

## MOTION ON ADDRESS TO THE PRESIDENT—*Concid.*

**The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Sir, as the House is aware, this debate on the President's Address, is a new departure, and we have no conventions to cover such a debate. This new Republic has to make its own conventions. I have followed this debate, and we as the Government have welcomed and will always welcome opportunities when hon. Members can criticise the Government or express their opinions about the various activities of the Government. But I have noticed that in the course of this discussion a large number of matters have been raised or referred to, in fact the discussion has been to some extent on the lines of the normal budget discussion.

Now, it is not for me, Sir, to limit the discussion in any way or to restrict it, but I would suggest for your consideration, Sir, and for the consideration of the House, that perhaps the purpose of this debate at the beginning of the session is somewhat lost. It is treated in the same way as a budget debate and I am afraid details and relatively minor matters are also raised in it. The essential nature of this initial debate at the beginning of the session is to give an opportunity to the Opposition in the House to raise major questions of policy in fact to raise something which is tantamount to a vote of no confidence by the House. A new House meeting together, a new Government or a Government carrying on in a new session, wants to give this opportunity to the House to decide then and there whether they approve of that Government and their major lines of policy or not. If instead of that we have a debate on a large number of minor issues, the major issues are rather clouded and obscured, and therefore perhaps the principal object of such a debate is not served. There is a difficulty, I know, in this House because the Opposition is very small in numbers and it is therefore right and fair that some latitude be given.

It is not easy for me within the allotted time to deal with the multitude of questions that have been raised in the House, but I shall only deal with some major matters and to refer to some other matters briefly.

One hon. Member complained that the debate was limited to two days—it has gone a little beyond two days—and I was a little surprised at that complaint because we are not taking away from the rights of the House but we are adding two days for the first time to this kind of general discussion. If the House wants, of course, it can always have a discussion on a specific issue if it is so minded, but a general discussion extended rather indefinitely tends to lose significance; the point at issue is lost; everybody speaks and every subject is raised. It may give a certain satisfaction to an hon. Member or to his constituents that a certain subject has been mentioned, but the significance of that debate is lost.

There are one or two relatively small matters to which I shall refer right at the beginning. One or two hon. Members of this House complained that a sufficient number of women have not been returned to this House. That, of course, is not a matter which concerns Government policy or on which we can say much except that I would like to express my entire concurrence with that complaint and my firm opinion that women had not been given a fair deal in this country, further, in future it is a matter of serious consequence to this country and to this House as to whether a sufficient number of women are returned or not. May I add that in the experience we have had in foreign countries in our delegations, in our appointments of women, say, in the United Nations, appointments made by the United Nations itself, I cannot think of a single instance where that appointment has not justified itself. But I can think of many instances where appointments of men have not justified themselves. Speaking from a good deal of experience, I can tell this House that women who have gone abroad in our delegations and for other work have, each one of them, raised the credit of India and have left a good impression there.

[Then, referring to another matter, an hon. Member, Mr. Tyagi, took exception to the ceremonial that was observed when the President came in. He thought that it was too English for his liking and that we should have conches, or some other ancient instruments, blowing when he came in.

