

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION No. 38(1)  
TB/54 DATED THE 27TH AUGUST 1954.

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): Mr. Chairman, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following Notifications, under sub-section (2) of section 4A of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934:—

- (i) Ministry of Commerce and Industry Notification S.R.O. No. 2454, dated the 24th July 1954, enhancing the export duty on rice;

[Placed in Library. See No. S-260/54.]

- (ii) Ministry of Commerce and Industry Notification S.R.O. No. 2520, dated the 29th July 1954, levying an export duty on groundnut oil.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-261/54.]

I also lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers under sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951:—

- (i) Report (1954) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Hurricane Lantern Industry;
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 38(1)TB/54 dated the 27th August 1954.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-269/54 for items (i) and (ii).]

**REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) BILL, 1954.**

THE MINISTER FOR LAW AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI C. C. BISWAS): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to provide for the payment of compensation and rehabilitation grants to displaced persons and for matters connected therewith.

**MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION**

MR. CHAIRMAN: We resume the discussion. I would like hon. Members to be as brief as possible.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, with the restriction of time on one's speech, it is very difficult to do any justice to this very important subject. Nevertheless, before I come to the subject I must refer to the foreign policy as evolved and laid down by the Prime Minister. His foreign policy gives a new standard to the countries of the world. It shows a new method and a new tempo of how tensions could be relaxed and how differences could be resolved. His faithful interpreter of that policy, Mr. Krishna Menon, has succeeded in keeping up the Indian ideal. This was proved by the Prime Minister of China's visit to India. The culmination was seen in the friendly hand-shake of a thousand years between the two greatest countries of the East, between the two countries that have shown to the world that the Asian problems can be decided and settled by Asians.

Before I pass on to my pet subject Goa, I must mention you, for you plead the cause of humanity wherever you make public utterances. In the ten minutes at my disposal, I now come to my pet subject, Goa. So much has been said here about the Goans and Goa. I claim—at least I feel I can claim—a right to speak about the Goans, because I have been associated with the Goans for over two decades now. I know their way of thought; I know their culture; I know their way of life. I have been with them and away from them. I have seen their way of thinking change from decade to decade and from year to year. The Prime Minister has referred to the Goans in Bombay, but I shall begin my story from what I saw on the Portuguese border on the Independence Day this year. On the 15th August a number of us, legislators, were at the Portuguese border

at Majali, which is seven miles away from Karwar. With us were the Bombay legislature representatives—M.L.As. and M.L.Cs.—and the Lok Sabha Member from Karwar in whose constituency the village Majali falls. Village Majali touches off the Goa border. It is a small fishing village which we had observed and seen and worked in during the general election campaign. We had seen the women bringing fish and flowers from Goa. They looked as fresh as flowers themselves. They carried away rice and potatoes from our borders. But on that day, on the 15th August, what did we see? As we reached Majali, we saw the foreign correspondents who had crossed the border, whose vehicles were lying on the Portuguese side of the territory, and who had come there to meet us and greet us. I asked one of them, "How do you send your despatches?" He said, "We shall be sending our despatches from Panjim to Lisbon; and from Lisbon they will be released to the world." Nineteen young men got ready with the flag of India to march into this territory. Over three thousand people had collected; women wept as farewells were taken. I have never understood the definition of "Goan" yet, for a section of the Goans claim to be the descendants of Kashmiris. But for the present purpose Goans are Goans. Only yesterday I learnt that they are Goans who have registered themselves in the Portuguese register. But, nevertheless, Goans are one with us. They are flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. Today a demarcation is made and only Goans can enter Goa as *satyagrahis*. That day more than three thousand people were there. While women wept, men got ready to cross the barrier. But no less a person than the Prime Minister had said that it should be a movement by the Goans for the liberation of Goa. We sympathise with them. We were eyewitnesses of the show. It was a small beginning. There were two armed guards on the other side of the barrier. The foreign correspondents jumped in first. There was one Indian Assistant. We thought he would be challenged, but he was not challenged. He got

into the territory with the others. When our nineteen young men entered the territory, one of the armed guards challenged them and asked: "*thumche kaden passport na: thumka yeva chak jayna.*" This means, you have no passport; you have no order to get in. And then these guards themselves got in a small car, while we saw our boys shouting slogans. We stood on and heard their voices until the voices faded away. Our flag disappeared in the distance out of sight. That is, in short, what we saw at Majali border, between the 'no man's land' and the Portuguese border. The barbed wire and locks were put and we stood on this side. We sent nineteen young men that day. We do not know what is their fate. So little is known. Plenty of Indian journalists were there, but they were not allowed to cross. I do not know why this blanket ban on pressmen. We have no news except from what we hear from people that go and come. I am speaking about the lay public in India. We have to depend on the foreign correspondents. Our men were not allowed to go in. We do not know what is the fate of those nineteen young men whom I saw—whether they were imprisoned; whether they were assaulted; or tortured. Whether they were treated on *laddoos* and *jalebis*; whether they were treated fairly and squarely; or whether they were belaboured. We have still to know.

The time is so short that I do not know exactly how to compress my points. When speaking on Goa, one has to remember that one has to go back four hundred years when the Portuguese started their rule in Goa. I have a book brought here from the library of the Director of the Indian Archaeology titled "The Rise of Portuguese Power in India" by Whiteway. This book is an answer to Portuguese propaganda. We may speak of the Portuguese culture. We have no quarrel with our own brethren from Goa today when they talk of their culture and their religion, but it was built on scars and skulls.

[Shrimati Violet Alva.]

I shall be very brief, but I must read a few passages from this book. They are as follows:

"These doctrines (the church), which have destroyed whole tribes and nations and have affected the lives and happiness of millions, have been used to justify the most insatiable cupidity and the most atrocious barbarities.....terrorizing policy of Vasco da Gama. Da Gama tortured helpless fishermen, Almedia tore out the eyes of a Nair, Albuquerque cut off the noses of the women and the hands of the men."

\* \* \* \* \*

This spirit roused the fierce denunciations as seen in a letter of St. Francis Xavier.

\* \* \* \* \*

"And again, writing to a brother Jesuit in Europe, on January 22nd, 1545: Do not allow any of your friends to be sent to India with the charge of looking after the finances and affairs of the King. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and let their names be not written among the just....."

Robbery is so public and common that it hurts no-one's character and is hardly counted a fault."

On such practices was the Portuguese Empire built up.

(Interruption.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is an accessible document.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: It was published in 1899.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wind up, Mrs. Alva.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Yes, Sir. I have hardly begun, Sir. St. Francis Xavier, in disgust, left Goa for Cochin and did not come back to Goa. His

remains were brought back. Further it is stated as follows:

"No Christian could have infidel servants in his house, be cured by an infidel doctor or be shaved by an infidel barber. Neither Hindu nor Muhamedans could have any public worship, purchase anything appertaining to their religion—whether books or other articles—and all their priests were banished, even a twice-born Hindu required by his caste custom to wear the sacred cord was forbidden to do so."

I quote these things at length and I spend so many of my minutes just because we are getting these hand-outs marked "with compliments from the Legation of Portugal." Our propaganda has to meet that propaganda

The Prime Minister referred to an umbrella yesterday. Why do the Bombay Goans ask for an assurance for their culture and for Catholicism? Have not they all flourished in this country? We have lived in this country with goodwill and in partnership with our neighbours. It is not so in England today. Recently when the Queen of England gave a benefaction to rebuild a war bombed Roman Catholic Cathedral there was a howl from the Scottish Church. In the United States no Roman Catholic has yet come to the Presidency. It is so in the other civilised Christian countries where Roman Catholics cannot aspire to certain positions by written or unwritten law. In India, I am sure, any Roman Catholic, if he deserves, and if he lives with honesty, can aspire even to the Rashtrapati Bhavan or any other place. This I am saying because so much is being talked of creed and culture. Creed and culture, during our own days of struggle.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mrs. Alva. You have taken more.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: We have gladly associated with the Goans.

We asked them to join us. I must remind the House that Goa has been a very famous and patriotic place in India. Twenty-nine revolts were waged there, the last one in 1913. And those who revolted, were carried away into the far-off countries from where they never returned. During our freedom fight they could not work with us. We had pleaded with our brethren that they join us. They said the time was not opportune for one reason or the other, and they kept out. But today, we are not happy and pleased to note that they demand such assurances for their culture and for their creed when they want to join India. We have Mahatma Gandhi's words before us. He said "I do not want my doors to be shut, nor my windows to be stuffed. I want cultures of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible, but I refuse to be blown off my feet by any." What further assurances!

Just a few points more. I am going in a very disjointed way now. The *satyagraha* has taken place. But, we also must bear in mind that we stand by the Prime Minister in whatever decision he takes. The movement however must not become a stalemate. I refer to the case of Dr. Gaitonde about whom questions were asked in the other House. He is in Lisbon today. He was given three months' imprisonment or fine. He paid the fine. But for five years he cannot leave Lisbon and for twelve years he cannot enjoy citizenship rights in the Portuguese territories. These, then, are the sufferings of the patriotic Goans. They want to join us. But how are we going to help them? We just cannot leave them alone. Mere sympathy is not enough when we see the sufferings of people like these. We do feel that some ways and some means have got to be found out not only by the Goans but even by us as to how they are going to subsist, how they are going to be maintained in their hour of struggle. How are we going to give them relief? Unless Goa comes into India, our independence is not complete. With the foreign pockets on the East and the West, how can

we say that our independence is complete? Our ideal was "India for Indians". India is not for Indians until Pondicherry and Goa also join us. There will come a day when this argument can be set aside that Goans only can enter Goa. There will come a day when the nation will have to say "Well we shall all have to go and we shall have to be ready for their cause." They will shoot down a few, but Goa will come ultimately under the Indian Flag. In 1946 when Sir Stafford Cripps had a press conference here in Delhi at the time of the British Cabinet Mission, a question was put to him as to what would be the attitude of the British Government to the foreign pockets in India. He had then replied that it would be for the Government of India to decide. I do not know what the nine wise men who waited on the External Affairs Ministry are engaged in, nine diplomats out of whom one was the U.K. representative and the other is no less than the representative of the Vatican. About whom are they concerned? About Portugal? About India? Or about an amicable settlement?

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): With the general assessment, Sir, of the international situation which the Prime Minister presented to us yesterday, we are broadly in agreement. The Geneva decisions do mark a notable advance. The shooting war for once has been brought to an end. But, I believe, the Prime Minister will also agree with us that the underlying world situation has not changed. For, the U.S.A. still sees in the encirclement, and containment, if not attrition, of the Communist countries the only chance of survival while the Communist bloc is busy in isolating the U.S.A. and undermining, what is called the free world. Unless some of the serious problems which threaten world peace are resolved, all that we can hope for today is a precarious avoidance of general war problems, such as the entry of China into the U.N., the problems, of East and West Germany, the problems which are nearer to us, of

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

colonialism and racialism, and the problem of the economic condition of backward countries.

On racialism and colonialism the Government policy is well-known. The abhorrence of colonialism is also well-known, although the expression given to this sentiment is not always very forthright as in the case of Malaya and Kenya. Yesterday, Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar was trying to make out a difference between different kinds of colonialism, between Portuguese and the others. But I fail to see any difference between colonialism perpetrated by any imperialist country, whether it is Great Britain, France or Portugal. I do not know if the conditions in Kenya or the atrocities committed there would be in any way different from the atrocities which were committed by the Portuguese on their colonial people.

On economic conditions in backward countries, it is necessary that we should pay some more attention, because that, I believe, is a very serious source of imbalance in the world situation.

It is unfortunate that politicians are apt to overlook or not to pay so much attention to economic conditions. In this matter we have so far concerned ourselves primarily with schemes which have been sponsored by the Western countries, like Point Four, the Colombo Plan, the Ford Foundation Scheme and so on. It is time that the Asian countries also get together to devise ways and means as to how their conditions can be improved. I believe, that the Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu, made certain proposals before the Colombo powers for economic co-operation between those countries. Those proposals probably stood referred to the countries concerned. I should like to know from the Prime Minister as to what progress has been made with regard to those proposals, because I feel that economic co-operation in these matters will also help to bring about solidarity amongst the coun-

tries of Asia and maintain and expand the area of peace.

