage of ships through the Suez Canal and how it recoiled on our own position. Reference was made this morning by the Prime Minister in regard to freedom of navigation. Here again, I would request reference by members to statements made on behalf of the Government on this issue, wherever it has taken place, whether it is in conferences in London

or by the Prime Minister in Delhi or in the United Nations. We are the only country and indeed we took the initiative in coming out, and it was not a popular thing to do if you know Arab sentiment on this Israel question, and we said that irrespective of whatever sentiment there was, the issue should be subject to the jurisdiction of the world court if there was a grievance. The position is this, that Egypt does not make any reservations in regard to the freedom of unrestricted navigation through the Canal and she says that she will observe and has observed the Convention of Constantinople of 1888, but she says at the same time that in stopping the Israeli ships, arresting them in territorial waters and preventing their entry into the Suez Canal, she has acted in full accord with the 1888 Convention and what is more, in accordance with the practice of the Allies during the First and the Second World Wars. That is to say, she says that she is at war with Israel, that her security is in danger, that she could not allow unfriendly craft to go through the Suez Canal and photograph her harbours, nor could she allow a situation where it might lead to irritation of opinion inside the country which might endanger the passage of other ships through the Canal for which she is responsible. Now the Government of India does not subscribe to any of these arguments. But this is their argument. If that is their argument, what does it boil down to? It comes to an interpretation of the Convention. They said 'We are acting in accordance with the Convention which permitted us to safeguard our security'. The other people said 'You are acting against the Convention'. We said in London last August on this question—and we came under very much criticism from the Arab side and even from others for saying this—that it was an Instrument and if there was a difference of interpretation of an International Instrument, then the aggrieved party or its friends should go to the World Court and that Egypt should accept the ver-

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]
dict of the World Court. I think it is true to say that it is largely because of the position that we took in this matter that generally the Egyptian Government has not shown any hostility to that idea. Therefore the suggestion that we are entering this issue in a very partisan way is not true, is not in accordance with the facts in which our policy is carried out.

It was also said that in regard to our problems—the problems that we have for ourselves, namely in Ceylon, South Africa and so on,—we have not been able to do anything. Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a little difficult to understand what we are expected to do. Are we to wage a war on South Africa? Are we to wage a war on Ceylon? I think with regard to Ceylon, very protracted negotiations have been conducted, they still go on and a certain amount of remedial measures come about and even though the problem of people of Indian origin or Indian nationals is vital to us, the friendship of Ceylon is equally vital to us, if not more vital. The Prime Minister, in spite of his great pre-occupations, has engaged himself in these conversations over the years and it is a country next door to us, with her problems, having many complexities—this Ceylon Government—as there are for us, and to pursue any other policy than one of continuous endeavour to resolve it is not either wisdom or statesmanship.

In regard to South Africa, for 10 continuous years in spite of the understandable fatigue that the Assembly has suffered from the continuous introduction of this question, we have kept this problem alive. It is not possible to bring, in fact today it may not be possible to introduce this question into the Assembly. They cannot agree to it, but it was agreed to 10 years ago and now, each year the problem of the peoples of Indian and also Pakistani origin in South Africa as well as the problem of *Apartheid* come up for discussion. The main burden of piloting this matter falls on

the Indian delegation. Also it is a matter that equally concerns Pakistanis, and we have done what alone can be done in the circumstances by way of peaceful measures, that is, to rally world public opinion and it is a fact that in regard to the peoples of Indian origin, there is only one vote against the Resolution and that is the vote of South Africa. I think, as said, Government welcomes criticism but equally considering that these are matters which have a public bearing far beyond our country, those criticisms, if I may submit, Mr. Deputy Chairman, are regrettable if they are not of a character that helps the general cause that is before us.

There was a suggestion, which one would have understood if it came from a foreign audience or a conference of hostile journalists. That is, while we profess our policy of non-alignment and it is supported, yet we are told that we are non-aligned and we ought to be aligned. That is one argument I entirely agree with the observations made by Dr. Kunzru that even though we may have strong views, it is not always necessary to express them. I think in saying that, he only expresses the practice of our Government and its representatives. It is a patent fact that there is no instance where we have tried to pursue a thing merely for the purpose of logic. Does this House say, for example, when Egypt was invaded, that we should have kept quiet and should not have thrown whatever weight we had behind for obtaining a position where the invaders and the assisting forces were made to withdraw?

