

smell what is correct. I do not want, Sir, to repeat what I said earlier.

(Time bell *rings*.)

Last time I actually gave, one by one, what the Government can do today about the official language.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your fifteen minutes are over.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I will take two minutes more and then sit down.

I mentioned the points one, two, three and so on. Immediately for the All India services Hindi should be made optional. A man should be allowed to answer in Hindi. You can say that within six months all Government servants shall learn Nagri. Then you have got all these sign boards. In our very lobby you have got this 'Ayes' and 'Noes'. Instead you can say 'Han' and 'Nan'. Why can't you do that? We have got our official letter papers all in English. Why can't they be in Hindi? It can be done easily tomorrow. Then we get our invitations for tea parties. I can understand invitations in Tamil, I can understand them in Telugu, I can understand them in Bengali if it is an invitation for a tea party but we put all that in English.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have also forgotten Hindi, Mr. Mal-kani.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: The urge is lacking but then you talk of big things, of our Rash-tra Bhasha, our cultural Bhasha, the university stage and so many other things and we get lost in controversy. I want to avoid all controversy. If we have that, then English will stay, Hindi will not come in and the regional languages will be in a mess. I want the regional languages to come unto their own immediately in their own States and I want Hindi also to come in gradually and progressively. The Englishmen have left us but we refuse to let English go; we stick to English. English should have gone away with the Englishmen.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about your Resolution, Mr. Malkani?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is a bigamous resolution.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: After hearing the hon. Home Minister, who is not here, who has not heard what I have been saying, I feel he has given some sort of assurance and that assurance makes me beg leave to withdraw this Resolution.

The Resolution\* was, by leave, withdrawn.

#### RESOLUTION REGARDING U.S. MILITARY AID TO PAKISTAN

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

"That this Council is of opinion that Government should invite a convention of the leaders of different political parties and prominent independents in the country to discuss the situation — arising out of the proposed military aid by the U.S.A. to Pakistan and to suggest the line of action to be adopted by the nation in the matter."

Sir, I need hardly emphasise how deeply concerned we feel about this matter. We feel deeply concerned not because we are afraid of any aggression from Pakistan—that would be taking a very narrow and a very superficial view of this very grave matter—but we feel deeply concerned because of the far more grave consequences which inevitably follow from such an arrangement. As a matter of fact Sir, we feel equally concerned about Pakistan. After all, what is Pakistan? It is a twin brother of India, flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. It is not only that it is we in India who think in these terms, it is not only the four crores of Muslims who think and feel the same way but there are many wise men in Pakistan and I have every reason to believe that

\*For text of Resolution, vide col. 2643 *supra*.

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] there is an overwhelming majority of them whose patriotism is above suspicion who feel the same way and think the same way. They definitely feel and they have given expression to their opinion in this matter that this U.S. aid to Pakistan is a great danger to their own freedom and independence. Do we not know, Sir, that the Members of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan have spoken very strongly against this proposed aid to Pakistan? Sir, we also know for certain that when more than half the population of Pakistan got an opportunity to express themselves on this point, they in a very unequivocal manner gave expression to their own view. We know that more than 167 Members of the newly elected Legislature in East Bengal have themselves tabled a resolution and that they have represented—they are Members drawn from all the various parties and represent all the various interests and the view-points but they are united on this matter—that the "resources and manpower of Pakistan will be used for the purposes of American war supremacy and that the freedom and sovereignty of Pakistan will be in danger". They demand that the pact should be scrapped without any further delay. I have every reason to believe that if an opportunity were given for a free expression of view in other parts of Pakistan, there is no doubt that the result is going to be the same. Many leading papers in Pakistan have vehemently opposed this move of military assistance to Pakistan: so also all the countries in the world excepting one or two directly connected in this matter, have given free expression to their opinion in this matter. Particularly, the countries in Asia—Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia and China—have all expressed the opinion that this Pact, instead of getting any security for Pakistan or for any part of the world has given us more tension and more of insecurity. Even in America and in England, there are wise statesmen who have spoken very strongly against this Pact—Senator Cellar who had visited

India and who was acquainted with the conditions here has advised the U.S. Government very strongly against this Pact. Even an ex-Ambassador of America, Mr. Chester Bowles, has written and, on more than one occasion, has expressed himself against this military aid to Pakistan. Of course, we know that the entire Labour Party, representing a very strong group in England have condemned this aid to Pakistan. Mr. Bevan had characterised this move as foolish and! fantastic.