I should then like to draw your attention to certain talks and speculations about proposals for doing one thing or the other in the South East Asian region, for example, for maintaining peace, for isolating America or for containing communism. There was first the proposal sponsored by America—the proposal for the South-East Asia Treaty Organisation. We all know where we stand with regard to this proposal. We agree with the Prime Minister that we should not have entered into that organisation not for the reason only that Shri Ramaswami Mudaliar gave yesterday, and to which the Prime Minister also referred, that it would be morally not justified for us in view of the fact that we have now undertaken certain responsibilities in Indo-China to enter into such an agreement, but because to enter into this agreement would have been contrary to the policy that we have so long been pursuing. Then there has been the proposal for the formation of an Asian Bloc. You may have noticed that Chinese Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai, made a proposal at Geneva that “the countries of Asia should consult among themselves with a view to seeking common measures to safeguard peace and security in Asia by assuming obligations mutually and respectively.” I should like to know from the Prime Minister if any discussions were held with him when the Chinese Prime Minister was here in this country. This proposal does not refer to the five principles only which were enumerated in the joint communique issued by the Prime Ministers of India and China. The reference here is to assumption of obligations mutually and respectively. I should like to know from the Prime Minister if any discussions have been held on this subject and with what results. Thirdly, there is supposed to be an Indian alternative proposal. I am not referring to the question which was asked by Dr. Kunzru yesterday about the statement made by the

Ceylon Prime Minister to which our Prime Minister has already replied, but there was a report in some of the Indian newspapers about an Indian alternative proposal. I do not know if our Prime Minister, allergic as he is to reading many newspapers, has noticed that report. The gist of the report was that there was to be a South-East Asia Mutual Assistance Pact in which by a series of bilateral talks, Britain, China, Indonesia and the Colombo powers would pledge themselves to go to the help of any of the others which might be the victim of aggression. This is, in the nature of, I believe, a locarno Pact, and this proposal was supposed to have been put forward by our Chinese Ambassador for the consideration of Mr. Attlee. That was the report which appeared in the newspapers. Now, I ask whether there is any truth in this report. I think there is not, but in this proposal there is one important implication, one serious implication, which I should like to put before you, because it would mean not only a serious impairment but I believe the very abandonment of the policy that we have been hitherto pursuing, because it is not a non-aggression pact but will mean a mutual assistance pact. That would imply that, whenever any of the participating countries would be the victim of aggression, the others would have to go to the help of that country. An aggression can only be from either of the two blocs today in this world. Therefore, we will become immediately involved in a war with or against one of the power blocs. I do not know if our Government is considering any proposal of that nature, but if it is, I should like to know what are the reasons behind such a proposal and what are the advantages that the Government feel that they would derive from pursuing such a scheme.

Before I come to Goa, there are two questions, I should like to ask of the Prime Minister. One is in regard to the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Indo-China States, particularly with Laos and Cambo-

dia. Have any decisions been taken in this matter? Burma, I believe, and also Indonesia, have already moved in the matter. The second is about the Prime Minister's observation that the Indo-China settlement means a gradual growth of the area of peace in the South-East Asia. I agree, provided, however, we take sufficient care to maintain and consolidate that area. I should like to know what steps are being taken in that direction. We had the Colombo Conference which yielded very good results. We do not know if the powers concerned are meeting again or from time to time, because I believe that unless we hold periodical conferences, it may not be possible to maintain the area of peace that we all seek to establish.

Now, I come to Goa, and it is a question on which we all feel very strongly. I have tried to understand the Government of India's point of view, but I fail to appreciate the logic which prevented the Government of India from allowing peaceful *satyagrahis* from entering Goa. We heard Shri Ramaswami's condemnation of *satyagraha* as such. I can see that he is consistent in his views. His opinion has not changed from what it was when he was a Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. But what would interest one to know is whether the opinion of the Prime Minister has also changed and whether he shares now the opinion which Shri Ramaswami had expressed yesterday. There are many reasons, as far as I can see, why the Government should not have interfered with the object of the Indian *satyagrahis* who wanted to participate in the Goan struggle. In the first place, they do not violate any of the principles which the Prime Minister had himself enunciated in the statement made in the other House. He stated there that the Government would be actuated in its policy towards Goa by principles of non-violence which means:

"(i) that we may not abandon or permit any derogation of our identification with the cause of our compatriots under Portuguese rule; and

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

(ii) equally we may not adopt, advocate or deliberately bring about situations of violence."

I do not think that the *satyagrahis* would violate any of those principles. They do not intend to deliberately bring about a situation of violence. If any situation of violence develops, it will be because of what the other party would be doing. In the second place, if Goa is a part and parcel of India, it is our right and our duty to participate in their liberation movement on peaceful and non-violent lines. The *satyagrahis* have asked for no protection and no assistance from the Government of India. They were prepared to suffer all the tribulations that awaited them on the other side of Goa.

Therefore, I see no reason why the Government should have prevented them from entering Goa. Thirdly, the action of the Government makes a distinction, as my friend Mr. Sundarayya pointed out yesterday. It makes and underlines a distinction between Goans and Indians which the Portuguese Government are anxious to emphasise. I believe that the Government of India is also of opinion that Goa is a part and parcel of India and if so, there should be no reason why Indians should be prevented from participating in a peaceful manner in the Goan struggle. In the fourth place, there is another important matter. While we say that Goa is a part and parcel of India, the Portuguese Government maintain that it is a part of metropolitan Portugal and not merely a colony of Portugal. Now, that is a very serious proposition which I believe we cannot accept and the prevention of the non-Goan *satyagrahis* from participating in the liberation movement might lend colour to the distinction which the Portuguese Government are seeking to make. In the fifth place, about 20,000 to 25,000 Goans have come away from Goa to India on account of these troubles, so we cannot consider ourselves immune from happenings in Goa even though the Government may take action in

preventing Indians from going over to Goa. And lastly, what the Indian *satyagrahis* wanted to do does not, I believe, violate any international usage. As everybody knows, volunteers from all over the world joined the International Brigade to fight in the Spanish Civil War. May I bring to your notice a Resolution which was passed by the Faizpur Session of the Congress in the drafting of which I dare say our Prime Minister had also a hand. It stated that:

"The Congress on behalf of the people of India send greetings to the Spanish people and the assurance of the solidarity with them in this great struggle for liberation."

Spain was a land across the seven seas. Goa is a part and parcel of India and, as the Prime Minister has said, it is a part of our mother land. Should we not, therefore, be permitted to demonstrate our solidarity with our brethren in Goa in a peaceful and non-violent manner in the struggle for freedom from imperial domination? Of course, I don't accept the suggestion which my friend Mr. Sundarayya made that we should march our troops into Goa in the immediate or in the proximate future.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): Then there is no other way.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There are other ways to which I have been referring.

AN HON. MEMBER: The most effective way.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: The Government should take these facts into serious consideration and I believe it is just and proper that they should not stand in the way of the Indian *satyagrahis* participating in the liberation movement of Goans. I will end by saying that only yesterday we received a telegram from Mr. Peter Alvares, the leader of the Goan Nationalist Movement. He said that the Prime Minister's statement on Goa in this House was extremely disappointing. I am

sure that that statement fills with dismay the nationalists in Goa and can only bring joy and satisfaction to the Government of Portugal.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay): Sir, when the debate started I had no idea of taking part in it. I am neither a student of foreign affairs nor of diplomacy but what provoked me to speak was when I heard many speeches from partisans, non-partisans and eye-witnesses and especially, the speech of Dr. Ambedkar whom I respect very much. When he says something, one has to listen carefully. Dr. Ambedkar is a good lawyer. He advanced many arguments like a partisan lawyer which were fallacious in many respects. So, I shall confine my remarks to some of the points made by him because the time is very short and one cannot say everything that one wishes to say in that time. He started attacking the three principles of the Prime Minister. According to him the three principles are, peace, co-existence and opposition to SEATO. He also said that Russia had become a giant. He ridiculed co-existence, he talked about the geographical factors and asked us, "Peace—at what price?" Finally he asked us to align with U.S.A. and either purchase Goa or take it on lease. These are some of the arguments with which I am going to deal.

First of all he attacked the principle of peace and he said that the Allies had created a giant in Russia who would consume all. Well, for the sake of argument, let us assume that it is so, but he himself said that the giant was created by the Allies and none else. I am quoting him. He said that at the end of World War II they had themselves given to Russia the guardianship of 10 countries and parts of 3 countries had also been given. Now they feel that the giant has become too big. They want to fight it, fight for their own lives of course and they want us to help them in that fight, but let me ask the learn-

ed Doctor, whether the free world itself is strong. Are they not suspicious of each other? Are they not undermining each other's strength, strength of their own allies? Are they not becoming selfish in many respects? Their selfishness is so very apparent. Are they not doing things behind the back of each other? Are they not, each one, putting their self-interest first rather than the interests of all of them and do they not support colonialism? They speak of the free world but what kind of free world, when they support colonialism? These are some of the questions which arise in our minds when we are asked to align with the free world. Of course, personally, I like the free world better, because there is ground for suspicion in our minds about the communist countries, and because first of all we can go to these free countries and see for ourselves, talk to the people by ourselves and find out the facts for ourselves whereas it is not possible to do so in the communist countries. Of course, we can be taken in a guided tour there but that is a different matter altogether. And so by contacts and by education, our instinct is towards the free world. Of that, there is no doubt. But from some of the things that these countries do, we find that their behaviour is not very friendly towards us. Take for instance the British attitude to Portugal and their asking us not to fight. Their sympathy seems to be with the Portuguese people and not with us. Is it in fairness that they do this? I do not think so. Though they call themselves free and profess sympathy for freedom, they still support colonialism in different parts of the world and that, of course, is because each one of them has a skeleton in the cupboard, each one of them has a colony or more which they want to protect and keep and that is why they want to support each other in this way. And that is also the reason why there is ground for one to feel that they do not wish us well. We trusted our allies, but what happened in Kashmir? In Hyderabad too, we know how the British Commander who was here



[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

then, till the last did not want the police action to take place and till the last moment he asked Sardar Patel not to enter the territory of Hyderabad. Well, under these circumstances we are trying to keep our heads above the water. And I must say that we are trying to do our best in this direction. We are but a new country, that is we have only recently regained our freedom after a few hundred years and we are trying to evolve ourselves. In our own country people fight in the name of different ideologies and over other small things instead of putting their shoulders to the wheel to build up the nation. How are we going to make our country strong unless we all work together and work for a common cause? After all nobody is going to protect us even if we were to align with one side or the other. Nothing is going to protect us except our own strength. We have to protect ourselves and that is the principle that we should follow.

Then the learned Doctor said that we should align ourselves with America. Personally I like the Americans very much. They are large-hearted and generous and in many ways they are a very likeable people. But I think they are their own enemies. They always boast of their superiority, their superiority in arms, their superiority in this and that and the other, and this puts up people against them. They declare from the house-tops that they are superior in all things, that they have achieved this or that. Besides that, they depend on the machine rather than on man and they seem to believe that by giving money they can win men's hearts. In this they are sadly mistaken.

After all, it is not a question of which side is better and which side is the worse of the two or which side we should go. Shall we side with the Communists? No, because there is no freedom of thought or action, they do not believe in human dignity. They do not believe in freedom. We have no free access here to know how things are, except

what we are shown. So, unless we ourselves can judge for ourselves, it is no use our lining up with them. Then are we to align with the free countries? Well, can they protect us in time of emergency? What happened in Korea? What happened in Indo-China? So by aligning with them are we going to be stronger? I don't think so. So, as I said before, ultimately we have to protect ourselves and for that we should be properly prepared.

9 A.M.

Dr. Ambedkar ridiculed the idea of co-existence and he compared it to a forest fire and also said that that was going to burn up the whole world. Well, how do we control a forest fire? We do it by clearing the land around the fire and by isolating the fire. That is what they do in the hills as I have seen. In the same way, the Prime Minister is trying to isolate this problem and he is trying to prevent the fire of war from spreading. Of course, I do agree with him that there is a geographical factor in deciding our policy one way or the other and that exactly is the reason why we are deciding our policy in the way we are doing. If it was the foolishness of the Allies to start with the policy of appeasement and make the giant grow, that was their own fault. And moreover, they can hardly succeed so long as they have jealousy towards each other, so long as they are selfish. Even now fissures are seen. See how they try to make a scapegoat of a country and go against their own friend when they want to win their own points. England has a different point. France has a different one, Italy has a different one, America has a different one. And so when we see what they are doing and saying, we find that they are not speaking with one voice. That being so, how can they win our confidence?

The learned doctor then asked us, "You want peace, but peace at what price?" Can anyone ask the other question, "War, but war at what price?" Can anyone even imagine the

price that the world will have to pay in case there is a third world war? New countries are now emerging and they are trying to build themselves up and if this forest fire—to use his words—were to start, if it is not stopped, then all of them are sure to be consumed and it is sure to consume the whole world.

The last argument of his that I would like to deal with is that we should either purchase Goa or take it on lease. Well, the whole House laughed at it and that I think was a fitting answer. I need not say anything more on that.

Just one word more and I have done. Politics is like a game of chess and today's enemy may be tomorrow's friend and *vice versa*. Our outlook is to remain free and democratic and under the circumstances, I believe the policy pursued by the Prime Minister is the best policy for India.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Mr. Chairman, I shall preface my speech by declaring that I have been more or less in agreement with the general line of foreign policy that has been followed by our country ever since we have become free and that foreign policy has been consistent with the foreign policy that was being evolved by the Indian National Congress for the previous 20 to 25 years. It is indeed a matter for congratulation for us as Indians that we have the fortune of having today as our Prime Minister and also as our Foreign Minister a gentleman who was the author, the principal author, of the foreign policy of the Indian National Congress. We have been striving to help and sympathise with all the struggles of all colonial peoples all over the world during the past 30 years and it was in the fitness of things that when we became free, we should expect our Government and our Prime Minister to do their best to help this struggle of these colonial peoples in different parts of the world.