**Shri Tyagi** (Uttar Pradesh): I did not mean that.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: Whether he meant it seriously or not I do not know, but it does raise an interesting point for the consideration of this House and that is this: We are anxious in India to have our own customs and our own ceremonial, but when we adopt a certain practice or ceremonial, which comes from foreign countries, it has a certain meaning, I suppose. We have in this Constitution that we have adopted followed very largely the practice of foreign countries and more especially that of the British House of Commons. We have in our judicial system adopted a good deal from abroad. Would the hon. Member who complained, like us to have armies after the model of the Mahabhartha or modern armies, or use weapons which were used five hundred years ago or weapons that are used now? I say this because there is a tendency in this country in the name of nationalism to promote obscurantism.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya** (Mysore): I take objection to that, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker**: Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: The hon. Member may take objection. I regret to say that the hon. Member merely gives an example of what I was saying.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya**: I repeat my objection.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I referred to the armies of the Mahabhartha and not to the doctrines of the Mahabhartha. So, the hon. Member need not at all get agitated about it. No discourtesy was meant to the Mahabhartha, but the point is that we mix up all the great things of the past with the minor trappings of the past. If we mix up the great things of the past and the minor trappings of the past, the great things suffer, and the minor trappings may remain anyhow. Therefore we must be careful about this. India has suffered sufficiently in the past by being caught in the minor trappings. India became a slave country, a conquered country, because it did not keep pace with the world. If we forget that lesson today, we shall again fall back. Nationalism is a vital force, it is a great force and if we give up any part of the genius of our people and the basic traditions of our people, we lose a great deal thereby; we become rootless. At the same time nationalism often covers a multitude of sins and a multitude of throw-backs on something that is dead and gone. What is communalism? In its very essence it is a throw-back to some mediæval age, to a mediæval state of mind and mediæval habits and mediæval slogans. So, when we talk about foreign customs and Indian customs, let us preserve every single Indian custom and every single Indian way of thought; but let us not go back to something that has no application to the modern world. The President came in. There was no blowing of trumpets. He came keeping in with others. Does Mr. Tyagi object to people walking in step?

**Pandit Balkrishna Sharma** (Uttar Pradesh): The hideous head-dress of the men who followed is objected.

**Mr. Speaker**: Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Does any hon. Member object to military officers accompanying our President? Do the hon. Members object to our military officers wearing the uniform they put on? Do they expect them to go about in the dress I am wearing today or in the dress some hon. Members are wearing?

**Shri Tyagi:** Do you object to *Tilak* and *Arati*?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order; no interruptions.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know what the hon. Member is thinking about. *Tilak* and *Arati*, in the precincts of the House I do object. Outside, I welcome them; in the precincts of the House, I certainly object to them.

**An Honourable Member:** Why?

**Pandit Balkrishna Sharma:** There are differences of opinion on this with you, Mr. Prime Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is why I venture to say to the House and I am deliberately placing before the House certain considerations which moved this Government and the Prime Minister of this Government. It is for the House to choose their Prime Minister and their Government.

**Pandit Balkrishna Sharma:** We have chosen the Prime Minister in spite of our differences.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pandit Balkrishna Sharma will not interrupt. I shall not allow any more interruptions.

**Pandit Balkrishna Sharma:** You may turn me out, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any interruptor will be asked to leave the House.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The House will observe how certain observations made by me which normally speaking I take it would be admitted as obvious have, yet, somehow raised a great deal of excitement and passion.

**Pandit Balkrishna Sharma:** Even you are excited.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have stated and I refer again because these things will occur again and again. The President will come again. The President will come accompanied by his ADCs and military officers. If the ADCs and military officers are to accompany the President, are they to wear their military uniform or are they to put on a special uniform for accompanying the President? Is our Army to put on a different uniform? One has to be logical about it. One has to think about these things. We can and we should consider what new customs we should introduce in this House and in this country but are we to introduce anything which gives us a sense of aloofness and sloppiness, which has been the bane of this country and which would lead inevitably to inefficiency and to many other evils. We live in an age where we have to be efficient whether on the political plane or economic plane or any other plane.

We criticise this Government for lack of efficiency, and may be, the criticism is right. I admit that in many ways the Government ought to be more efficient. But, all these qualities of efficiency, etc., come in a certain context, in *milieu*, in environments. You cannot have environments and *milieu* which totally lack efficiency and carry on your activities and then expect efficiency to rise as a phoenix out of ashes of inefficiency. Therefore, we have

12 NOON to be clear about our ways of life, and ways of functioning on the political, economic and social planes.

An hon. Member talked about revolutionaries. I think it was my friend, Mr. Tyagi, who said, we should have a Government of revolutionaries. I should very much like to know Mr. Tyagi's definition of a revolutionary, because a revolutionary has been defined in many ways. In the old days, possibly, a normal definition of revolutionary activity would be an activity directed against the foreign Government. I accept that; I agree.