Sir, I have expressed my view in this House before and I repeat with growing conviction today that the master diplomats who carved Pakistan out and who designed it are trying to see that those designs and those purposes for which they carved Pakistan out are fulfilled. We do not realise as a matter of fact what is already happening in Pakistan. I am quoting, Sir, from a despatch of the correspondent of the *London Times*, a friend of the framers of this military aid agreement. It has been observed by an English observer that "no Englishman who visits Pakistan can fail to be impressed at the demonstrations of Pan-Islamic friendship on Friday—I am talking naturally of the 16th of April—when King Saud led a congregation of about a lakh and fifty thousand in prayer on the Polo grounds and they talked of the success of the American policy in whipping up this communal frenzy." He further observes—and I say, Sir, this is much more important—that "Americans are quickly establishing themselves here. Diplomatic privilege has been granted to many technicians and advisers whose participation in Government activities is welcomed at most levels. The drafting of the Five Year National Development Plan of Pakistan, for instance, is to await the arrival of the advisers provided by the Ford Foundation and Harvard University." I am just quoting him Sir. "Thus the closest co-operation between the two countries has been achieved within a few months in the military and economic affairs and

won some reservation in diplomacy also"—that is the observation and that is the summing up, Sir—it is considered not unlikely that the number of American advisers, consultants and technicians will soon exceed all the British officials of the Indian Civil Service who administered this area in the past.

Sir, what comments, can one offer in the face of these facts? It leaves us so sad about Pakistan and I sometimes wonder how people can create and play upon personal jealousies and how people are blinded by personal emotions to destroy a great cause and a great country.

Sir, we definitely resent this military not so much—as I stated at the very outset—because we are fearing any aggression but from the point of view of the very grave consequences that inevitably follow. As a matter of fact, it is a growing conviction with me, Sir, that this military pact definitely sabotages the policy of peace and non-alignment which India had pursued assiduously ever since its independence. It has been the policy of this Government, Sir, that we seal off this area for peace and progress, that this particular area may be left outside the influence of both the power blocs so that we may be able to consolidate our freedom and our independence, so that we may carry on our developmental programmes and try to raise the standard of living which is already very low. It is therefore, Sir, that we never hesitated to give the best of the friendship to those people who were helpful in developing this area. It has been asked on many occasions, "Why should we have accepted any economic assistance and aid?" Economic assistance and aid, it has been argued, is equal to military aid, but even those people who have given this military aid—I quote the Ambassador of Pakistan here—have clearly admitted that the implications and the impact of the military aid are entirely different from that of economic aid. We have accepted this economic aid only because we were anxious to develop our areas and if we were to know that this economic aid was in any way to have

any strings or it was in any way to predominate not only the political and the diplomatic administration of this country but even the economic administration of this country, we would have certainly had nothing to do with this economic aid. In view of what I have stated, Sir, we feel deeply concerned! and we deeply resent the U.S.-Pakistan military pact because our entire policy, the policy of non-alignment and the policy of sealing off this area for ourselves, to keep it out of the war, to keep this area almost as a sanctuary of peace, that policy, that programme is being sabotaged, and we have to understand it. Sir, that this military aid to Pakistan is only a link in a big chain. America which pursued a policy of isolationism for a long time has now come out with vengeance. Now, Sir, it is for the first time, we must remember, that America, through an agreement with Korea, is involved in an entanglement on this continent of Asia. We must also remember, Sir, that American assistance to France and her associate States is going up and it constitutes to-day about 78 per cent, of the entire contribution for the war which is being carried on in Indo-China. Again, Sir, about a hundred million dollar economic and military assistance is being given by America to Japan, an ex-enemy, and this assistance is to be given within six months.