When, for instance, the African people began to rise against their imperialist shackles and imperialist masters from country to country, we wanted the Government to give them every possible assistance. One of the very first things that we did was to make it known to the world that the Indian settlers in those various African countries would not be expected to demand any special rights which could not be enjoyed by the nationals of those countries and we wanted those Indian settlers to consider themselves only as the nationals of those countries.

The second contribution we made was to invite an ever increasing number of their young men to our own Universities and give them every possible facility on this side, to help them to gain the know-how to the extent that India is capable of giving to them. In this way, we have shown or rather set an example to other free countries of the world as to how they should deal with these struggles of the colonial people in different parts of the world. If America, England and other so-called free countries of the world had only cared to watch this experiment that India was making, to support it and to strengthen it and also, by their example and precept, helped these colonial people to become free, things would certainly have been very much different from what they are today.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): But that would be asking tigers to be vegetarians.

PROF. G. RANGA: In Indo-China, when Dr. Ho Chi-Minh and others started the struggle, France came to a provisional agreement with them. Then this great leader went over to Paris, waited there on the convenience of the French leaders and the French cabinet for months. He was given only the cold shoulder and the result is what has happened today. Who is to be thanked for this? The French have to thank themselves for

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

this, so have the Americans and the British who were trying to help and to sympathise with the French rather than with those people who were struggling for freedom.

Next, came the struggle in Malaya. We were expected not to be impatient because the British told us quietly, diplomatically, that they were also interested in conferring self-government upon the people of Malaya. Later on, they trotted out difficulty after difficulty and the result is that today Malaya is as far away from self-government as she had been before the War.

Then there is the third example of Kenya. My hon. friend Mr. Ghose has already referred to that. Our hearts go out to all those people of the Kikuyu Tribe and their noble leader Kenyatta who is now in the British jail. How do the British people expect us to react to this kind of a policy of suppression that they have been carrying on? They cannot very well say that they form part and parcel of the democratic parts of the world and also one of the great leaders of the democratic world at the same time asking us to keep mum, be patient, when this kind of repressive policy is being carried on by them.

It was because of all these things and of our awareness of their imperialistic reactions that from the very beginning, ever since we became free—although we were willing to be associated with the Commonwealth—we were not prepared to align ourselves with the Anglo-American Bloc known as the free world. On the other hand, there was the Soviet Bloc also. For obvious reasons, because we believe in Parliamentary democracy, because we believe in free speech and other civil liberties and as our way of living is different from theirs, we did not wish to align with them either. Therefore, we wanted to remain not neutral but independent. Our Prime Minister had rightly resented this word, 'neutrality'. We

wanted to evolve a policy of our own. Why do we want to follow this independent policy? It is true that we want to follow this policy in the interests of the world but it is even more true to say that we want to pursue this policy because we want to keep India's interest foremost before ourselves. Is it not necessary that we should have peace whether it is for a long period or for a short period? Is it not necessary that we should have peace in order that we may be able to build ourselves? Everyone knows that we are backward. We need a tremendous lot of development; we have got to make great strides in order to become half as well advanced as the Western countries, industrially and economically. But then how can we do it unless we have peace? How can we have peace if, over this huge Himalayan range, over a distance of two thousand miles, we do not take steps to see that we have a peaceful neighbour, a neighbour who would be interested in maintaining peace on his side and in not disturbing our peace, a neighbour who will give his word of honour, to the extent that in international affairs these words of honour may count for anything at all, that he would not disturb our peace in our own country so that we would not have to turn to our back at every moment when we think of the Himalayan borders. It was because of that, so many of us hailed the emergence of that joint statement issued by these two Prime Ministers. Those five principles are nothing new; they were incorporated in the Indo-Tibetan Treaty; there also they were not mentioned for the first time. When the brother-in-law of our own Prime Minister—Mr. Huthee Singh—interviewed Mr. Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung in China four years ago, these very same principles were enunciated by the Chinese statesmen. But that is no reason why we should not accept them if we find ourselves in agreement with them. Co-existence is supposed to be a bug-bear by some of our friends. Was not co-existence a bug-bear during the last war and yet

did not U.K. and U.S.A. find it necessary to have co-existence with Soviet Russia then? If it was not a sin then how does it become a sin merely because India finds it necessary to establish this co-existence relationship with her nearest neighbour and the most powerful neighbour in Asia?

It is from this view-point, that we have begun to re-think about our own foreign affairs in the recent past. I wish to congratulate our Government in having played the noble part that they did in the recent Geneva Conference over Indo-China. Somebody said that Indo-China was being split up. Historical facts deny that fact; Indo-China has never been one nation or one country. It has had several rulers and several States. It is a combination of a number of countries, two, three or four. We have not been a party to the creation of a split where there was no split, a division where there was no division. It was also hinted that we might have contributed also to the division of Korea. Korea came to be divided by the U.N. decision, not by us. We only went in there to help, first through our Red Cross and later on through our own Peace Mission. Therefore, we are not, in any way, contributing to the division of the world or to the division of any of those countries. Surely we want peace for our country but not at any cost. It was because of that that we have taken the initiative in regard to peace, not America, not England. We offered peace even to our own neighbour Pakistan. And who have been egging Pakistan not to give the proper response when we said that between Pakistan and India there should not be any war at all, that we should settle all our disputes only by peaceful means and not by War? Who else excepting these people who call themselves free nations, who today pride themselves as the champions of the free world? Who has created this gap in the whole of the South East Asian countries? What is it that America thought that she was going to gain or that she was going to gain for the whole of the world by coming

into that military alliance with Pakistan in spite of the repeated and loud protests from our Prime Minister as well as from the whole of our country? Was it a contribution towards world peace? I would call it the other way. It was a contribution for the beginning of the disturbance of world peace if ever there could have been any world peace at all. They were very glad when we supported them in declaring through the U.N. that North Korea was the aggressor but they did not have the decency to realise who was the aggressor in Kashmir. Kashmir continues to be the burning spot between these two countries. It is all very well to say that all the Asiatics should be united among themselves when it has not been possible for all the Europeans to be united among themselves. I do not think there is going to be any chance of all the Asiatics being united so long as the Americans and the British people and their statesmen try to prop up one country against another in Asian politics. That is what exactly has happened as a result of this military pact between U. S. A. and Pakistan. We are offering once again our good offices in regard to this SEATO also, that they should not have SEATO first of all. That is one thing. My hon. friend Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar had eloquently stated yesterday how indecent it was for any group of countries to have rushed into this kind of scheme no sooner that peace treaty was signed in Geneva. And yet they call themselves the greatest possible diplomats and the most experienced diplomats. If diplomacy is of this type, then, it is best that our Prime Minister does not consider himself to be that kind of a diplomat. Two reasons have been given for our non-participation in the forthcoming SEATO conference. One is the question of impartiality that we should maintain regarding Indo-China dispute, and, therefore, we should not go to SEATO. The other is the one that was given by my hon. friend Mr. B. C. Ghose only this Morning. That

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

is, our unwillingness to get into mutual defence pact. The third one is this. Not so long ago all those people of Australia, New Zealand, U.S.A. and U.K. used to espay a peril as 'yellow peril'. They did not want Australia and New Zealand ever to be open to the colonization of and at the mercy of these yellow hordes of people who are on the continent of Asia. Today they no longer call it 'yellow peril'; they call it 'communist peril', but nevertheless these two great sub-continent or continents are to be kept there as preserves of white peoples for adding to the misery of the world. Is it wrong on our part to think or to fear that the SEATO might have that ulterior motive too behind it? Would it be possible for peoples of the world to establish and maintain eternal peace as long as these inequalities persist, inequalities between races, between populations, between the pressure of populations in different countries, between different countries and different communities? And as long as these inequalities are not put an end to, it is not possible to have eternal peace. That is no reason why we should not go on fighting for peace and for the freedom of the subjugated people even while these inequalities are being removed. I am one with our Prime Minister in his fight for freedom and for peace. However much we want this peace, if a third world war were to come upon us, even if we were to remain unattached, uninvolved, it is going to be a miserable life for us as we can judge from our bitter experience of it even during the last two wars. We have to become self-sufficient in as many industries as possible, in as many departments of our own economic life as possible before the third world war breaks out, if ever it should come. It is quite possible—my hon. friend the Prime Minister may be ambitious—that he himself and his colleagues in the world arena would be able to prevent this world war ever coming at all. He may excuse some of us if we are not so very hopeful

but nevertheless, even if that third world war were to come, we should, before it comes, have built ourselves so well in our own country that it would be possible for us not only to remain uninvolved but also not to be too much affected by the fangs and fumes of that third war.

Lastly, coming to the question of Goa, I am in favour of the policy that my hon. friend the Prime Minister is pursuing not because in every detail it is necessary for me to agree. Indeed my view is like this. In regard to foreign policy there must be a national policy. There must be a sense of national unity. That does not mean that we should not have different views. I myself claim the privilege of having different views and also airing them, but when it comes to action we should not do anything, according to me, which would embarrass the policy which the Prime Minister would be following. I am not saying it only today. There was an occasion, not so long ago, when I associated myself with some of my friends in giving the lead to the people to organize what is known as the Tibet Day. But the moment I came to know that the Prime Minister was embarrassed about it, I hastened to dissociate myself openly. I gave the reasons also. "I do not wish to embarrass the Prime Minister and therefore I am withdrawing from this Day's celebrations", I said. Now that is a policy for anyone to follow even today. It is quite possible for my hon. friends to go on arguing that peaceful Indians should be allowed to go into Goa with all its humours. We can all go into Goa but you will not find even sufficient space in it; we may have to come back. That is a different matter of course. We are not in possession of all the facts that are there. One of the facts that was given by my friend, Mr. Sundarayya was that as soon as the British note came, the Indian Government's attitude changed. That may be a fact, I am not going to find fault with him. It is the duty of the Prime Minister to set matters right if there is anything

wrong. If we are to live in a co-operative manner in the world, if we are to do so, consistent with our own national interests we may react in a favourable manner to any note that may be coming from any of our own friendly nations or other nations with whom we are for the time being at least on the best terms. At the same time I would like to express this wish that because we are free and because of that we happen to be a member of the United Nations and therefore, so many obligations have been cast upon us, we should not allow the other nations and especially these colonial nations to turn this into such a disqualification, such a disability on our part that we would not be able at the right moment to go to the rescue of our own Goan friends to help them in their own freedom struggle. I would like my hon. friend the Prime Minister to agree to this. I am sure that he would be keeping this view in his mind. I am confident that he must be as anxious as any one of us to see that the Goanese people should become free at the earliest possible moment. But there is need for patience. There is a time factor also. A reference was made to Hyderabad. So many of us were very impatient at that time. We all expressed our impatience. In Parliament day after day we used to get impatient with Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru for the delay in taking action there. Yet we had to wait. But did we wait in vain? Six years have passed; Hyderabad is a part of Mother India today. Similarly, if and when the Prime Minister feels confident that Goa must be made a part and parcel of India and should become a part and parcel of Mother India he will take the necessary action and I do not see any reason why we should rush into this field now. It will mean that we are dismissing the Government's view and the Government's leadership. If we do so we shall be rushing into troubled waters.

SHRI S. N. MAHTHA (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, I should wish to preface

my remarks by saying that perhaps the international jurist and the political historian may well remind us that India was already an international person even before the end of British rule. This contention may perhaps find support from the fact that India became a Member of the League of Nations, that India attended the Peace Conference at Paris, that India was invited in her own right to the San Francisco Conference and that India became one of the original Founder-Members of the United Nations. But the undeniable fact remains that India had no independent voice of her own. She was at the most a vassal or a client of the British Government. The most remarkable fact of history, therefore, is the exceptional speed with which India has attained her present international position. It is almost phenomenal. Bigger countries, say a country like the U.S.S.R. until about ten or twelve years after the Bolshevik Revolution, was a *pariah* in the international field. A country like the U.S.A., which I believe attained its independence some time about the end of the eighteenth century, had to remain within closed doors for about forty years before she could enter the international arena. A country like Japan, which was independent for a long time, received no international notice until after her victories over Russia.

As compared with these tardy precedents, the achievement of India has been remarkable indeed. I should admit that in this achievement the accident of time and history has played a great part. But for the most part I should think the balanced political thinking, the uprightness and the personal high stature of the Prime Minister have played the utmost part. (Applause).

I am inclined to quote a few sentences from the English version of an article that recently appeared in a French paper. The name of the French paper is "*Le Monde*". The author of the article is M. Tiber

[Shri S. N. Mahtha.]  
Mende, a Frenchman of Hungarian origin. He wrote as follows:—

"The Republic of India is one of the most curious phenomena of modern history. It is by itself a sub-continent; its population is more than double that of the United States, and is increasing every ten years at the rate of the population of France. But the real military strength of the country is not perhaps much greater than that of Sweden, which has only slightly over six million inhabitants. Moreover, its rigid social pyramid and the income of the people—which at an average is 15,000 francs a year—make this people a facile prey to the extremist agitator. Nonetheless, the views of its Prime Minister carry as much weight as those of a leader of the Great Powers, and India's role in world affairs is unique."