There was the hon. Member from Andhra who said that Poland has got out of the Soviet Bloc and that we should do the same. It is impossible because we have never been in it. They were in the Bloc and they could get out of it but we were not in it. So how can we get out? So any idea that we are aligned to one country or another rather reflects, what I fear, the unconscious adoption of foreign propaganda by ourselves. It is because

we see it in print that attacks are made, we seem to take it that way. This country can get nowhere either in its internal policies or external policies unless it is sure of itself and unless it has confidence that it is following the path that is in its national interest and is in the interest of the world. The Prime Minister set out this morning that those are the lines that we are following.

With regard to Suez Canal, again in pursuance of the brief observations the Prime Minister made this morning, clarification was sought. It is not proper for us here as a Government to say what the Egyptian Government may do tomorrow or the day after tomorrow but since it is a matter of international interest and what is more, a matter of national interest to us, because a great deal of goods or traffic, our food supplies, industrial equipment and everything, comes through the Suez Canal, our exports go through the Canal—and the countries east of the Suez have lost at the rate of £10 millions a month since the passage was stopped,—therefore, it is relevant and appropriate to make a further reference to it. It is the belief, it is our belief, that not only would the Suez Canal be opened for international traffic in a few days but that the Egyptian Government approaches this problem in a practical way without any desire to create a crisis atmosphere, trying not to give assurances perhaps but trying to enable the international community to feel assured that the freedom of passage, the equitability of the tolls that are levied, the condition of the canal, facilities for redressing any grievances such as they may have, and that a general assurance that it is going to be run as a good public international service will be forthcoming. It would be entirely inappropriate for another Government to state before-hand what some one outside is likely to do because after all our anticipations may prove either fully or slightly inaccurate, but this is our present estimate of the situation.

And I for one hope that that estimate would not be far wrong.

The greater part of the debate centered round the question of Kashmir. As I said in another place yesterday, both Kashmir and Goa are really internal questions. But they come up in our foreign affairs debates because in one case the country is occupied by a foreign power, namely Portugal. Part of India is occupied by a foreign power. In the other, part of India is not only occupied by an external authority—a Commonwealth State—we do not call Pakistan a foreign power, but an external authority—but also this problem was referred to the United Nations in our desire to pursue methods of conciliation, irrespective of our moral, legal and political rights in this place.

The criticism in regard to the Kashmir matter has been this. First of all, we should not have agreed to a cease fire, and if we agreed to a cease fire, why within our own country? Secondly, why should it take so long to present the case about Kashmir in the Security Council? The Ministry of External Affairs thought it was necessary, before I returned from New York, to circulate the reports of the proceedings of the Security Council. Sir, in view of what has been said, it is quite obvious that as in the case of Hungary, some of these statements have not been read. It is, I think, impractical to expect that Members of Parliament who have a very busy life, and who are burdened with papers every morning, could read everything that comes to them. But I think the best way to find out whether the statements were too long or too short, is for Members to read them and try to cut something out, and if that exercise is successful, then there would be no criticism. In any case, about the length of the speech, it is not for India so much as for other people to feel, and considering that the Security Council was prepared to listen to the statements of India, for nearly sixteen or seventeen hours—I

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

forget how long—and in the end the position was not where it started. It was necessary. Here again, the observations made are based upon erroneous information. The decision reached by the Security Council today is not a decision that is hostile to India. I do not say it is friendly to India. It is not, even then, hostile to India, because the first Resolution that was passed was a reiteration of the former Resolutions, based upon an erroneous estimate of what the Constituent Assembly was. A similar Resolution was passed five years ago, when Sir B. N. Rau was our representative on the Council, and I made practically the same statement that he did and left it there. The final Resolution that was passed by the Security Council was the Resolution sending its then President to India, to talk to the Governments of India and Pakistan and for going into the question with them. Well, I should have thought that it was rather an anti-climax for the Pakistan proposal that was mooted before. As they say, it went up like a rocket and came down like a stick. But I am told that the Indian delegate got trapped by Sir Feroze Khan Noon. I think this is the first time Sir Feroze Khan Noon has been paid a compliment on this debate, and it is strange that it should come from our Parliament. It is necessary in a debate of this character, that however trivial the attack on the country may be, it has got to be replied to, for the purpose of the record. If it is not replied to, then the other statement remains there and this thing will go and a few years hence it will be quoted that the Indian representative did not refute it. That is not so in Parliament, but it is so in the proceedings of the Security Council particularly, and we have, in fact, suffered by letting things go in a normal civilized fashion and not entering a caveat, if anything was said with which we did not agree. This is not correct. For example, Sir Feroze Khan Noon set out in print that we had twelve times refused to accept methods of conciliation or offers made to us and so on.