What I am trying to make out is that this assistance to Pakistan is a part of a big policy, a policy which goes out to involve this entire area in our proximity and now the area of our immediate neighbour Pakistan and convert that area into almost a sort of war zone and in the light of the mounting tension and insecurity in the world due to there being two power blocs, in case there is any war this area may be devastated and ravaged. If our policy had been given effect to and if the two power blocs were away from each other and without trying to establish military bases, may be ultimately, in this area, there would have been a very great chance for the

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] tensions being lessened, but when two blocs come face to face, draw, nearer to each other in a pace of war, any small thing can set off the fuse. We have worked definitely for peace for ourselves. We wanted peace for ourselves; we wanted peace to consolidate ourselves but we also worked for the peace of the entire world because we definitely believe in peace and we definitely believe in negotiations. We definitely believe that by talking as friends we can do a considerable lot in reducing the tensions and paving the way for peace and certainly, Sir, our policy has borne fruit in Korea. Anything may be said but we definitely know that through the intervention of India and through the policy of peace followed by this country we have been able to manage a cease fire and! we are advocating the same policy for Indo-China. That way lies peace to that region, peace to us and also peace to the world. But it is this Pact which sabotages that very basic policy to which we have all the time been wedded and the sabotaging of that policy of peace definitely makes us feel very seriously about the whole matter.

Sir, if there was any matter on which every section of population in this country was agreed and in which we felt absolutely one with the Government and the Prime Minister, it was the statement of policy of our Prime Minister in the House of the People on this particular matter.

It is not only that we feel like cooperating, it is not only that we feel that it is our duty to co-operate, but every word that was uttered by the Prime Minister on this particular matter touched the chord of our heart and the response was absolutely spontaneous. We feel absolutely in harmony with every word that has been stated by the hon. Prime Minister on this particular matter in the other House. It is therefore I think that the Government should not at all feel embarrassed in inviting a convention as has been suggested in this Resolution.

It is one thing that a particular party formulates a policy and that policy is supported by others—everybody in the country of course—but it is entirely another thing that that policy and programme is discussed and chalked out by all people sitting together. If the policy and programme is not the policy of a party to which co-operation is sought but if the policy and programme is the national policy and the national programme which has been chalked out by all, it makes a great difference. We feel that we have sat together and we have chalked out this particular policy; we have chalked out this particular programme. I say such a programme is much more important. I was asked by many Members as to why it was necessary that the Government should invite such a convention. As you know, many leading people in this country having faith in different political parties have already convened a convention which is meeting here in Delhi on the 7th, 8th and 9th and this is the very purpose for which they are meeting. This is the only resolution which is going to be discussed. It shows the importance of the matter. It shows how the minds of the people are exercised over this issue. What will happen at the convention, I am not going to anticipate. Of course we will give expression to our views but what is the action which is going to follow, I cannot say. This is not a matter which can be tackled either by the Government exclusively or which can be tackled by any non-officials exclusively. It is certainly a matter which has got to be tackled both by the Government and the people hand in hand. We must definitely sit together and chalk out a plan and programme which must be pursued. It is all right that we have given expression to our views here, that people have given expression to their views and supported the policy of the Government, but do we not know that the masses in the country do not know what is happening? We must educate the people on this point. We must not only educate the people but we must prepare them. It is absolutely-one thing to be panicky; it is absolutely

another thing to be prepared. It is only those people who are not prepared, who get panicky.