I would not like to exercise on this point to say how this role has been achieved by India.

But, I would like to say that Indian foreign policy has three facets or it works on three planes. The first and the foremost facet, or the highest plane, on which it works is the universal plane, where India stands up as the exponent of world peace, as the proponent of world peace. On this plane India has received the widest, and I should say, almost universal approbation.

The second facet, or the second plane, of our foreign policy is the Asiatic plane, on which India stands forward as the exponent of Asian policy, that is to say that the Asian countries must have a predominating voice in the settlement of affairs that concern Asia more prominently. On this plane, India has not received the same amount of approbation, but, I should think, has received a considerable amount of consideration at the

hands of countries like the U.K., although not countries like the U.S.A.

Then, on the third plane, which I should call the third facet, which is the national facet, India tries to further and protect the interests of India within the shores of India or outside the shores of India. This is a plane on which India has few supporters. The situation in South Africa, the colour bar in South Africa, and the situation in Goa are instances in point. Whatever may happen due to the strength of the Goans or the moral claim of India is another matter, but the fact remains that few countries have come forward to support India on this plane. I would not like to touch upon Goa very much, because the question has been discussed since yesterday. But I would like to say that the Government must exercise the uttermost firmness and the uttermost restraint in the matter; and here I should like to dismiss outright the two suggestions made by Dr. Ambedkar, namely, that we take Goa on lease or we purchase Goa, for the very simple reason that the proposals are very derogatory. Human populations cannot be leased out or sold out.

I would like to mention that in 1946 we read in newspapers and got the news on the wireless that a certain planet, or comet, named "Balila's Comet" split itself into two parts. The two principal reasons attributed by scientists to this development were that the component parts of the comet had very poor adhesive qualities and the second reason was the action and counteraction of gravitational pulls from divergent directions. We notice that something of a similar nature has been happening in the international field also. The fact as we see is that today there are two Germanys instead of one; there are two Koreas instead of one; and some people feel that there are two Indo-Chinas as well. When this sub-continent itself was divided in 1947 into two countries,—India and Pakistan—it was still pos-

sible for these two countries to formulate and pursue a common military policy and a common foreign policy. But, on account of the granting of military aid by U.S.A. and the acceptance of military aid by Pakistan, the division has been completed. Pakistan is no longer an independent agent and we cannot sit down face to face to formulate a common policy. I feel sure that the lesson that we have to draw from the splitting up into two parts of this comet known as Balia's comet is that the various contesting or conflicting factions in this country must coalesce, must show better adhesive qualities and must unitedly act on the military and foreign front. There can be no two policies in one country so far as the military policy or the foreign policy is concerned. It is a strange world. The old policy was to 'Divide and rule'; the new policy seems to be to 'Divide and Leave'. Let not internecine antagonism drive any Indian party into the trap of foreign designers.

I would like to end with the note that it is not through diplomatic channels alone that international greatness is attained. In order to rest our international edifice, which we have built up, we must have solid foundations to place that edifice on. These foundations are economic and social. You will forgive me if I remind this House that India gained no small amount of international recognition through the works of persons like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, or Tagore, or yourself, and I believe that if India has to be great, she must make herself intrinsically great, and intrinsic greatness comes from economic and social qualities.

Sir, I should not take up any more time.

**SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa):** Mr. Chairman, it is my misfortune that I could not join the chorus of praise for the foreign policy of our Prime Minister. The foreign policy statement, which we had heard yesterday, should be more noted for its omissions than

commissions. It took us away to the Conference lobby of Geneva; it took us to Korea, the land of mourning peace; it took us to the rice fields of Indo-China. But about Kashmir, about Indo-Pakistan relations, about Indo-Ceylonese relations, about Indians in South Africa he maintained a sphinx-like silence. The time at my disposal is very short and I cannot possibly go into the various facets of our foreign policy.

Now, broadly speaking, the foreign policy that we have pursued has been aimed at solving the outstanding foreign problems of other nations, while we have left our own outstanding problems in cold storage for posterity to solve. I will cite some concrete illustrations. In the beginning we were with the so-called free democracies of the West. That is how Uncle Sam came to the Far East where he is now deeply entrenched. We are turning over to others now. We are fraternising with China and helping her in solving the problems of her foreign policy. I welcome it. Now, what are the basic problems of China's foreign policy? It is nothing new. It has remained the same since the days of Sun Yat Sen. There were three outstanding problems. One was recovery of Chinese suzerainty on Tibet, the second was elimination of foreign influence from Korea and Indo-China, and thirdly, integration of Formosa with the mainland. We have gone all our way in solving the outstanding problems of the People's Government of China, while our own problems have remained untouched. A lot of things have been said about Tibet. We have congratulated ourselves over the agreement that we have reached with China over Tibet. What is after all our achievement in Tibet? You know, it is a matter of history that during the British regime in India Tibet was maintained as a closed area for diplomatic as well as commercial purposes of the British Government. In 1904, the Dalai Lama of Tibet had something to do with the Czar of Russia which scared



[Shri S. Mahanty.]  
the British. And thereafter came the in-famous Sir Charles Younghusband's expedition which brought in murder, rape and loot in that peaceful Lama land of Tibet. Since then Tibet formed a sort of a Protectorate of the British Government against which the Chinese Government recorded a protest. In 1910 again there was trouble in Tibet which came in the wake of Chinese invasion of Eastern Tibet. The thirteenth Dalai Lama fled Lhasa and lived very much as a guest in Kalimpong or Darjeeling. After the Chinese invaders were expelled from Tibet, Tibet continued as a Protectorate of India as much as Sikkim is today. But we were never told anything about what happened in Tibet. One fine morning, we were asked to put our democratic *dhobi* mark over an agreement which was reached with China in relation to Tibet, in which we completely surrendered our interests to China in Tibet.

Again, we have gone to partition Korea, maybe, in the interest of peace. We are going today to partition Indo-China also in the interest of peace. I welcome it. I have got no quarrel with that. But my only contention is that we have solved the outstanding problems of other countries without solving our own. We went to the Colombo Conference. There we said that colonialism should go. It was a real menace in Asia. We talked about Tunisia; we talked about Morocco, but we never talked about Goa, about the French possessions.

Now, coming to Goa, if you permit me, Sir, I will present my reaction to this House in a figurative manner. If I were to place it in a rough and ready manner, it would be too rude a shock. If any of those ancient travellers like Herodotus, Strabo, Fahien or Hiuen Tsang were to visit India in 1954, and attend this foreign affairs debate on Goa, well, they would leave behind a very interesting record for posterity to be

amused with. They would have said "We visited India's capital, New Delhi, where people drank more cocktail than water. They were a queer people. They were violent at home and non-violent abroad. We found their Home Minister sitting with the Public Safety Act in one hand and the Press (Amendment) Act in the other, with a lethal weapon ready for action. But we found their Foreign Minister sitting with a rosary of prayer-beads like a *Bodhisatva* of the Buddhist pantheon." That in a nut shell correctly portrays our vacillating policy towards Goa. It has resulted in a diplomatic jargon. The Prime Minister has said in his statement to the other House.

"This adherence to non-violence means—

(i) that we may not abandon or permit any derogation of our identification with the cause of our compatriots under Portuguese rule; and

(ii) equally we may not adopt, advocate or deliberately bring about situations of violence."

With all respect, if I may say so, it means nothing. We admit, that liberation of India cannot be complete so long as the foreign flags fly on the Indian soil. In 1947 we claimed it. In 1948 we demanded it. And in 1950 again, we repeated the demand. But we were charged with youthful impertinence. And the time has come when we can retort back saying it is non-descript senility. If you cannot meet the problem, you leave it to the resurgent people of India and of Goa. You are not going to solve it by simply exchange of these notes.

Now, I have got another point to make and that is about these international observers who are going to be invited to observe situations in and around Goa. I have no objection if observers are invited to observe conditions inside Goa. Well,

Goa is not so far a territory of India. It is not a part of sovereign India's territory as delimited in the Indian Constitution. But, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister, as to how he has agreed to the appointment of observers—foreign observers—to come to the Indian soil and observe conditions which are taking place inside Goa? At least in the fitness of things he should have taken this Parliament into confidence, otherwise thereby he is going to subtract the sovereignty of India, as it is understood by us. Therefore, I venture to think, that the policy that we have followed in the case of Goa is as vacillating as we pursued in the case of Kashmir. Now, the examples of French possessions are there. The Government of India did not go there. They did not get themselves involved in French possessions. There is no good denying the fact that the resurgent people of both, French possessions and of India, fought the battle; they won it to a very great extent. And we were very happy to learn yesterday that we were coming to a very satisfactory conclusion. Therefore, I am led to believe—and I do admit—that there may be some international complications if the Government openly goes and gets itself involved there. The only solution that I can offer is to leave the way open for the free Indian people to fight their own battles in Goa and thereby get a solution of it.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Chairman, if I requested you to sanction me a few minutes to speak on this question, it was to reply to Dr. Ambedkar. I shall confine my remarks to what he said. Although Mrs. Munshi has very ably taken care of him, I think he deserves a little more discussion, because whereas the other critics have differed on details as to what we should do in Goa or as to what we should have done in Indo-China, etc., Dr. Ambedkar questioned the very basis, the very validity of the principles on which the foreign policy of

our Government is based, and I was rather surprised to see that Dr. Ambedkar was suffering from the same kind of phobia as the celebrated crusader of democracy, Dr. Syngman Rhee. Dr. Ambedkar thinks that the only menace today is communism, and that unless that giant is slain and laid down, there will be no peace and that we will be bartering our souls. I need not go into history nor am I here an apologist of aggression by anyone, whether it comes from America, Britain or the Soviet Union, but I think that in order to have a proper perspective of the dilemma in which the Soviet Union finds itself, one must keep one or two things in mind, how Russia was surrounded and encircled by her allies and how she was once again betrayed by them. I think that whatever Russia did was legitimate in the sense that her fears were well-founded. Whatever its policy may have been in the past, I feel—I have only recently returned from an unofficial tour and I give this testimony of not only myself but also that of my other six colleagues for whatever it is worth—that there is an overwhelming desire on the part of the Soviet people for peace. It may not spring from any great principle but let us say that it springs from expediency. The Soviet people everywhere are busy in the very gigantic task of construction and reconstruction all over the country and I think that the one thing that they do not desire is war with anyone. That testimony of the people who have been there may be of little consequence to Dr. Ambedkar, but nevertheless it is the testimony of all the people who have gone there, not only the Indians who have been there but of others also. There have been 71 delegations from 22 countries during one year. I have read the reports of those people and certainly not all of them were biased in favour of the Soviet Union—they came from different parties and from different parts of the world—and it is the unanimous testimony of all those people that the Soviet people and the

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

Soviet Government today want peace more than anything else.

The second thing that Dr. Ambedkar made out was that co-existence was not only not possible but, by implication, that it was not even desirable. That certainly is one of the most astounding propositions that I have ever heard from any responsible representative. What are you going to do if you are not going to live side by side with people of different ideas and different ideologies? What is the alternative? And what precisely is Dr. Ambedkar's suggestion? We know from history that in the past republics, democracies and monarchies of the worst type have managed to live together side by side. There have been clashes but not exactly because their ideologies were different. There were other factors. Today, the two systems or three or whatever you may choose to designate them or call them, have to live side by side. Let ideas jostle with each other and let them be tested in the free market of ideas. If communism has any basic validity, I am sure that neither Dr. Ambedkar nor anybody else can stop it. The only way to stop it, if you want to stop it, is to have something better than communism. I would therefore say that co-existence is not only possible but indeed eminently desirable today.

Referring to SEATO, Dr. Ambedkar also insinuated that the Prime Minister was suffering from some kind of hostility towards America. I personally feel that it is an unwarranted accusation and rather an irresponsible one. I do not believe that our Prime Minister or for that matter any responsible person who formulates policies does anything simply because he has developed some kind of ill-will towards a country. I have been in America for a number of years, and I am fully aware of the overwhelming goodwill on the part of Americans towards India, and we have the same good-

will towards them. I personally think that the policy that our Government is pursuing is in the best interests of the Americans themselves. They may not realise it today, but there are a few people, fortunately some liberals, who feel that the Prime Minister of India is the best friend of the Americans themselves, and I fully share that view and as time goes on, his present policy will be fully vindicated.