**Shri Tyagi:** I consider you as the ideal revolutionary.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am flattered and gratified by this. May I say that I entirely agree with Mr. Tyagi? But being a revolutionary at a time when we have to oppose a foreign imperialistic Government, one can understand. It is a clear issue. Therein too there may be a difference of opinion in the sense that one man takes to the bomb and calls himself a revolutionary although his action may actually be counter-revolutionary in consequence, in the true mechanics of revolution. Yet by some strange misuse of language, a bomb thrower has been called a revolutionary. I would call him a counter-revolutionary. Here is the test of a revolution against a political order represented by a foreign Government. Now that the foreign Government is gone, we are facing other problems. What is the test of revolution now? You see many of the people who were revolutionaries in the old sense of the word previously, are no longer revolutionaries in the modern sense of the word. In fact, some of them may possibly be classed as actually reactionaries. So it becomes difficult to understand and define these terms except in the modern context in the new political or economic, social order, call it what you will. Merely because a person was a revolutionary as against the British Government, therefore he is necessarily a revolutionary today, does not follow. Hon. Members know very well, some people who were our colleagues in the old days, intimate colleagues in the fight against the British are now encouraging sabotage in the country. Take some of the communists. They were our colleagues some time. Today, they are carrying out an anti-social policy of destruction and promoting chaos. They were revolutionaries. There are others who were our colleagues who are opposing us. There are others again who may not be opposing us on the political plane, but on the economic plane, they hold different views in this House. How many views are represented on the economic plane? It is difficult to talk about who is a revolutionary and who is not till you define the terms.

There are some other matters which are important; I shall refer to them rather briefly. There is the question of food. I think hon. Mr. Anthony hinted at the fact that the target date we have laid down for achieving self-sufficiency in food is not likely to be achieved and, therefore, we had better advance it by two or three years. I do not know where he gets his figures or his information. But, I might inform him that we are going to achieve that and we will achieve it. I might inform him, it just does not matter what his information is, I am convinced and so far as I am concerned, I am determined to achieve it. What is more, I might inform him that we have gone a good way in that direction.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

That is, I speak not merely in terms of hope and expectation, but in terms of actual achievement today, that is, with such facts and figures as we have got; we are making good progress on the food front. Naturally we would like it to be faster and better. Unfortunately, there has been a lack of rainfall in Madras and in other places. In spite of that, we are doing fairly well, and we hope to do better in the next year. I have not the exact figures before me, but in this year, i.e., 1950, the amount of food we propose to import is considerably less than half last year's. Sometime or the other, the House would be informed of these details by the Food Minister, but it is much less and I have no doubt that the year after the next, it will be much less still.

**Shri Sidhva** (Madhya Pradesh): We have got sufficient food, Sir.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Then many hon. Members referred to controls and expressed very strong disagreement at the continuation of any controls. This is not the time to discuss this question of controls. It is a complicated, and difficult matter which this House, I presume, would discuss some time or the other. I should like to say this that while the inconvenience and even the corruption due to controls is obvious, there is another and a very important aspect of this question, which no responsible Government can possibly ignore. When last time we withdrew controls, something in the nature of minor disasters followed. It may be that if you are prepared for a relatively long term facing disasters and crises, we will right ourselves in the end. But it is not an easy matter to face this crisis for a year or two running just in the hope of adapting ourselves and I am quite convinced that our removal of controls two years ago was a wrong thing. We made a mistake in doing so and if we had not removed them, we would be much better off (*Hear, hear*). I am not talking of all controls; of course, some may be removed—I am talking about the basic things and especially food. It is a most dangerous thing to play about with the food crisis. On the one side we had to make an attempt to lessen prices of the basic necessities, especially food etc., and on the other, if we take the slightest risk the thing goes up and anti-social people profit by it. I do think whatever credit this Government may have, it will be infinitely lessened. However, these are matters for careful consideration by Government and by this House.

Sugar was referred to. I might inform the House that the Tariff Board report on sugar has been received by Government, and it is going to be considered very soon. It is just a brief document about a thousand pages. I am told it is 450 pages, but it is difficult suddenly to grasp it.