When I have stated all these, we must not also forget that in spite of the fact that an overwhelming majority in Pakistan feel that this kind of a pact is a grave danger to their own independence, the ruling party, may be with its legs in the grave, thinks differently. They are the people who are responsible for this Pact and how on earth can we ignore what has been said by the leading members of this party? Sir, if we have taken care to read what has been said by them, we must try to understand what is there between the lines. I particularly invite the attention of the House to the statement of the Prime Minister of Pakistan which he made at Dacca when he said that with this military assistance it will be easier for them to negotiate the Kashmir affair. I cannot attach any other meaning to this except that this military assistance will give them strength to settle the Kashmir issue. As I submitted earlier, it has been my definite conviction that this Kashmir issue would have been settled much earlier but for the intervention of the foreign Powers. This Kashmir issue has been kept hanging for serving their own purpose. They want to use Kashmir only as a bait to hook Pakistan and they have used it definitely now. If we were to follow the discussions that took place in the Pakistan Constituent Assembly, Kashmir figured very much there. I am not bothered about it. I am not going to refer to the rash speeches made by many members. I am not even worried about what was said by an ex-Minister of that country but we cannot certainly ignore what was said by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and what has been said by the Prime Minister of Pakistan. They said that there can be no friendship with India until and unless this Kashmir issue was settled. And they stated that this Kashmir issue could be settled much better when they have got this military assistance. I particularly want to invite the attention of the Government

to what the Foreign Minister of that country said the other day. He said that Kashmir was a very vital matter for Pakistan. Pakistan cannot sustain herself without Kashmir. He emphasized that Pakistan cannot exist without Kashmir. So it is no consideration to Pakistan what Kashmir actually feels about the question; it is no consideration to Pakistan how Kashmir wants to decide its own fate: it is no consideration to Pakistan what is in the best interests of Kashmir itself. What they feel is that Pakistan cannot exist without Kashmir. Whatever may be the decision of Kashmir, they must definitely have Kashmir. That is the clear and definite opinion of the Foreign Minister of that great country. If people, who are in charge of the affairs of that country, feel like that then certainly we must take note of these things. We must also realise that all their actions are directed towards that end. We very earnestly hope that they will take no action which will prove suicidal for themselves and I have every reason to hope that there are many wise men in Pakistan, who have expressed themselves very strongly and I hope that they will stay the hands of people who are out to destroy the freedom and independence of Pakistan. We wanted the best of relations. We wanted to settle the Kashmir issue by negotiations and a very healthy atmosphere had been created but we never knew that the Prime Minister of Pakistan was talking with such reservations and that he had something up his sleeve. Now we have known what it was.

Now, look at what is happening in Afghanistan. There were all sorts of trouble between Afghanistan and Pakistan but the American influence and American money is being used. I do not know what they will do. Supposing the Pakhtoons unfortunately fall a victim to them and there is a fatal decision, an arbitrary decision to attack

Kashmir, Sir, it would be .....(Time bell rings)..... very suicidal for that country, but we have got to be prepared because we have suffered in the past. If there

("Shri H. C. Mathur.] was something which prompted them to attack Kashmir some time back, how has the position changed now? With all the indications that we have— their activities in Afghanistan, the military aid and the expression of opinion by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan it is definitely our duty to be prepared. In fact, we would be making the gravest mistake of our life if we did not educate our people and if we were not prepared for whatever may happen. That word "panicky" is a hackneyed word. We are not panicky. It is an entirely different thing to be prepared. I repeat that it is only those people who are not prepared, who get panicky.

I would add only one word more. We must rise above petty considerations of pride and prejudice. This is certainly a matter on which we can all unite. And there will be another good to the country. Apart from tactfully and strongly dealing with this matter we will be able to unite this country and next when the Prime Minister of India speaks he will be speaking with a voltage of 380 million batteries if we see that all these batteries are surcharged and made to lend all their force and support in favour of what is being done in this matter by this country. Sir. I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This Council is of opinion that Government should invite a convention of the leaders of different political parties and prominent independents in the country to discuss the situation arising out of the proposed military aid by the U.S.A. to Pakistan and to suggest the line of action to be adopted by the nation in the matter."