Finally, a word about Goa. I think that the policy that is being pursued is the only policy. We will be only playing into the hands of our critics by changing it to any other policy, either to force or deliberately encouraging people to go to Goa. I share the view as a matter of principle that we should have encouraged them to go to Goa, because Goa is only part of India, but when I was in England and also in France where I was for about two weeks, I saw that some of the people there were actually hoping that India would get involved in some sort of situation over Goa. The British Press unfortunately, as was said yesterday, has been very provocative and with some few exceptions, the whole Press there has launched a most vicious and sustained campaign against India and against our Prime Minister. There are many reasons but I need not go into them here. I found later on in Paris also that some of the Americans were very jubilant that India was being at last cornered over Goa. "We will see what India does over Goa." I feel that this systematic campaign is deliberately designed to provoke India, and I would, therefore, urge that all those people who feel very strongly, and there are good reasons for feeling very strongly, should have patience and realise the implications and reactions of what they say in other countries. The Government are in a better position to judge the situation than we are. We read only newspaper reports. We get excited no doubt, and our sympathies go out to those people, but I think we

should fully support the Government of India in its present policy towards Goa. But what may happen ultimately, no one knows. Things shift and change very rapidly, but I believe that the Government of India is pursuing a policy which is the only policy in the circumstances. Thank you.

SHRI A. S. KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my whole-hearted support to the statement made by our Prime Minister yesterday. I found some of the speeches made yesterday from the Opposition very amusing and amazing, amusing in this sense, that I noticed that the statement made by the Prime Minister was subjected to a cross-firing. Both sides were trying to advocate a policy of deviation from the middle course that we have adopted. One side was trying to say that we should go a little bit towards the right and the other side was trying to say that we should deviate towards the left. I wonder why it is that some friends seek to admire the policy of every other country but their own. Amazing I found it in this sense that now when it has been proved manifestly that our policy has been a success, how is it that there are some people even now in our country who doubt the soundness of our policy? One can understand when a plant is just planted that perhaps the soil will not suit it, perhaps the climatic conditions will be unfavourable but when it has grown into a tree, when it is full of blossoms and flowers and when we see the fruits, how can anybody now doubt that the policy that was followed for the last 7 years was not quite correct. We remember that only a few years ago India had no position whatsoever in the international world but today we have to play a very responsible part after the war in Korea. Does it not show that we are commanding the respect of the nations and the confidence of the nations? Then again in the affairs of Indo-China at Geneva our representative and a dis-

tinguished Member of this House, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, played a very important part as a personal representative of our Prime Minister and under his wise guidance His efforts brought fruit and brought peace to Indo-China and I am sure that this policy of ours has been respected and admired by all the other nations. Therefore now, when the results are so obvious, how can anybody doubt that the policy that was followed during these years was not sound? Now, coming to the question of Goa, I will only say that geographical facts cannot be undone by mere talks: Goa is a part of India; it has always been a part of India and I am really surprised why a modern nation like Portugal is unable to read the writing on the wall and see the signs of the times. When big powers like the British had to leave such a big country as India, why are they trying to stick to this little territory of Goa? There also I absolutely agree with the policy that is being followed by our Government. Some people thought it was weak-kneed policy. To them I will say that this weak-kneed policy of ours this weak-kneed policy of the Congress has proved that it is not a weak-kneed policy, it is a very sound policy. It is through this non-violence that we could get freedom of our country and now when we have all along pleaded that we are for non-violence, I think that if we take any other course as far as Goa is concerned, the nations of the world will say that we are not sincere in our professions, that we are non-violent when we are faced with a strong power but when there is a weak enemy or opponent, then we change our principle. Therefore, this great principle—it is not a policy of ours but it is our principle—that we should remain non-violent should be followed and I am sure that perhaps after the successful conclusion of our talks with France, Portugal will be able to see a way to settle their own question also. Whatever be the result I am sure in my mind that the policy of non-violence and peace is the best policy. I don't wish to take any more time of the House.

10 A. M.

**डॉ० रघुवीर (मध्य प्रदेश) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, दिन प्रति दिन इस सदन में अंग्रेजी का साम्राज्य चलता हुआ देख कर हृदय में क्षोभ होता है। हिन्दी भाषी सदस्य भी हिन्दी में बोलने की अपेक्षा अंग्रेज़ों ही बोलना पसन्द करते हैं। विदेश संवाददाताओं के मुखों की ओर कल देख कर मुझे क्षोभ हुआ, उनमें दो चार से बात करने से पता लगा कि अभी तक वे लोग भारतवर्ष को संस्कृति और भाषा की दृष्टि से अंग्रेज़ों की कालोनी मानते हैं। इस ओर हमारा ध्यान अवश्य जाना चाहिये।

आज का विषय वैदेशिक नीति है। हमारा वैदेशिक नीति अभी अभी समाप्त हुये स्वतंत्रता युद्ध का ही एक नया स्वरूप है। स्वतंत्र भारत अपने ही सदृश पड़ोसी परतंत्र देशों को भी विदेशी आततायी शक्तियों के कराल मुख से बाहर निकालना चाहता है। हम और हमारे सदृश अन्य देश विदेशी शक्तियों के किस प्रकार अधीन बने, संसार में किस प्रकार से परतंत्रता का जाल चारों ओर बिछाया गया, इसकी एक लम्बी कहानी है। यह कहानी साढ़े चार सौ वर्ष पुराने कहानी है। बढ़ता हुआ उच्छृंखल यूरोप छोटे से भूमध्य सागर में न समा सका और उससे बाहर निकलने लगा और संसार के समुद्रों में विचरने लगा। सोने की चाह ने, चांदी की मांग ने, काली मिर्च और लौंग का लालसा ने, पुराने लैटिन और ग्रीक साहित्य में भारत देश के वर्णन ने, इस लब्धप्रतिष्ठ भारत देश की चाह ने, कि इस देश को हम प्राप्त करें, वहां के नागरिकों और वहां के राजाओं को विचलित

कर दिया। वीर, धीर और पराक्रमी नाविक पूर्व और दक्षिण दिशा में चलने लगे। सन् १४९२ में कोलम्बस ने अमेरिका के तट पर पहुंच कर एक नये विशाल देश का आविष्कार किया और उसने उसको भारत समझा। किन्तु उसके छः वर्ष पश्चात् ही वास्कोदागामा वास्तविक भारतवर्ष में पहुंच गया, भारतवर्ष से होते हुये मलाया, मलाया से होते हुये इंडोनेशिया, इंडोनेशिया से फिलीपाइन पहुंचा। फिलीपाइन में स्पेन के लोग अमेरिका की ओर से पहुंचे। इस प्रकार १५वीं शताब्दी के अन्त में गोर जातियों की यह यात्रा आरम्भ हुई। ग्रह एक प्रकार से संसार के आविष्कार का यात्रा थी, किन्तु दूसरी प्रकार से यह एक विचित्र भूमिका थी और देशों को दासता में जकड़ने की संसार के इतिहास में पहली बार नावों और जहाजों में तोपें लादी गयीं। वास्कोदागामा जिस समय भारतवर्ष में आया था तो उसके जहाज पर जहां एक ओर ईसाई धर्म का क्रान्त था तो दूसरी ओर उस पर तोपें थीं। यद्यपि बारूद का आविष्कार चीन में किया गया था, किन्तु बारूद का बृद्धि, उसका उन्नति, तोपों और बन्दूकों का विकास यूरोप ने किया। यूरोप तोपें लेकर संसार में फैला। तीन सौ वर्ष तक यूरोप की तोपें संसार में घूमती रहीं। उत्तर अमेरिका और दक्षिणी अमेरिका को उन्होंने आत्मसात् किया, वहां के जनतंत्र का विध्वंस किया। आस्ट्रेलिया, न्यूजीलैंड और आस पास के देशों के शासन और वहां की जातियों को बन्दूकों से उड़ाया गया यह जातियां अधिकांश में साक्षर जातियां नहीं थीं, पढ़ना लिखना नहीं

जानती थीं, साहित्य और दर्शन शास्त्र इनके पास नहीं था। इसलिये बड़ी सरलता से यूरोप की गोर जातियों ने उत्तर अमेरिका, दक्षिणी अमेरिका, सहारा से नीचे अफ्रीका, आस्ट्रेलिया, न्यूजीलैंड तथा इन देशों के आस पास के सैकड़ों छोटे मोटे द्वीपों को आत्मसात् किया। इन देशों की स्वतंत्रता छीनी, इन देशों की जातियों से उनकी भूमि छीनी, उनका धर्म छीना, उनकी भाषा छीनी, उनके व्यक्तित्व की समाप्ति की और जो लोग थोड़े बहुत बच गये उनको दासता की श्रृंखला में बांधा। आज यह स्थिति है कि उत्तरी अमेरिका दक्षिणी अमेरिका, आस्ट्रेलिया व न्यूजीलैंड गोर जातियों के प्रदेश बन गए हैं और वहां से सदा के लिए वहां की जातियों की समाप्ति हो गई है। अब रहा अफ्रीका। अफ्रीका में भी उन्होंने अपनी प्रभुता जमाई, किन्तु अब यह स्पष्ट है कि वहां की जातियां वहां उठने लगी हैं। जिनसे कभी ऐसी आशा नहीं थी कि वे आत्मगौरव के सिद्धान्त से अनुप्राणित, होंगी वे जातियां भी आत्मगौरव अनुभव करने लगी हैं।

अब हम दूसरी ओर से देखते हैं कि भारतवर्ष, चीन, बर्मा इंडो-चायना, मलाया, इंडोनेशिया, ये सभी जातियां ऐसी थीं कि उनके पास अक्षर-ज्ञान था, उनके पास साहित्य था, उनके पास बड़े बड़े राज्य थे, ढाई सौ वर्षों तक यद्यपि पुर्तगाली जमे बैठे रहे, किन्तु उनको यह साहस न पड़ा कि वे अपने राज्य की स्थापना कर सकें। सामान्य रूप से पहले सौ वर्षों तक यूरोपियनों के साथ उनका व्यापार रहा। सत्रहवीं शताब्दी के पश्चात् यूरोपियन लोगों

ने एशिया का राजर्नति में पदार्पण किया। उन्नीसवीं शताब्दी में जाकर उन्होंने तोपों के बल पर चीन और भारत के व्यापारियों को भूमि-बंद कर दिया। हमारा घरों से बाहर निकलना बंद हो गया, हमारी व्यापार-नौकाएं, चीन की व्यापार नौकाएं जो समुद्र में चलती थीं, वे यूरोपियन तोपों के सामने बंद हो गईं। इंडोनेशिया से हमारा सम्बन्ध टूटा। सम्बन्ध टूटते गए और यूरोपियन व्यापार बढ़ता गया। साथ ही साथ यूरोप में विज्ञान की उन्नति होती रही। एशिया पीछे रह गया, यूरोप विज्ञान के सहारे बहुत आगे बढ़ता गया यहां तक कि उन्नीसवीं शताब्दी में यूरोपियनों का संसार में पूर्ण रूप से साम्राज्य जम गया और कोई शक्ति उनका सामना न कर सकी। फिर भी उन्नीसवीं शताब्दी के मध्य में भारत और चीन में क्रांति का आरम्भ हुआ। यह क्रांति आरम्भ तो हुई किन्तु उन्नीसवीं शताब्दी में बहुत सफलता प्राप्त नहीं कर सकी। यूरोपीय गोर जातियां जो उस समय तक शक्ति में थीं, वे इंग्लैंड, फ्रांस, होलैंड, स्पेन और पुर्तगाल थीं। इनके अतिरिक्त उन्नीसवीं शताब्दी के मध्य में जिन गोर नई जातियों का संसार में समावेश हुआ, वे जातियां थीं उत्तरी अमेरिका में, संयुक्त राज्य (यू० एस० ए०) और यूरोप में रूस। उन्नीसवीं शताब्दी के मध्य में यू० एस० ए० ने प्रशान्त महासागर पैसिफिक ओशन में पदार्पण किया और उसके तीन चार वर्ष पश्चात् रूस ने भी पैसिफिक ओशन पर अपना अधिकार जमाया। १८४८ के लगभग जनरल इमावीव ने व्लाडिवोस्टोक की स्थापना की और उसके आसपास के सामुद्रिक प्रान्त को रूस का

[डा० रघुवीर]

भाग बनाया । इस प्रकार से रूस और अमेरिका संसार की राजनीति के क्षेत्रों में आने लगे । वं सवीं शताब्दी में जिस समय समझा जा रहा था कि यूरोप का साम्राज्य संसार में सर्वदा के लिए अटल है, उस समय उनमें आपस में संघर्ष हुआ । १९१४ में युद्ध का आरम्भ हुआ । इस युद्ध में रूस में साम्यवाद ने जन्म लिया और अमेरिका जो उस समय तक संसार के राजनैतिक क्षेत्र से बाहर रहता था, जो अकेले रहने को ही अपना कर्तव्य मानता था, वह यूरोप के युद्ध में धाया और उसको बड़ी ऊंचे स्थिति मिली । पहले युद्ध के पश्चात् भारतवर्ष भी च न में क्रांति बढ़त गई और स्वतंत्रता के लिए जनता में जाग्रति उत्पन्न हुई । उसके पश्चात् यूरोप का दूसरा महायुद्ध प्रारम्भ हुआ । दूसरे महायुद्ध के परिणामस्वरूप भारतवर्ष और चीन स्वतंत्र हुए ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly wind up, Dr. Raghu Vira.