Two or three other matters I will not deal with. Criticism has been made on the subject of economy, on the subject of co-ordination and efficiency; these are very vital matters, but these are not matters of policy and we all agree that there should be economy, there should be efficiency, there should be co-ordination; there is no disagreement; we may fail in bringing it about and we can discuss the measures to bring it about, but it is not a matter of disagreement of policy.

Then again there is the question of displaced persons, refugees. There again, broadly speaking, there is no disagreement; there may be disagreement:

as to the method of approach, as to the method of doing something. We are all agreed that it is the responsibility of Government and the country to provide for them, to rehabilitate them, to help them in every way; but apart from the question of limitation of resources, money etc., there are a large number of other factors. I think and I hope, the House will agree with me that in spite of our financial condition, the Government have not really spared money in this matter. We could have naturally if we had funds like the U.S.A. thrown about much vaster sums. But I feel honestly that we, that is, the Government have been in error in the approach to this problem, right from the beginning. Money was required; money is required but money is a secondary factor. After all, it is the human approach that is required on the part of the refugees, on the part of those who deal with the refugees. It is the approach of work that is required; people talk so much about loans and monetary help, and some people say "put on a new tax for the refugees". I have come to the conclusion that while money might no doubt give relief, so far as the process of rehabilitation goes, it is not a question of money so much but other qualities that we ought to produce in ourselves and if you like, in the refugees. You will not rehabilitate a many by giving him Rs. 200 or Rs. 2,000. The average person thinks in terms of opening a little shop. Well, some shops may go on; most shops will not probably go on; you cannot add thousands of shops all over and you can only think of rehabilitation ultimately in terms of productive effort, that is adding to the wealth of the country and adding to the wealth of the individual concerned. Now, I do not think we as a Government.....

**Shri Kamath** (Madhya Pradesh): Can Government find work for them all?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I am saying that, I think, we as a Government have not. In the first couple of years or a year and a half, we were overwhelmed with this problem. We did not perhaps lay that stress on productive effort as we should have done. We want to do it now; we try to do it now but we find enormous difficulties on every side. I do not wish to be unfair because I think a very large number of displaced persons have made every effort; they have played the game and I am not criticising them in the least. Where they have had a chance, they have done well. Unfortunately, a considerable number think in terms not of effort. We have offered work to them, solid work, which will earn them some money but they have refused that work, and they have simply sat there and asked for doles, asked for loans of money, when we are giving them good solid work. So there is that difficulty. It is not a difficulty peculiar to this country; wherever this refugee problem has arisen, the same difficulties have come to exist and the refugee problem is an old problem in Europe, and in other parts of Asia.

Now, may I come to some of the major issues—foreign policy? There has been very little criticism as far as I could gather of our foreign policy, except in so far as it applied to Pakistan. So I need say little about our foreign policy. I would like to say this, however, and the House will forgive me for referring to it, as I happen to be the Foreign Minister, that the general record of our foreign policy in the last two years and half since we attained Independence is a very satisfactory record, judged from the normal standards of the status of the nation in external affairs, or in international affairs. There is no doubt that India for a variety of reasons, not merely because of the policy pursued but for other reasons also, stands very high in the scale of nations in regard to international affairs today. Now, as the House knows, we have adopted a policy which has

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

been variously described as one of neutrality or non-alignment, etc. I dislike the word "neutrality" because there is a certain passivity about it and our policy is not passive. When some countries or some critics of ours say that our policy should side with this group or that group and we are criticised as sitting on the fence, I do not quite understand; or, I do understand what they say, but I do not appreciate it at all. A country's foreign policy ultimately emerges from its own traditions, from its own urges, from its own objectives and more particularly from its recent past. Now India has had a recent past which is powerfully affecting her. During the last twenty or thirty years we have tried, even when we were not the Government but were in opposition or a party conducting revolutionary activities, to lay down the basis of our foreign policy. I submit that within the limits of a changing situation we have tried to follow that policy which we as the Congress laid down years ago. Apart from that, it seems to me extraordinarily presumptuous on anybody's part to ask me to join this or that bloc. Am I so insignificant, is my country so small, so lacking in importance, so lacking in worth or force that it cannot say what it wants to say, that it must say ditto to this or that? Why should my policy be the policy of that country or this country? It is going to be my policy, the Indian policy and my country's policy.