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I think it is absolutely clear that no single issue, as my friend Mr. Mathur has sug-

gested, has in recent times evoked such spontaneous sense of unity and common approach as the American military aid to Pakistan. This has been very clearly manifested in both the Houses of Parliament and I think the large number of demonstrations and protests that have been organised all over the country simply go to supplement what has been said in Parliament. But, unfortunately—and I say that this is the point which we should consider—this chorus of protests, the almost unanimous disapproval of the proposed military aid, both here and abroad, has not made any perceptible difference in the attitude of the American people and the American legislators. On the contrary, Sir, as I scrutinise some of the recent statements made by very responsible American people and American legislators, I find them harsh and strident against the Indian Prime Minister. Certainly we ought to take notice of it and I think what is pertinent and what we should address ourselves to is what is behind this American attitude. How is it possible that a great nation like America simply goes on unmindful of what is said and felt by a great country like India and in many Asiatic countries. I think, Sir, in the very short time at my disposal, I should submit to the House two or three arguments which appear to be rather basic in the attitude of the American Government and the American people. One has been this, and that has been repeated time and again, that there are no designs against India; that this policy on the part of America is not calculated to jeopardise India's safety, nor is it a token of greater friendship towards Pakistan in preference to that of India. This constitutes an integral part of their policy of containing or combating Communism. And, somehow or other, by a curious and peculiar twist of logic they say that the only way to contain Communism is by a show of force. I need not here go into the validity of that argument

except to say that it is a colossal mistake on the part of the American people to think that ideas or movements of that sort can be checked, vitiated and thwarted by a mere show of force. History, Sir, bears ample testimony to the contrary, and I think this move will be no exception. Justice Douglas, a very eminent jurist of America, has very aptly portrayed the American mind. He says:

"We have to presume that if a nation is not with us it must be against us.

A nation that temporizes on that issue, a country that fails to join us in that crusade against Communism, covertly if not openly ....." "

I do wish, Sir, very earnestly, as a ! person who has lived for many years in America, that we pay heed and attention to the more sober and more progressive views expressed by their own people.

The second argument that has been advanced, is this and many of the articles I have come across say: Why all this fuss on the part of the Indian people and the Indian Prime Minister? We are perfectly willing and we are going to be very generous in offering similar aid to India if India wants it. All I would like to say on this is that it sounds to me to be an extraordinary proposition. There is already tension between India and Pakistan, say A and B. A third person comes to offer a gun to A; B protests; and that third person says: I am perfectly willing to give you two guns if necessary. That is an extraordinary proposition. This at any rate • is not the way of reconciling the differences between countries.

A third argument that has been repeated quite often is that America has given similar aid to many other countries. They have cited, particularly, the military aid to Yugoslavia and Italy. This, they say, has not precipitated any military clash between the two countries; and why,

21 C.S.D.

therefore, should the Indian people assume that the military aid given to Pakistan should necessarily bring about armed conflict between the two countries ? There again, I say, it is not very difficult to expose the fallacy. I do wish only to say that the conditions are different and even if they were similar, the situation has not been too congenial. I am sure, you will remember not very long ago, Marshal Tito did mobilise all his forces. Unfortunately, in the case of Pakistan, their spokesmen have been\* threatening India with invasion, and any help from anywhere or any encouragement is certainly prejudicial to the cause and peaceful relations between the two countries.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to say that America had much long ago initiated a doctrine called the Monroe doctrine named after the American President. The purport or the idea of this doctrine is rather interesting. The whole of South America, and North America, including Mexico and Canada, are, so to say, under the protectorate of the United States and if anybody interferes in the affairs of these countries that move will be considered as prejudicial to the best interests of America and they look upon it as if it were an unfriendly act. Now they have improved upon their doctrine; they have gone much further, to offer aid to Pakistan under the existing circumstances. And, in view of the recent historical background and the present prejudicial attitude of Pakistan towards India, this offer of military aid is certainly an unfriendly act. I do not want to use this official expression and I leave it to the Government of India. And, I think tht American people should be the first to recognise why the Indian people are so very disturbed. I for one should see some doctrine enunciated and proclaimed. I do know that our Prime Minister fights shy of all this, of assuming the leadership of Asia. He voices our opinion in all the councils of the world, but he is **not** out to be

[Dr. Anup Singh.] the leader of the Asian countries. Be that as it may, I think it will serve India's purpose of peace in the world if We were to enunciate and perhaps call it the 'Nehru Doctrine', that if any country, wherever it may be, chooses to interfere in the affairs of any of the Asian countries and aids directly or indirectly one country against another, this move would be considered an unfriendly act. I do hope that more sober voices in America are heard on this question, and it is encouraging to note that a number of people do already appreciate and recognise that this aid is not in the best interests of America. I do hope that their voices will be heard and heeded by the American authorities.