But all the twelve times he was wrong about it. Does the House say that to save time, your representative should have said, "Well, that does not matter, though what he says is not true: that it will not convince anybody." So far as the Kashmir issue itself is concerned, this is necessary, in view of the many observations made. It is true that the British representative did say something about the claims of the tribesmen and various others, in order to buttress the idea of a plebiscite.

The Government was asked, why it is that the representative of India in the Security Council did not say that we were not going back on the plebiscite, that the plebiscite was not the issue, that invasion was? Again, if you read the record, it will be seen that we did say that the issue was that of invasion, that we were dealing with the question of Kashmir in the same way that we dealt with Egypt, that the invader must withdraw. We said that we maintain that Kashmir is a constituent part of this Union and the invasion of Kashmir was invasion of India. In fact, we said it because though it was formerly the State of Kashmir, the invasion that took place was the invasion of India. And what is more, under instructions from the Government of India, I stated categorically before the Security Council that any further violation, any fresh violation of any part of Kashmir would be violation of the territory of the Union and would be so regarded.

With regard to other matters again, the Government very deliberately stated that they will not go back on any international commitments or engagements. We accepted the Resolution of 17th January, 1948 and two other Resolutions which were originally confirmed by the Commission and on which the whole of this discussion has centered during the last several years. These are the Resolutions to which the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government, agreed. This is covered by various other matters which it is not necessary this afternoon to go into,

as it would not be possible for a country like ourselves to repudiate those undertakings or those engagements. But as I have said, we have also stated that those engagements must be taken as they stand, in their context, in their content and purposes, and not as other people would interpret them. For example, the plebiscite is part of these engagements. But it comes in sequence, after a number of things. And we have said we are quite prepared to consider, for the purpose of convenience and in good faith, in order that we may be ready for a plebiscite, how various things could be done about a plebiscite, when the other things were being done. But the fact that we were prepared to discuss these items and go into them did not mean that we were walking into a plebiscite. And according to the Prime Minister's letter and the *aide memoire* which were confirmed by the Commission, it is definitely stated that unless parts I and II of this Resolution are implemented, part III cannot be operated. We have not said anything more or anything less. We have not said that the plebiscite has lapsed. We have not said, "Take a plebiscite under any circumstances." We have asked for the consideration of the initial complaint of India. We went there, saying that the country was invaded by the aid and assistance given to the tribal invaders by Pakistan over Pakistan territory. That was an act of aggression and the only way we could meet this aggression, was by invasion of Pakistan. The only way we could meet it militarily, was by invasion of Pakistan and that we wanted to avoid. Therefore, we asked the Security Council, under the relevant provision of the Charter, to ask the Pakistanis to withdraw, to cease giving this aid and to stop this aggression of our country. In the years that followed we asked for various things from the Security Council which are all embodied in these Resolutions.

For the past eight or nine years we have tried to resolve the situation. We did not go there for a dispute about the territory because so far as we are

concerned, we had no dispute about this territory. It had acceded to India even as Mysore acceded to India and, therefore, it is part of the Union but some one came there through their support and it developed into a state of war and we preferred to try and deal with them by conciliatory methods. Therefore, we agreed to the consideration of this pattern of settlement and for eight or nine years we tried to get some resolution of the situation in this way. But during that period not only has there not been any implementation of the first and the second parts of the resolution, which we all know, but there has been, on the contrary, the annexation of half of the country, I do not say legally, according to Pakistan law, that is to say, the integration, the Anschluss of this area with that territory, the training and the establishment of enormous military forces which we think run to about 45 battalions of Azad Armies of the same level as the Pakistan Army, equipped with artillery and everything else, and the establishment of Pakistan administrative authority coupled with all the campaigns of war and hatred against India. These are all not only violations of the agreement—if they were merely violations of the agreement, they would not have sounded as bad as they are now—but they are conditions which made any further progress in this matter very difficult. It is not possible to negotiate when someone is declaring a war. But we have been able to maintain the position that irrespective of all these difficulties—and this does not apply to Kashmir only; in any problem in which we are involved, however right our position may be—we would never refuse to listen to counsels of conciliation. That, Government believes, is the sentiment of this country and the background in which we have reared ourselves and our constitution has been built. That is the position in regard to Kashmir.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJEE
(Nominated): May I ask a question? To whom was the promise of a plebiscite made?