It is true that no policy is isolated from others' policies. We cooperate with other countries. Naturally we seek the cooperation of others. We have our likes and dislikes. In regard to our likes they help us to cooperate but in regard to our dislikes they come in the way. But because we want to be friendly with other countries we tone down our dislikes deliberately.

When we look round the world today we see that the world is blinded by fear and hatred. It is an extraordinary position and it is becoming more and more difficult for any country to view any subject or any problem objectively. Because of this enveloping fear and hatred, all this leads them to violence and to preparations for violence and for war. What it will ultimately lead to I cannot say. But I still think that it is a possibility with grave disasters and catastrophes for the world, which might be avoided, not by the effort of India alone, but there are people thinking on these lines in other parts of the world—earnest people of goodwill. It is a possibility that might be avoided, because the alternative is a world war. It is so terrible to contemplate that whatever the result of that war may be, one thing is dead certain, that most things that we value in life, in every country and in every part of the world will vanish. Whether you call yourself a Communist, a Socialist or any 'ist', the very basis of progress and civilised existence will probably be destroyed for a generation or two. May be some third or fourth generation may arise from the ashes of that war. So any person who thinks at all earnestly about these problems must come to the conclusion that every effort must be made to prevent this great catastrophe descending upon the world.

I am not vain enough to imagine that any efforts that our Government may make will make a vital difference to world affairs. Yet every little effort counts and in any event I do not see why our efforts should not be in that direction and why we should take for granted that war is inevitable and therefore give up all attempts to prevent it. So our foreign policy has been aimed at that.

Then there is another question about our foreign policy, namely, our association with the Commonwealth of Nations. Some hon. Members had criticised that. May I beg the House or those members who object to it, to consider this question separated and isolated from past sentiment? Because I do feel that it is the past sentiment that governs them more than the present situation. Presumably some people imagine that by our association with the Commonwealth some kind of restricting or limiting factor comes into our activities—political, economic, foreign, domestic and whatever else. That is completely unjustified. There is no limiting factor. By our joining the United Nations certain limiting factors came in as they must come in if you join any organisation of the type. You join, let us say, the International Monetary Fund: certain limiting factors come in immediately you join an international organisation. But in our association with the Commonwealth there is not an iota of a limiting factor.

As the House knows well, the Constitution does not mention the Commonwealth. It is not a constitutional issue, it is a Gentleman's agreement between the countries of the Commonwealth which we deliberately after serious thought entered into, because we felt that it was to our advantage. After the experience of some months of it I am more than ever convinced that it is to our advantage.

I think an hon. Member said something about devaluation. Whether devaluation was good or bad has nothing to do with our being in the Commonwealth. We may carry out any policy we like whether we are in the Commonwealth or not. When people think of the Commonwealth influencing us in regard to our policies, may I suggest to them that it is also possible that we may influence others greatly too in the right direction?

Then reference was made to certain countries like South Africa, where a policy is being pursued which brings it into conflict with us in various phases of our activities. Questions are often asked of me: Did you consider the South African issue or the Pakistan issue at the Colombo Conference or somewhere else? My answer invariably is that we did not, because deliberately we do not want to make the Commonwealth Conference a kind of tribunal or a kind of superior body to decide our issues. We are independent countries: we deal with one another directly. The House knows that by our being in the Commonwealth there has been no difference whatever in regard to our dealings with the South African issue. If we go out of the Commonwealth it will make no difference. It might, to some extent, slightly, in some ways, make it more easy for us to deal with each country in the Commonwealth as that country deals with us absolutely on a reciprocal basis.