As for the convention sought to be invited by this Resolution, I think the Government of India has already taken adequate steps to meet the situation and after the whole hearted support of all the political parties and both the House of Parliament, their hands will be strengthened. I do not, therefore, think that this proposed convention is likely to serve any particular useful purpose. I am not against it, but I for one feel that the same purpose can be accomplished without the Government of India taking an official initiative in calling such a convention.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, I must confess that I do not feel very enamoured of the Resolution as such, although I believe there is hardly any disagreement, if there is no unanimity, on the facts which underlie this Resolution, because the Resolution says:

"This Council is of opinion that Government should invite a convention of the leaders of different political parties and prominent independents in the country to discuss the situation arising out of the proposed military aid by the **U.S.A. to Pakistan and to** suggest the line

of action to be adopted by the nation in the matter."

The Resolution does not as such say anything as to what we feel about this aid which the U.S.A. has proposed to give to Pakistan. That is taken for granted. I agree. And that is why I said there is unanimity on that proposition, because I do not know of any political party which has expressed itself in opposition to the opinion expressed by the Prime Minister on this issue.

Now the question arises as to why did Pakistan accept this aid. And there is also another very important question, namely, where do we go from here; namely, the expression of our opinion against the aid which has been proposed to Pakistan? Now, when we analyse as to why Pakistan accepted that aid, certain very interesting features, I believe, emerge. I do not agree with what the hon. mover has said, that the people of Pakistan, or the majority of them, or most of them, are opposed to this Pact, although I do not deny that there is a very influential section in Pakistan which is against the Pact. And I have reason to believe that if only in India we had not raised our protest so loud against this Pact, we would have had more protests in Pakistan against the Pact itself. That is the impression which I have been able to gather about this Pact.

#### 1 P.M.

Now, the reason why Pakistan accepted this Pact is, I believe, this. It is not that the leaders of Pakistan do not realise that they are bartering away to a very large extent the independence which they have recently won, because I do not believe that you can have military aid on that scale from any country and still retain your independence. Now, why, even at that cost, should Pakistan have agreed, or the leaders of Pakistan have agreed, to accept the American aid is a very important question. I



believe the reason is Kashmir. And we should not shut our eyes to that fact.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Even without it they would have had it.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There was, I believe, a little bit of contradiction in the argument of the mover when he said that we did not expect any aggression from Pakistan. We are not afraid of any aggression from Pakistan. That is a different proposition. I can understand that. But it is better to realise that whatever may be said by America, or whatever may be said by Pakistan, the only reason that we can see for Pakistan accepting this aid from America is that Pakistanis feel that in their dealings with India in regard to the Kashmir issue they would be able to deal better with India. Now that raises a question on which, I believe, the ordinary people cannot do anything more than bringing to the notice of the Government the fact of this danger, and ascertaining from the Government as to what steps they are taking in this matter, because it becomes a question of defence. And if Pakistan leaders are hoping that with this aid they would be able to deal better with India, and that India will be made to come to terms, then we should like to know as to what action our Government are taking in this matter. I do not think that a convention of this nature will help in the realisation of that objective to any very large extent. It all depends upon the policy that the Government will be adopting in this respect.

Now the argument that is advanced by Pakistan, when we object to their having accepted the military aid, is that we also accept aid from America, but in a different form. Of course, that argument is not tenable, at least not tenable in certain important respects. There is a lot of difference between military aid and economic aid. And even the economic aid that we get is not.....

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Sir, I move that the debate on this Resolution be adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' business in the next session and be taken up as the first item on that day.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the debate on this Resolution (by Mr. Mathur) be adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' business in the next session and be taken up as the first item on that day."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, after this Resolution I believe I cannot continue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. on Monday.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Monday, the 3rd May 1954.