डा० रघुवीर : दो मिनट और ।

दूसरे महायुद्ध के पश्चात् रूस और अमेरिका संसार के शिखर पर आ गए, शिखर पर चढ़ गए । इंग्लैंड और दूसरे यूरोपीय जातियां नचे गिरने लगीं । इन दोनों शक्तियों के सामने आने से एक नई परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हुई । रूस जो समष्टिवाद का समर्थक है और अमेरिका जो व्यक्तिवाद का समर्थक है, इन दोनों में संघर्ष की संभावना युद्ध के पश्चात् बढ़ गई और उस संभावना के बढ़ने के साथ साथ ही परमाणु प्रस्फोट (एटम बम) के आविष्कार के कारण संसार को प्रलय सामने दिखाई देने

लगी । ऐसी स्थिति में भारतवर्ष जो इस सारे नाटक को देख रहा था, जो स्वयम् स्वतंत्र हो चुका था, जिसका एशियाई देशों के साथ पिछले दो हजार वर्षों से प्राचीन सम्बन्ध था, वह तटस्थ हो कर नहीं रह सकता था । भारतवर्ष ने इंडोनेशिया को स्वतंत्रता युद्ध में शांतिपूर्वक सहायता की और आज इंडो-चायना और कोरिया जो भारतवर्ष के प्राचीन साथी रहे हैं, उनके साथ भी उसकी सहानुभूति है । भारतवर्ष की आज की नीति शांति की नीति है । भारतवर्ष का घोषणाद है शांतिविजयताम् । शांतिविजयताम्, यह भारतवर्ष की प्राचीन सन्म्यता, यह भारत की आधुनिक सन्म्यता दोनों का प्रतीक है । यह हमारी आने वाली संस्कृति का प्रतीक है । सारे संसार की भी भावें संस्कृति का प्रतीक हैं । इस ही लिए भारतवर्ष को इस नीति में सफलता मिल रही है ।

मैं बड़ा प्रसन्न हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री आज पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू हैं । संसार इन से प्रसन्न है । हम उनको शतशः बधाई देते हैं और उनकी नीति का पूर्ण रूप से समर्थन करते हैं ।

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON (Madras): Mr. Chairman, I would at the outset like to remind myself that the debate in which the House is engaged at the moment arose from a submission made to it by the Prime Minister that the House take into consideration "the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto." The Prime Minister has referred to certain specific aspects both of the international situation and the policy of his Government. I think it is proper and very necessary that we should remind ourselves of one basic factor in regard to the first part of his motion. The time, Mr. Chairman, you have allocated to this debate does not permit it, nor is it necessary for us to go

over the whole field of the entire international situation or in great detail at present. But the outstanding factor is that the Prime Minister has said that though a great many things have happened in the world, little has happened to change the international situation fundamentally. That is to say, the world today is still poised on the brink of possible war and the threat of the armageddon is as serious and severe as ever before. Whether it is slightly removed or slightly nearer is not something that fundamentally changes its character. The fear of dread weapons on the one hand and the desire of populations in every country in the world to avoid this grim alternative on the other, the knowledge of the leaders of the armed forces of every country of the nature of modern war and the grimness of war itself have brought into operation certain forces, and perhaps certain slight improvements have taken place here, there and everywhere. Real change can come about only with the renewal of the policy and outlook towards 'one world', towards the more universal conception of and approach to human problems and human civilization. This is the basis of the foundation of the United Nations and of the endeavours made by the leaders of the war at that time when they founded that organization. But this became reversed soon after by the emergence of the policies of balance of power or as we now call it, the cold war. How, cold it is we do not always know. Therefore, it is necessary for any country, particularly ours, to know that whatever we call our policy, it cannot escape the consequences of a war. There will be consequences, physical, economic, moral or others, and we should have this fully and clearly in our minds. Therefore, the primary purpose and the concern of our foreign policy becomes the disintegration or rather the dissolution of this conflict and the contribution, into the world pattern, of those elements that tend to neutralise the approach that is based on conflict. It is only from that point of view that we may look at any proposition, whether it be

Goa or Pakistan or Indo-China or disarmament or East and West Germany.

I will say as little as possible with regard to the problem that arises from the Portuguese Empire in India. That is what it is. I think the House would allow me to say that in our system the executive is part of the legislature and that whatever is said in this House,—whatever its effects may be in this country—it has a wider audience outside. To suggest, by implication or by reference, the idea that there is any doubt in the minds of the Government or any section of the people with regard to the basic aspect of this problem, namely, that these possessions should become reunited with India, to suggest that there is any change in this policy reflected in the steps taken by the Government, is calculated to help the enemy, because we are not addressing a private audience; we have an international audience. Secondly, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an aspect that seems to have <sup>been</sup> forgotten. No Government, not even the Government of Brazil, has pronounced itself on the merits of this question. They have all said, "we hope there will not be a war; we hope you go slow and we hope what we have heard is wrong", and so on. No Government has come forward and said: 'On the merits of this question we hold this view or that and you are wrong'. This in itself is the proclamation of the fact that they are all well conscious of the attitude of our people and Government and of the nature of this problem as being one which is integrated with our historical background. The whole tenor of our outlook on such problems and of the principles this country holds in respect of colonial empires as a whole is well in the minds of other nations and Governments. I do think that we have a long way to go towards realising that in international affairs and relations. We may not take up the position that whatever our policy, even if it is right, it will and must necessarily remain uncriticised by others. There are eighty other nations



[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]  
in the world, each with its own sense of nationalism, each with its own idea that what they put forward is the correct point of view; and I would like to ask with all respect and in all humility, why we get so excited and why we get so upset when newspapers in other countries or other Governments make pronouncements or send notes. Our proper answer is and should be to send answers back in whatever way we think is appropriate to the issue and there the matter ends. So far, therefore, as the problem of Goa is concerned, the fundamental principles that govern our approach to this problem—so far as I understand the Prime Minister's elucidation of them and in all the correspondence that has been published—is that we are not going to be provoked into a situation whereby the great strength that this country, along with others, exercises towards peace would be neutralised by those who do not want peace. After all, a country that has a responsible Government, a country with limited military, economic and diplomatic resources, cannot afford to blunt such weapons as it has.

No one would be more pleased than those who are against us if we make one false move in this; and a false move is not necessarily or alone a false move that the Government makes; it includes also steps that give others the opportunity to say that responsible persons in our country—and Members of Parliament are responsible persons, editors of Newspapers are responsible persons and those who take part in public life are responsible persons; the degree of responsibility and the burdens that they carry may vary—are doing something that belies their professions. From any point of view this would be a setback to our prestige. Secondly, for myself I would like to think whether it is right or wise that any Government should either say or do anything which it is not prepared to carry to its logical conclusion. They say that in international conversations and communications, what is euphemistically called

diplomacy, one of the things you have got to guard against is being trapped by the opposite side; but no trap by the opposite side is so dangerous or embarrassing as the trap one unwillingly sets for oneself. Politicians are sometimes the victims of their own past statements. One of the favourite devices of an opposition is what is called Hansardize, that is to say, quote from previous speeches what their opponents had said. So in this problem of Goa the test is not so much for Portugal as for us. It is one of those things where there is a sort of challenge that we have thrown out to the world that every problem is capable of being resolved by negotiations that it is possible to bring about the liquidation of an authoritarian and imperial regime in any country by the use of non-violent and peaceful methods. Other methods are foreign to us and inapplicable to the situation. There is also no way of our proving it to the world except by example and, therefore, in the matter of Goa, any particular mode that may be adopted by the Government of India or its representatives, at any time, must be in conformity with the principles which this country itself has adopted and proclaims. The rest, namely steps taken by Government at any time, I submit with great respect, should be matters of as little debate as possible. So far as the crux of the question itself is concerned, Portugal is in the fortunate position that she is virtually outside the easy competence of the Parliamentary Procedure of nations. She is not a member of the United Nations; she does not come into the general arrangements and arguments about colonial territories at the United Nations. The hon. Member from Madras yesterday made an aside reference to this and asked why we did not bring up this problem in the Trusteeship Council. The reason is very simple and it is that Portugal has no trust territories and their colonial territories are not subject to the information and procedures of the United Nations. Therefore, they are in the comfortable position of being outside the combine, so to say. They are a free firm and

they are not bound by the rules of the trade. That is how it is. So much with regard to Portugal.

I think the House will expect me to say a few words about the settlement in Indo-China. I hope, Sir, you will allow me to express my sense of gratitude for the somewhat embarrassing generosity that has been shown to me with regard to what small part I may have had in this matter. I think we should not make a mistake about one aspect of this or similar matters. Whatever an individual does is only incidental. It is the policy of a country, exemplified by its conduct, that matters, and in this the element of our not taking credit and in that way not arousing the jealousy or resentment of other nations is very important. I do not presume to prescribe this; I only think aloud and say that we should understand this problem in this way. When some country talks about its being a leader of the world or the leader of this part or that part, we on our part feel somewhat resentful or disapproving. We feel that it is a peculiar pose to take. We have only to remind ourselves of this reaction of ours that we do not claim ourselves that we have a pattern or that we have a remedy or that we have a unique role to play. The Prime Minister has constantly denied and disapproved of such postures and said that there is no question of our having a particular role to play. We have, however, our contribution to make; we may find ourselves useful in certain capacities and so on. That is one of the reasons why, I believe, we are asked sometimes to do something or the other or even if we are not asked, we try to do something. There is, I believe, a general acceptance in the world that, nationally, the Government of India want nothing out of their foreign policy by way of territory, by way of being elected to Councils or Committees or even by way of recognition. This is a new thing almost in diplomacy and in international relations and, so far as we are concerned, it stands tested up to this

time; whatever happens tomorrow we do not know, but it has stood that test till now.

In regard to Indo-China, the House will appreciate that the present agreement that has been reached is not a peace settlement. It consists of three Armistice Agreements relating to the three territories which, generally, are or were separate sub-sovereign States under the French hegemony. I will not go into the history of the whole of this question but will simply refer to some fundamental aspects of it and some misconceptions that seem to prevail.

First of all, references have been made to the partition of Viet Nam. It is quite true that it has been the time-honoured policy of imperial governments and their allies to "Divide and Rule." I believe, since the war the pattern has changed. Now it is 'Divide and Leave'. In the present case we have moved away from this pattern and I would like those who are interested to look at the Armistice Agreement in regard to Viet Nam. It is there in Chapter I of the Agreement. I am not going to read the whole of it but in every paragraph where the question of the demarcation line appears, it says "provisional demarcation line". That is number one. Secondly the demarcation line arises not from a partition of the country between the two Governments but from a regrouping of forces. Now, this is not word-splitting exercise; it has taken a long time to get to this position. The device that is now adopted is the result of a great deal of work in the Conference or outside the Conference to produce a situation of this kind. In the context of political theory, what there is on the territory of Viet Nam are not two separate "States" mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, but one territory which is to be an independent State in the near future in which there are two authorities and these two authorities for the purpose of convenience are asked to sit here and there and so on. So, it is not as though

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

there are two parts which are to be united in the future as in Korea and that is why you do not see anywhere any reference to the two Viet Nams. In theory the latent authority of such Government is not restricted to its own area; it is, however, so in practical and factual terms. And then the Agreement goes on to provide for a free election. Now, that election is not a plebiscite. That election is not to decide whether the country shall go to this man or that man, to this Government or the other Government. It would be like election to a Constituent Assembly. It would be an election to decide the future of the place, that is, this election is for the whole country. In order to arrange that election, the two parties have to come together to make the arrangements. The Supervisory Commission does not run the election as it would be in the case of a plebiscite. The two authorities in the whole territory—these authorities may even change in some way or another in the intervening period before June 1955—come together, for practical reasons, to discuss the date of the election and about polling booths and about rules, this, that and the other. Therefore, any idea that either we as a Government or as a country or even the Geneva Conference has partitioned this territory or the purport of this Armistice Agreement is to keep it divided would be an error. What is more, neither the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam nor the French nor the other allies of the French including the Viet Nameese want the country divided. In fact this idea of the Cease-Fire-Line near to the Benhai River at about the 17th Parallel was the result of the compulsion of practical considerations. It was impossible to hold cease-fire pockets all over the territory. So it was the best possible of a practical device and was arranged by military men on both sides; it does not constitute a political boundary line. It does not constitute the delineation of future division between the two countries. It does not mean that the country should not get

divided. The present Viet Nam has had got several other political boundaries in the course of her history. Whether it will get divided in five years or ten years or twenty years or in two years one cannot say, but there is nothing in the present settlement which envisages the idea of two States where in one part one group of political ideas or political Governments would be confined or embodied and another the other way. That is not the present purport of anything accomplished at Geneva. This applies to the entire arrangement with regard to the Neutral Supervisory Commission and the functions of the Trung Gia Military Commission or the other Joint Commissions. Now, it is necessary that we do understand this because otherwise appreciation of the rest of the Agreement would be incomplete and inadequate.