Apart from the general reason that there is absolutely no object in our breaking an association which might help and which certainly cannot hinder but which helps also in the larger context of world affairs. There is one major reason for our being in the Commonwealth and that is that a very large number of Indians live abroad in what are called British Colonies or dependencies. I am not talking about the self-governing or independent countries of the Commonwealth but other places. By our remaining in the Commonwealth those people are in a better position. Otherwise they would have to make a sudden choice to break with India or to break with the country where they reside. It would have put millions of our people in a very difficult position and it was totally unnecessary for them to be put into that position. So that is another advantage.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Then coming to Pakistan and our relations with Pakistan, many hon. Members have referred to this and have expressed their opinion that we have been too gentle, that we have been indulging in appeasement or that we have not been firm enough and so on and so forth. Well, it is a little difficult to consider a vague indictment of this kind. One can discuss specific matters and give an answer. It is difficult, because, first of all, one has not got a grip of any particular point, and, secondly, in the very delicate state of relations between India and Pakistan during the last two and a half years everything that has happened does not see the light of day. What we do we do not shout from housetops, and therefore sometimes all the facts are not before the public. But I do not wish to take shelter behind that argument. Most of the facts are before the public and before this House. I should like the House and hon. Members, if not now at a later stage, to tell me what their views are. I welcome them to come and tell me about any specific matter; what they think should be done and what they think should not be done. This vague idea of 'being firm' does not help.

**Pandit Maitra** (West Bengal): Has not the Cabinet any idea about it?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru** : The Cabinet has the clearest ideas and is acting according to them.

**Pandit Maitra**: According to them?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: Naturally. According to their own ideas. You are criticising the Cabinet's ideas. But I am asking hon. Members to help me in regard to any specific matter. If you permit me I shall go on and explain myself on this little issue.

**Pandit Maitra**: Please do.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: This partition problem was from every point of view a very unnatural thing. Well, we accepted it and we continue to accept it, and we will act accordingly. But it created—not so much the partition perhaps, but the events that happened after the partition—deep wounds in India and in Pakistan—among the people I am talking about—and those wounds will take some time in healing as the President said in his Address. We have to deal with vast masses of people in India and Pakistan.

How are we to deal with this question? Hon. Members have been pointing out that in Pakistan wrong methods are employed, wrong things are done, and that they have not followed a straight policy and so on. I agree. But would hon. Members suggest to this Government also not to follow a straight policy in regard to Pakistan? I want that question to be considered and answered straightaway. Because, I am quite convinced in my mind that whatever policy Pakistan may follow, we should not follow a crooked policy.

**Sardar B. S. Man** (Punjab): Let it not be a weak policy.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I say that not merely on grounds of high principles but from the narrowest grounds of the sheerest opportunism. If I have gained any experience in the last thirty or forty years of my public life, it is this, and certainly if I learnt any lesson from the Great Master who taught us many

things it is this that a crooked policy does not pay in the end. It may pay temporarily.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nobody wants that.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not suggesting that anybody is asking me to do so.

**Pandit Maitra:** Please have just the policy necessary for the country at this moment,—for the safety and security of the country.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. This is a reply coming from the Prime Minister and is not an occasion for putting questions.

**Pandit Maitra:** But it is highly debatable.

**Mr. Speaker:** He is giving his own views and they must be considered coolly and dispassionately.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was saying that anything that is in the nature of a crooked policy does not pay in the end. I do not suggest—how could I—that any Member is suggesting such a policy, but there are people outside the House who do suggest it and that is why I referred to it. There are people and organisations who are suggesting it. Some of the things suggested by them—like the Hindu Mahasabha—seem to me the stupidest of things. But there is a market place for stupidity and cupidity in this country. I therefore want to make it perfectly clear that these suggestions which, according to me, are crooked suggestions and come out of crooked minds will not be accepted by us, whatever the consequences. Therefore it was not to this House that I was addressing myself but to other people outside who say things irresponsibly which affect our foreign policy, which give a cause to the people on the other side of the frontier, if I may say so, to misbehave more. We are a great country and this House has great authority over matters of State, domestic and foreign. What this House says or what an hon. Member in this House may say is carried to far countries and other people judge of our country by that statement. Therefore we have to speak with a great deal of responsibility. Our lightest utterance may have a special meaning to other countries. I try, in spite of a certain failing on my part to talk rashly occasionally, to restrain myself. And I have tried in regard to these matters—foreign matters or Pakistan—to speak with as much moderation as I could. Because, I was convinced that while on the one hand we must be strong enough and firm enough in our policies and in our preparations—whatever they may be, whether military or other—and while we must not give in on any point that we consider wrong, whatever may happen, still our attitude should be restrained, moderate and friendly. Whether it is possible to combine the two or not it is difficult to say. Anyhow that is my training, and that was the training that we got even when we were fighting a powerful Imperialism and risking everything in that fight, that is, not to bow down to evil but to be firm with it, not to compromise with it but to prepare to meet it on every front, and yet to be gentle in your appearance, moderate in your language and not to meet it on a level of evil. Perhaps some hon. Members may mistake our soft language sometimes, or our moderate approaches sometimes, for lack of firmness. But why not examine the actions? See what the actions are, whether they are in the plains or on the mountains of Kashmir or somewhere else. Study those actions.