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: We made no promise of a plebiscite. If you want, I will give you the whole history of it. The first reference to the wishes of the people appears in a letter written by the Governor-General of India, on behalf of the Government—and it should be made very clear that it is not a private letter. It was a letter which we were entitled in this system of our Dominion Status at that time to write in the negotiations with the Princes. After Kashmir was invaded, the Kashmir Maharaja wrote to the Governor-General at that time and said that 'in view of the geographical position of my country, I did not make up my mind whether it was in the interests of Kashmir and India and Pakistan that we should side with one side or the other or remain independent'. Therefore, I asked for a Standstill Agreement but when all this was going on, raiders from the other side came and my country is now invaded, my people are molested, raped, plundered and all that. In those circumstances, he asked the Government of India to come to the aid of his people in order to repel the invaders and he said that knowing that India had a policy which would not permit her to send her forces outside, he acceded to India. There is nothing in that letter to show that the accession was under duress. Not only was there a letter but along with that letter was the usual form of accession which is in our Constitution. That was sent in and the Governor-General accepted it, that is accession, but in writing to the Maharaja the Governor-General said, "I have accepted your accession but in accordance with our policy—not in accordance with any law—it is the wish of the Government of India that when the invader has been cleared from the soil and law and order has been restored, we will take steps to consult the wishes of the people in order to settle this accession" or something of that character. It was for the first time that this was referred to and that is why there was the Constituent Assembly and everything else. This was referred to the Security Council. There was a full-scale war and so much of slaughter going on and

the main concern of the Security Council and certainly of ourselves was that there should be a cease fire. Pakistan was not willing for a cease fire and finally, after a great deal of negotiation and with the intervention of the Commission appointed by the United Nations and discussion with the Government of India—it was mainly conducted by the Prime Minister at that time—this resolution of the 13th August, 1948, was formulated and we accepted that resolution. Pakistan did not accept it at that time. It is there that the question of plebiscite—it is not a plebiscite but an engagement in connection with these areas—to which Prof. Radha Kumud Mookerji referred comes. Now, the resolution consists of three parts. The first part says that a cease fire shall be established in that area. It says that the authorities may not accumulate any more military material. We have not done that but they have. It also enjoins the parties not to do anything that would aggravate the situation and all that. That is the first part. The second part is what is called a truce. Now, this part consists of two or three clauses which are purely about action which Pakistan must perform unilaterally, that is, she must withdraw altogether. We have to do nothing at all here. When Pakistan has withdrawn, when this has been performed under the supervision of the Commission, we have to withdraw certain of our troops consistent with the safety and security of the territory. This second part also says that we have the responsibility for coming to the assistance of the local authorities in the occupied areas, fully stating thereby that Pakistan had no functions there at all, that she has no *locus standi* in that place. Local authority is merely the local officials. If there is a tribal invasion again, then it is necessary that somebody should go and help them and law and order and external defence became the responsibility of the Government of India. I think on the 20th August of that year, the Prime Minister, in writing to the Commission—I think it was some seven days after that—pointed

out that we have the responsibility of protecting the north-west hilly areas, of stationing garrisons there in order to protect the trade routes that go through them, etc. Therefore, it is not as though it was a country that was in dispute, we and they having the same rights and so on. This is the second part. Then comes the third part. Here it says—and it is interesting to read this resolution because it is full of ‘when’, ‘if’, ‘wherefore’ and all that—that when the first and the second parts have been accomplished—these are not the exact words of the resolution—then the two Governments agree to confer about the fair means of ascertaining the wishes of the people. That is all it says. On the 5th January, another resolution was passed which was supplementary to this and this provided the pattern by which the third part could be implemented. Now, fortunately or unfortunately, all the discussion that went on between us afterwards has been concentrated on the 5th January resolution as to how the plebiscite administrator should be appointed, how many troops are to be withdrawn, this, that and the other. It may well be that we have proved accommodating—a mistake on our part, of generosity, but we did not think so. To make it clear, at all times in every letter that had been sent and in the summaries and in the various reports submitted to Dr. Graham, we had said that our position with regard to this is, the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir Government, right under the Constitution of the Government to defend the whole territory, that Pakistan has no *locus standi* in the matter, that the plebiscite administrator is to be appointed by us and so on. This is where the plebiscite comes in. Now, of course, the newspapers are full of the word “plebiscite” in all these discussions to find out how many enumerators would be required, the work to be done by them, the number of troops to be withdrawn and so on and so on.

The fact that so much has been said about the plebiscite does not alter the international character of our commit-

ment, that is to say, the Resolution of January 5 is merely an elaboration of the third part of the previous Resolution, and the third part of the previous Resolution is, so to say, to be triggered in only in regard to the operation of the other two parts. If the other two are not performed, this cannot be performed.

PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of clarification, may I know why the then Government of India suggested a different procedure with regard to Kashmir's accession, different from the one with regard to other Indian States.

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON: I do not think there is anything very unusual about it. Under the arrangements at that time each State could make its own arrangements except with regard to three subjects. That was the position. It so happened that the other States found it convenient to merge in the Indian Union quickly and they thought that it was too expensive and cumbersome to be otherwise, and this Kashmir did a little later. Also we had to take the objective facts into account and we had to go to the aid of Kashmir. There was an invading army there on that territory and we had to combat that invasion in order to avoid bloodshed and sacrifice of human lives, of Pakistanis as well as ours, and what was more than all this, there was rapine and plunder in the area. There is no other difference in the ambit of the Constitution and Kashmir is part of India in the same way as any part of former British India is or any of the older Indian States is. That is the position with regard to Kashmir.

Now, there is one final matter I want to say and that is this. The hon. Member from Andhra referred to some statement that he thought that the Prime Minister had made in regard to Goa. Now it is necessary for Government to put this thing in its proper context in order to avoid international complications and to see that it is in line with its general policy. So far as my note says, it was said that the

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

Prime Minister had now agreed to take some further steps to integrate Goa. Now this phrase 'integrate Goa' has never been used by us at any time, and, what is more, this is what the Prime Minister said today: "The other day I said in the other House that we feel that this whole policy of Goa, not the broad policy, but rather the narrow interpretation of this broad policy, should be given careful consideration, and I further said that in this matter we would like to consult with Members of Parliament, not only of one party but all parties. I do not wish people to go away with the idea that we have evolved some big weapon to be wielded by us in the near future. That would be a wrong notion. All I said was that this matter was a national issue, of course, and is an irritating issue and it is a human issue." Then he refers to the people who are imprisoned there, and at the end of it he says this: "Nevertheless, as I said, this is a matter requiring careful consideration and, as far as possible, consultation with others, so that we may have the advantage of other people's advice and opinion. We propose to proceed on these lines. What exactly we shall do and how far it would produce any kind of results I cannot say at this stage."

Now finally, Sir, reference has been made to the strength or the soundness of this policy and the policies that we pursue, and this policy is not a sort of labelled article. It differs somewhat day to day, in the context of the events of the time. It is not merely the friendly relations which we make with other countries. There is a considerable amount of economic ties that are growing up, not only in the shape of trade but in the shape of technical co-operation, both ways, and in the form of regional understandings for entry into the various United Nations organizations for economic development, but our real strength lies in the fact that, whether it be at the United Nations or anywhere else, when there is an expression of the views of India on any international matter, the whole world knows that behind it lies

the solid opinion of the millions of people of our country, and this is not an attempt to wind up the speech, but that is the real fact. Otherwise there are many people who make far better speeches than we make. But behind the policies of our Government lie not only—I say this in all modesty—a degree of objectivity and a desire not to exploit either our position or other people's position, but equally the whole world knows, whether it be west, east or north, Latin America or Africa, that behind it lies an enlightened democracy, an intelligent people who understand the foreign policies of this country. It may appear that we are too near to understand the situation, but there are not many countries in the world where they can discuss the foreign policies, and therefore behind every utterance, behind every demand, behind every caveat, behind every insistence lies the united voice of this country, and the very strains of discord that naturally must be expressed in a Parliament are but proofs of that great unity.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, some reference was made to the Commonwealth question. Now we are aware of what the Prime Minister had said in the other House, but we would like to know from the Prime Minister, since he is present, whether he would be agreeable to discuss this question with the Members of the Opposition as to what course he should take with regard to the Commonwealth since he thinks that the matter deserves some kind of a review. That is just what I would like to know from the Prime Minister.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I think I dealt with this matter here in this House only a few days ago. What I have said here and elsewhere is that this is a matter which deserves consideration, in the sense that nothing is an absolutely closed chapter, which cannot be reconsidered, but having given it consideration here and now in this context we feel, the Government feels, that it is right and advantageous for us not to break the Commonwealth

connection and we propose therefore to maintain that association.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am putting the amendment to the House first. The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House fully agrees with and approves the said policy.'"

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the Motion as amended. 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 fully agrees with and approves the said policy."

motion was adopted.

EXTENSION OF THE SESSION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the hon. Members that there will be a sitting of the Rajya Sabha on Friday, March 29, 1957, for the transaction of Government Business. The House will meet as usual at 11 A.M.

There is a Message from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1957

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 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1957, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 27th March, 1957.

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

I lay the Bill on the Table.

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

The House then adjourned at fifty-eight minutes past four of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 28th March 1957.