The Agreement, as the Prime Minister mentioned in his statement in another place, has certain outstanding characteristics. One of these outstanding characteristics is the total independence of these territories which now stands pledged. Now that it has come we take it for granted, but it is a great achievement nevertheless. It is the abdication—the commitment of the Government of France to abdicate its authority in the territories of Indo-China; further it is not a series of bilateral agreements between each one of these units and the Government of France alone. In my opinion it is an international commitment and this, the House will recall, was asked for in the statement made by the Prime Minister in another place on the 24th of April last and which the Government of France has now publicly committed itself to through its Prime Minister and subsequently endorsed by an overwhelming vote in the French Chamber, that French authority will be withdrawn. And what is more, the conditions of this withdrawal have been laid down. Thus there is no question of their not being fully independent which of course does not preclude these territories making their own arrangements

about relations with France for the future. The second characteristic is that willy-nilly this area has come into what has come to be generally called the collective peace conception. It is basic to this Agreement that there shall be respect for the integrity of each of these territories by the other. Now that has been evolved after whole weeks of negotiation that there shall be respect for the integrity of each other, there shall be no interference in the territories of each other, and what is more, that they cannot enter into any military alliance or receive military aid from outside except as specified by agreement to which the Prime Minister referred yesterday with some slight modifications. I think he used the words with some slight modifications referring to the application of this provision to other territories which is entirely correct. I will refer to the nature of these modifications. These modifications apply to the territories of Laos and Cambodia where it is said:

"The Royal Government of Laos will never agree to pursue a policy of aggression and will never permit the territory of Laos to be used in furtherance of such a policy."

This is the commitment—not to allow its territory to be used as a base. It goes on further:

"The Royal Government of Laos will never join in any agreement with other States if this agreement includes the obligation for the Royal Government of Laos to participate in a military alliance not in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or with the principles of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities or, unless its security is threatened, the obligation to establish bases on Laotian territory for military forces of foreign powers."

There is a similar but slightly different set of provisions in the Cambodian Agreement and it reads:

"The Royal Government of Cambodia is resolved never to take part in an aggressive policy and never to permit the territory of Cambodia to be utilised in the service of such a policy."

The Royal Government of Cambodia will not join in any agreement with other states, if this agreement carries for Cambodia the obligation to enter into a military alliance not in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or, as long as its security is not threatened, the obligation to establish bases on Cambodian territory for the military forces of foreign powers."

It can be argued that as the United Nations stands at present, any kind of interpretation or arrangement can be justified by the power of votes in the Assembly. That is not, however, the position. This is a security matter and it can only be decided by the Security Council whether there is real threat to the security of this territory. Unless all international law is bypassed, it can only be decided by the Security Council by a unanimous vote. What is more, if there is a violation or a threat of violation to the security of the territory, it is to be referred to the International Supervisory Commission and if they do not come to an agreement unanimously, it is to be reported back to the nine powers of the Conference who can alter the agreement unless they agree among themselves. So as far as can be provided in the general context of difficulties the Agreements have done everything reasonably necessary in this respect. It is possible to argue that another form of words would have been better and if it were done then probably there would have been additional impediments to the Agreements being reached because every day would have brought further and further complications.

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

This matter has a very direct bearing on the immediate problem which is before us, namely, the projected South-East Asian Treaty Organization. We have heard from the Prime Minister the policy of the Government in regard to this matter. There have been various interpretations put on this. To my mind, our position is a very simple one. First of all, any suggestion regarding the projected South-East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) comes in the newspapers and that is where we see it. They have at present no other existence. This organization cannot by any stretch of interpretation of the Charter come under the United Nations Charter because the United Nations Charter provides for Regional organizations, but this is not a Regional organization. This is an organization of some people to protect a region. It is a modern version of a Protectorate. It is an organization of some imperial powers and some other powers who may have interest in it to join together in order to protect a territory which they say may be in danger. We are part of that territory and we say we do not want to be protected by this organization, and therefore when an association of that kind arises, it has no place under the Charter of the United Nations, as a Regional organization.

Secondly, the Prime Minister in his statement on the 24th of April last in another place said:

"While the decision about the Geneva Conference was a welcome development, it was soon followed by others which caused us concern and forebodings. Among these were (1) the repeated reference to instant and massive retaliation, to possible attacks on the Chinese mainland and statements about extending the scope and intensity of hostilities in Indo-China, (2) an invitation to the Western countries, to the ANZUS powers, and to some Asian States to join in united and collective

action in South-East Asia. This has been preceded by statements, which came near to assuming protection, or declaring a kind of Monroe Doctrine, unilaterally, over the countries of South-East Asia.

There were thus indications of impending direct intervention in Indo-China and the internationalisation of the war and its extension and intensification."

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the last sentence. The whole purpose or rather the whole object of achieving a settlement in Indo-China has been to remove the doubts expressed in this last paragraph, that is to say, the internationalisation of the war and direct intervention in Indo-China. Now, if that has been achieved, then before the ink is dry on this agreement, to set up an organization which was originally thought of and whose ostensible purpose is to include the area in the East is inimical to the agreement. An organisation of any like-minded countries for any purpose, we cannot as a sovereign State object to; but if it includes within its purview other people and if it goes against the agreements already made and agreements to which at least some of the signatories of the Final Act at the Geneva Conference are participants—and which the Government of India, so far as we are concerned, has by declarations supported—then the issue cuts into the agreements already reached. Therefore, whether we take it from the point of view of our commitments or what is good or bad for this region, there is no doubt that anything that emerges from the Baguio conference would affect us. I do not presume to know, I am not prepared to say what would emerge out of this South-East Asian Treaty Organization Conference. I think it is premature to get excited about it. They may hold some meetings and at the end of the talks they may issue a communique saying, "We discussed the outstanding issues and exchanged

views" and so on and so forth. That is possible. There are certain military agreements even today under the ANZUS pact and the Singapore conference. It would not, however, be correct to assume that this or that or the other will or will not take place. We have seen no blue-prints anywhere of what pacts are to be undertaken.

Secondly, there is a factual aspect of this matter that any agreement that is on a parallel basis with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would require a quantum of forces that has to be deployed in this area. Since India is no longer a part of an imperial country with interests in this region, where are these forces to come from? This is not a matter to be proved in the future for we know the situation. That is to say, if it was not possible to intervene in Indo-China during the last six months of the war, then the prospects are not better for the purpose in the future. It does not mean that we can relax our vigilance to prevent this happening. Its real harm is political—to create in the minds of those who have come nearer to some of the Western powers, at any rate—its real harm is probably to reverse the process of conciliation and the lowering of tension that has followed the Indo-China conference.

Therefore, it is more a diplomatic and political tragedy than a military one at the present moment. And I am sure that the statements that we had heard on behalf of the Government are reassuring in this respect. The very fact that the countries in South-East Asia, with the exception of Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines, are not participating in the conference proclaims to the world its character. We have no ill-will towards anyone. I am sure none others of us in South-East Asia have towards any of these countries, either Asian or European. But at the same time it is our bounden duty to proclaim that it attempts to build up a military alliance which is not in the interests of peace in this area or the

world. As the hon. Member from Madras said yesterday, what is a defensive agreement? The only kind of military defence is the preparation for offence. And, therefore, it is a defence against somebody and the only kind of agreement there could be is an agreement that it is not based on the two rival camps in the cold war. Otherwise, it would be an agreement of a war-like character.

Reference has been made to Korea. Here we face a situation which is full of difficulties and one about which we cannot feel very happy. There is an uneasy armistice agreement and there is, again,—if we are to listen to press reports—continual talk about the dissolution of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission. We can only hope that the wisdom of governments, of powerful governments, will persuade themselves and their friends or bed fellows or whatever they are, not to take any step which will break up the machinery of the armistice agreement, because a conflagration anywhere in this part of the world is fraught with ominous possibilities. The armistice agreement in Korea is very tenuously balanced and it has been held together by the Neutral Supervisory Commission. The Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission, despite all the newspaper reports, had functioned satisfactorily. It has been able to prevent breaches of agreement on any large scale. And if there should be any removal of this machinery, it would be a matter for this country, as part of the United Nations and other members of the United Nations, to feel concerned about it.

Now, I would like to refer back to what I said in the beginning about the international situation that you were asked to take into consideration, and also about the words "co-existence" and various things of that character. Of course, there is always co-existence. Because of the law of gravity in the world you cannot fly away from it. Co-existence and the whole

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]  
conception of a united world depends on toleration. That is what we are interested in, and our country, I hope, is making its small contribution towards it. Toleration and respect for parliamentary and democratic life in our own country can make a real contribution to co-existence in the world. In the national field, if our ideas and approach are authoritarian or tending that way, it would do a great harm to co-operation and therefore, to co-existence. One of the main factors is the exuberance and the overgrowth of economic nationalism, which is very conveniently disguised as patriotism. Any country that goes very long in the direction of economic nationalism shuts itself out behind tariff barriers, cuts down the communications of trade; and seeks to live in a state of immaculate conception. It will soon find itself either isolated or drawn into war or war preparedness with somebody else.

Secondly, we welcome certain factors that have emerged. First of all, there is this Indo-China settlement. There is the fact in regard to Korea that the Geneva Conference still remains in being. Syngman Rhee should not be permitted to do any mischief. He has one of the largest armies in Asia, his army is larger than ours. Perhaps the most important sign is the change of feeling, however small. Various matters that have happened, in what are called the main centres of the East and West, reflect this. There have been all these missions from Western European countries to China and Russia. There has been an attempt by the Soviet Union to bring in new suggestions for collaboration. There is the fact that the European Defence Community is under discussion and everybody is agreed that some basis acceptable all round has to be found. But over and above that, there has been—very little publicised—a statement the other day by President Eisenhower when he told his people, "We are not leaders of the world; we are partners in

world leadership". That is one step further on. That is very good thing. I say this because it is quite easy to develop as much hostility to one side in this bloc as in the other. What we are interested in is real co-existence, is real tolerance. We have every right to criticise antagonistic policies only if we maintain our non-dependence. I say with humility that it is a great mistake to think that in the United States everybody is against us. We still suffer from the disease of believing that what is printed is necessarily the fact. The newspapers of any country are very useful organs of opinion. You would be lost without them. But they are not the whole source of fact. And what is more about them, they express opinions on certain cross sections of a particular event. I fear it would not be very fashionable to say that we would be throwing the baby out of the bath water, if in the process of criticism we created a new degree and category of antagonism which we cannot bridge. It is necessary for Government to pronounce hard things, and to take firm action but people should not be roused to passion. We find that these are a few signs towards the lowering of tension, and it must be our hope that it will lead to something else. The test of it would be when there is some real reduction in arms. So long as there is no effective step towards disarmament, any talk about co-existence remains imperfect. Unless we can get a degree of disarmament in the world, unless it is possible to set limits to the growth of economic nationalism, unless it is possible effectively to counter the forces of advancing colonialism in certain parts and stimulate its disintegration in others, we cannot move towards the position of co-existence. Fortunately, it is now a well recognised doctrine that we have to live in this planet all together. If we go from one country we go into any other. That is the logic of national States. So there is no escape from this compulsory society, in this planet either by the force of circumstances or by the deliberate contributions that we ourselves

make We may, the e. be able to assist in this process appears to be the trend, and the desire and the motivation, of India's foreign policy, namely, not to create necessarily a physical area of peace, but to lower these tensions largely by the force of our own example.

**THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU)**

Mr Chairman during this day and a half's debate so many kindly things have been said about our Government's policy that I feel somewhat embarrassed. A number of questions have been put, and I might perhaps deal with a few of them briefly. But what is much more important really is to understand the background of this policy, the springs which lie behind it, because many of the criticisms are perhaps due to, if I may say so with all respect, not keeping this background in view.

Now, fortunately for me, my predecessor and my colleague, Mr Krishna Menon, has dealt with certain basic facts and backgrounds of our policy. Whenever people argue as to whether we should be inclined towards this group of nations or that,—they might think, and rightly think that this group is better than that, and it might be so this or that group might be justified—they forget the basic fact of this antagonism in the world today which is leading, and which might well lead, to a frightful catastrophe. If this is so what is our policy to be? To avoid that catastrophe from happening. Now how can we do that? We have no overwhelming power, material or military, etc., or if you like, financial or any other. In fact, as things go in this world, we can influence the events of the world very little, and let us always remember that, because we are always apt to forget simple facts, and in our patriotic fervour to think of ourselves in the world as bigger than what we are. That is a dangerous thing always. So what can we do about it? First of all, what is the right approach to

it? Secondly, what is the feasible approach to it? The first thing to be done in the world today is to avoid this tremendous conflict that might overwhelm the world. It is not necessary for me to remind you again what the nature of such a conflict is likely to be. It is admitted, it is known to you. The other day, the head of the air force of a great nation said, "War today would be a general suicide and the end of civilisation, as we have seen it." These are experts, who know their job and can talk about things, not vague politicians. Now, do we want that to happen or do we want that not to happen? We may think that we are working for a right cause. It does not matter whether you are working for a right cause, if the result is going to be what these experts in warfare tell us. Therefore, keeping that in view, we have to take steps in so far as we can, with the very limited resources at our disposal, to throw our weight on the side of its prevention. What are our resources? As I said they are not financial they are not military. And one would imagine that in such circumstances, when good advice can go far, it is rather resented. This moralising attitude is resented. Sometimes people say, "India sits on a high perch and tries to moralise." Well I have no desire nor my Government, to sit on a perch and to moralise anybody, because we are deeply conscious of our own failings in our own country. And, therefore, it is no business of mine to moralise anybody. Moralising is always a bad thing. I dislike moralising myself. So how can I expect anybody to like it? So, without appearing to be superior to others, what can we do, in this very limited sphere, to help to lessen tensions? Naturally, it is difficult for us to control events but we may, in a particular set-up throw our weight on a particular side and make a difference, as we, sometimes have made a difference.