**Pandit Maitra:** Study the evacuation.

**Sbri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I beg of you to consider here that we are facing a new situation, at any rate a new development, to which my hon. friend drew attention yesterday? The exodus from East to West Bengal is increasing. That is a bad thing and everything should be done to check it on the one hand and to help those who come over, on the other, I agree. But behind it lies something much bigger. If this kind of thing goes on, obviously, it may lead to disastrous consequences. Should we in a moment of anger say or do things which precipitate further crises and further disasters? I submit to this honourable House that a responsible government should not do that. It should take steps, of course—every effective step. But steps are not shouting aggressively in a loud language. Unfortunately in the modern world the old traditions of diplomacy have been forgotten. Diplomacy in the olden days may have been good or bad but people in those days did not curse each other in public. Today the new tradition is to carry on this verbal warfare in the strongest language in public. Well, may be that is better than actually fighting, but that leads to fighting or may lead to fighting.

So, I submit that in our relations with Pakistan we have, first of all, to follow this policy of firmness and adequate preparation, but always to have a friendly approach. Again, there can be no doubt—I have no doubt and hon. Members surely can have no doubt—that India and Pakistan, as they are situated, geographically and otherwise, and with their historic background, cannot carry on for ever as enemies. It is impossible. Catastrophe after catastrophe will come; either we will wipe each other off or one will wipe the other off and suffer the consequences. So, that is not possible. We are passing through trouble and crisis. It may last another year or another two or three years, I do not know. It is largely due to a certain fund of hatred and violence accumulated during the pre-partition days. We are inheritors of that, and we have to face that. Forget the Governments—our Government and the Government of Pakistan—but think of the millions of people who live next-door to each other. Ultimately, at some time or other, those millions will have to come together, will have to co-operate, will have to be friends. There is no doubt about it. Now, let us think of that future which may not be very distant and let us not do things today which may lead to generations of rivalry and conflict. We have to think of that future. Therefore, I beg of this House to consider this matter

We have, as the House knows, offered to make a joint declaration with the Government of Pakistan for the avoidance of war. Some hon. Members may think it is a gesture of weakness. Well, I am sorry if they think so because it has nothing to do with weakness. It is a gesture of strength. We know exactly how strong we are, we know exactly up to what limit we are going to permit things to happen after which we do not permit what we do not want to allow to happen. We have made that offer because we were convinced that if that was agreed to that would lay the foundations of a gradual improvement, not sudden, and the settlement of various questions. I want hon. Members to think of any question which they want to be decided by war and war alone. I can understand war in the context of defence. I do not wish to understand war in the context of aggression, and I want to make that perfectly clear on behalf of myself and my Government. We have fallen far enough from what might be