Again, I should like to refer to something that Mr Krishna Menon



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

just said. It is wrong both factually and for all practical purposes, for people to imagine and say in their patriotic fervour that we are taking a lead in this campaign, or that we are going to function as leaders of Asia or any group of nations. We do not presume to do any such thing. If we have any virtue, it will have its way and make itself felt, but it is wrong—not out of any false sense of modesty, as I said—and it is basically a wrong approach—not the approach, at any rate, I hope of mature and civilised nations. If I may say so, none of the nations is civilised enough, or mature enough including ours of course. So, what can we do about this?

In this connection, we should examine every step that we take in regard to every matter. Whether it is Indo-China, whether it is Korea, whether it is Goa, whether it is some conflict in Europe, whether it is some conflict in Africa, it is very easy for any one of us to express our opinion, and express it very strongly about something we dislike. It gives a sense of great satisfaction to point out other people's or other countries' errors and sins. We feel a little superior and feel the better for it but nevertheless it does not help often enough. You may go about and catch your neighbour and tell him, "You are a scoundrel. You do this thing wrongly or that thing wrongly. You are bad. You treat your wife badly. You do this or that." You may be perfectly right in telling your neighbour what his limitations or weaknesses are, but all the same you are not creating any feeling of brotherliness or good neighbourliness in your neighbour. So we are not going about and telling other nations about their limitations, their errors and weaknesses. Naturally, the result of that is that they point out some weaknesses of ours, and then it becomes or may become a competition in calling each other names. That again is not helpful, nor is it civilised behaviour if I may say so with all respect. Take for instance this point

Hon Members opposite are always telling us or telling me and our Government that we are afraid of the British Government, because we are in the Commonwealth, we are afraid of saying anything about Malaya or Kenya or other places. I do not know how to explain certain simple facts to my hon friends there. We are not afraid of this Government or that Government, we are afraid of taking a wrong step which will produce difficulties and we want to avoid that. Take the position of people of Indian descent in South Africa. Is there any single question which angers India more than the way these people of Indian descent—leave alone Indians, whether they are Indians or whether they are Africans—are being treated down in South Africa? I think it is disgraceful—these negotiations and talks in the United Nations. People talk about, as I said yesterday, the crisis of our times, communism or anti-communism. It may be, these are big things of conflict of ideologies and otherwise. But what about this racialism that is going on or other things? This angers me exceedingly and yet I control myself. I do not go about cursing South Africa all the time or go about cursing what is happening in the other colonies whether French or British, all the time. When occasion arises I express myself in restrained language about this, because my object is to obtain a certain atmosphere to gain something, not merely to reveal my feelings. If Governments behave in this way, they cannot carry anything very far. Therefore we have to see all these things in this context—not of expressing our feelings in an unrestrained way but of achieving something, of improving the atmosphere in the world and lessening tension. It is in that context that we see Goa or any other problem. Goa is a small problem, and hon Members must realise that, if I act on my own urges, far from stopping people going there, I will go there myself with a flag on

SHRI B. GUPTA: Why not do it?

11 A.M.

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** I regret to say that I do not think that the hon. Member will understand or has understood what I have said all this time. It is very difficult to point this out to enthusiastic people with large numbers of locks to their minds. They cannot entertain any new idea. That is the difficulty. So, we have to consider this Goa question not only in this larger context but even from the limited and practical context of bringing about a certain result that we all desire. Of course, in trying to bring about results in the narrower field, we may upset the results in the wider field. We will have to take both into consideration and then decide what we have to do. I cannot say precisely or definitely what in regard to Goa our steps might be from time to time. It depends upon so many circumstances, but I can say and I do wish to say that these questions should always be considered from this wider point of view that we should not, in our anger or in our impatience, take a step which puts us in difficulty, take a step which puts us in a trap of others making, because I have little doubt that all this business that the Portuguese have done in Goa, bringing in troops, gunboats and what not, the tremendous propaganda they indulged in, was largely meant to provoke us into taking a wrong step. It does not matter if they bring in 4,000, 5,000 or 10,000 troops or even if they double it and make it 20,000, it does not make a military difference to the situation, but I imagine, it is just to provoke us into doing a wrong thing. Some people suggest and newspapers suggest that we should march our troops also to the Portuguese border and tell them, "We are also here with guns, etc." That is foolish and we would have acted wrongly if we had done that. So, we must not be provoked and we must not lose our patience. That does not mean that we should be tolerant of the evil that is done or that we should be less vigilant or that we should not be prepared, but must look at things in this larger context.

I think some hon. Member—Mrs. Alva I think—said something about a number of foreign representatives from foreign countries trooping up in the Foreign Office presumably at the instance of Portugal to protest to us about our behaviour. It is not quite correct. It is extraordinary—the kind of things that have been said by the Portuguese Government. They name a number of countries and say, "These countries are some of the countries which agree with the Portuguese position in this matter." I was astounded to read that list, including Burma and some other countries. It is patently absurd. It is true that the representatives of three or four countries came to us to express the hope that the matter be peacefully settled. I do not for a moment remember any case of any country going beyond that. Mrs. Alva mentioned about the Vatican—that the Vatican is siding with Portugal in this matter. In fact—I cannot speak of course for the Vatican—but my own impression is that they are gravely disturbed at Portugal's attitude in this matter, so that it is odd that our own people have sometimes been taken in by Portuguese propaganda. If that is so, it is not surprising that some other people in other countries might have been taken in. Whether that is the fault of our propaganda or lack of propaganda—that is a different matter but we must not in this way lose our sense of proportion.

There are now one or two matters that I should like to deal with. Dr. Kunzru yesterday and somebody today referred to my lifting the veil about our dealings with the Colombo Conference countries or this South-East Asian Conference. There is really no veil to lift. There is no secrecy about it. Naturally, I cannot publish all the documents we exchanged but there is no secrecy. What I have told you today we might have elaborated more in some documents or minutes that we have written. Someone asked why we should not recognize Laos and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Cambodia. Now, I will not go into the merits of the recognition of any country—how far it is completely independent or not. I have no doubt that Laos and Cambodia and Viet Nam are fully independent and will be fully independent but that is not the point. Situated as we are now after our undertaking this business in Indo-China, if we start recognizing any country, it is difficult to recognize one and not the others—you either recognize the whole lot or you recognize none at all—I mean all those in Indo-China. Even if you thought of recognizing all of them, then you again create some difficulties. So, what the future will bring I don't know but for the present it does not seem desirable from many points of view for us formally to recognize these countries. I say formally. In effect informally we are recognizing them and we are dealing with them. Our Commissions are there sitting and dealing with their Governments and dealing with others. So it is only the formal part that remains. Once you start it, we don't know where to stop and all kinds of new situations and difficulties might arise.

Now, I wish to lay stress on what Mr. Krishna Menon said about what has happened at Geneva. We are happy that the Geneva Conference has ended as it did and the war in Indo-China has stopped but this is not a settlement. This is some kind of a truce, armistice, intermediate—if you like—settlement leaving the main cause of complaint all there. Therefore, we have to be very careful, very cautious and very vigilant. If I say in regard to the South-East Asia meeting that is going to take place that I think it is unfortunate the way they are approaching this, that does not mean that I think that everything is calm and peaceful, happy and prosperous and that we should not be vigilant. I don't think so. I think we should be vigilant, we should be wide awake, we should be careful, we should think of our security and our defence and everything. I don't deny that. be-

cause the world is made that way. While on the one hand I think it is our duty and the duty of others to move in the direction of peace and try to avoid these horrors of a possible war that might come, on the other side it is essential that we should remain wide awake and, if you like, prepare for any consequences that might come; but I don't think that is the way of preparation or that is the way of approach that this South-East Asian meeting is likely to adopt. I don't know, of course, what they will do. Now I would like to take a look back on history. Of course, we live in the present and we are pressed by the present and perhaps we attach too much importance to the present era, because it is the present era and we think that this present era is the most important era since the world began.

Naturally, our perspective compels us to do that kind of thing and some countries get terribly frightened of communism—others of the anti-communist movement. Each thinks that it is going to be encircled and attempts are made to throttle it and suppress it. All that may have some truth in it. I should like you to throw your minds back to past history—not behind Indian history but European and something more than Europe. From the 11th century to the 14th century, there were wars of religion between Christianity and Islam, usually called the Crusades and their developments. I have no doubt that the people who lived in those days had the most intense realization of that crisis of that time and thought the world would be overwhelmed by this thing or that. Now the Crusades which were meant, of course, to crush or suppress Islam failed completely to do so. In fact, after 200 years of fighting, Islam was probably more closely knit than it was previously. Later, in the 16th and 17th centuries, in Europe there were terribly devastating wars between religious groups—wars in a sense between Catholicism and the new Protestantism. They devastated Europe. Well, Europe survived and

gradually those terrible feelings against each other were forgotten as they are forgotten today. Look at the political field. In the 19th Century, after the Napoleonic wars, gradually Russia, i.e., Czarist Russia, became a bogey and people were frightened. France and England on the one side and Czarist Russia on the other, and they disliked each other and even in India where the English were establishing their domain, there was talk of the Russian Bear in the north. For 90 or 100 years these things were there. What I am pointing out is that antagonisms between countries, however deep-seated they might appear to be, are not everlasting. Although they may appear terribly intense even in the present day, we need not think that there would be any everlasting antagonism. Countries will come together, I hope.

Naturally, I hope, there will be no war and all that kind of thing, but whatever happens, we must look at it in two perspectives today—in the perspective of history and of the future. The difference is apparent today and it is a big thing that the weapons of warfare, however, are terrific and, therefore, mistakes which led to war previously will lead to a different type of war which might bring about what I just read to you—almost extinction of modern civilization. That is a very big difference and that, therefore, ought to make us all the more vigilant to prevent a war and make every effort to prevent a war. That, I submit, is our basic approach with some perspective—not to be lost in the trouble or passion of the moment, to try not to be too impatient, not to be tolerant either and not to be too patient either, and thereby working with such limited resources that we have—limited in the material sense,—but that working need not be so limited if we are wise and use our wisdom properly in the cause of peace, not only because peace is good but because it is quite an essential thing for our own progress, for Asia's progress and for all that we stand for. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to press your amendment, Mr. Mahanty?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same the House regrets—

(a) that the policy pursued by the Government in regard to the elimination of foreign pockets from India, particularly the Portuguese territories, has been belated, halting and unplanned; and

(b) that Parliament has not been taken into confidence in shaping and directing the foreign policy of India.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sundarayya, do you press your amendment?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, the House regrets that Government have let down the Indian people in their struggle against the continued Portuguese occupation of Goa, Daman and Diu.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Mr. Ghose?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Yes, Sir, I press my amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, the House regrets the action of the Government in preventing peaceful satyagrahis from entering Goa with a view to take part in its liberation movement.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And now, the last amendment.

The question is:

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

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

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 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, the House approves of the policy."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, may I draw your attention to this cartoon from the "Daily Mail" which has been reproduced in a Bengali paper which shows the Prime Minister talking peace but showing his guns at Pakistan? And it asks, "Mr. Nehru, can you spare a moment for your celebrated 'Angel-of-Peace' act?"

We say that this is inspired by the British Tory policy.....

MR. CHAIRMAN Order, order.

SHRI B. GUPTA: ... and I think it has to be taken note of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has a bee in his bonnet.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

#### ANNOUNCEMENT RE: EXTRA TIME FOR PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up the Private Members' Resolutions.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, may I take a submission in connec-

tion with our discussion of the Private Members' Resolutions? Next week, on Friday we have to take up the Private Members' Bills and I believe that the Bills that we have will not take up much time. I, therefore, submit that we might take up Private Members' Resolutions also on that day, after we have discussed the Bills.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We would have had five hours today, but three hours have been taken away. Next Friday, does the House agree to continue discussion for three hours?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Very well.

#### RESOLUTION RE. U.S. MILITARY AID TO PAKISTAN—continued

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, the discussion on this Resolution, I take it, is in a sense a continuation of the discussion we have been having since yesterday and I believe that the Indo-Pakistan relations show up in a certain sense the weaknesses in some of the basic elements that go to constitute the foreign policy of the country. Last time when I was speaking, I asked myself the question as to why Pakistan, although it knew that if it should accept military aid from America it would be bartering away its freedom, even so agreed to accept that assistance. And the only answer that I could find was that rightly or wrongly Pakistan felt or feels that by accepting that assistance, it would be in a better position to deal with India in the solution of the Kashmir problem. I do not know how that can happen, in view of the expressed opinion of America that these weapons are not to be used against another country. But I had been to