called the Gandhian ideology, but still to some extent it influences us. But it is not a question of the Gandhian ideology or of any other ideology; it is a question of looking at the world today with clear eyes. As the House remembers, one fateful sentence of Mahatma Gandhi was when he warningly said something to the effect that the countries of the world were looking at each other with blood-shot eyes. He said, "Keep your eyes clear". So, I try so far as I can to keep my eyes clear when I look at the scene, whether it is the world scene or the Indian scene or the relations between India and Pakistan, because nothing good comes out of blood-shot eyes—no clear thinking and no clear action. If it is imagined, as one hon. Member hinted at, that people grow weak because we do not have blood-shot eyes or we do not urge them on to war all the time, well, that is not only a wrong policy but a policy of despair. If we can keep up to a certain level only by being given strong drinks and intoxicating words, well, some time or the other we will collapse when we have not got them. Therefore, it is well to be prepared for all contingencies, whether in the military way or any other way. It is well to be firm, it is well not to bow down to evil. But it is also well always to be conciliatory, always to stretch out your hand to those who will hold it, because though the Government may not hold it, the people will hold an outstretched hand—not only the people of any particular country but the people of all the countries of the world.

In regard to Kashmir I shall not say much because the matter is before the Security Council. The House knows that I have been intimately connected with the development of affairs in Kashmir in many ways and it has given me more anxious moments than almost anything else. I suppose in minor matters we may have erred here and there, but in major matters I am quite convinced that what we have said and done has been right, and I am not sorry for any major action that we have taken in the last 2½ years in regard to Kashmir.

Finally, if I may deal with perhaps the biggest question that faces us today, that is the economic position. That again, I am not going to deal with fully because it is a vast subject and it will also come up for consideration in various ways. The House will have noticed the reference to the constitution of the Planning Commission in the President's Address. Of course, Government had previously on many occasions assured the House that such a Commission would be constituted. So, it is nothing new; indeed it might well be said by hon. Members that there has been some delay. Well, we attach a great deal of importance to this and I hope that with this Planning Commission and with the other steps that we shall take we shall be in a somewhat better position to handle our problems.

There has been, there often is, a kind of argument against capital, against labour, and much is said about what the capitalists do or do not do. I should like this House to consider this question apart from the personal equation that capitalists are good and capitalists are bad. As a matter of fact, the state of India is such today that capitalism is very immature here; it has not developed as in the other countries of the world. But the point is that our capitalists are the product of our history, of our economic system and the rest of it. They are not to blame. You change your system, if you like, gradually or rapidly. It is no good blaming them. But I will say this, that our capitalists, good and bad—and many of them I have no doubt are very patriotic—do lack what I call a social outlook. And if I may extend that, it is not the capitalists only but the non-capitalists also lack the social outlook. We talk a great deal about doing good to the masses. When I say "we", I am not referring so much to the hon. Members in this House but to the people in the country. And yet, I would beg to say that we have not as a whole developed that social outlook yet which, if I may say so, is a common factor of Communism, Socialism and even

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

capitalism in advanced countries. Without that basic thing, we talk of bringing about changes at the top by sudden laws. Well, let us have the laws, by all means, which will help, but ultimately, laws are the product of a nation's thought, a nation's customs, activities and progress. All the laws in the world cannot make the people honest. You have got the Criminal Code, and yet you talk of corruption—and rightly too. It is not the lack of law that leads to corruption but something else. It is not the lack of law that possibly leads to that lack of social outlook and social sense in many of us, but something else which we have to develop. We have to consider our economic policies carefully and more from the point of view of which economic policy helps in the development of social outlook, and which helps in the hindrance of the anti-social outlook. That, I think, is the test. You cannot change millions of people suddenly. It cannot be done, however rapidly you may progress. You may, if you like, destroy what you have got and have a clean slate. Sometimes, that has to be done. But the process of destruction leads to utmost misery for long periods of time, may be generations. It is not worth while, unless it is forced down upon you. Therefore, you want to make progress without destruction, except destroying something that is bad.

So we have this vast problem before our country—the problem of raising 340 or 350 million people; raising them economically certainly; raising them educationally and raising them in so many unconscious ways, thus developing a new outlook amongst them. It is all integrated together. It is not merely an economic problem. It is not merely a political problem. It is a social problem and it affects our life in a hundred ways. Therefore, I am surprised sometimes to see an hon. Member who wants the most radical economic changes,—nationalisation and socialisation—yet, in another context, exhibiting an outlook which seems to be completely opposed to that economic reform, because it does not fit life as an integrated whole. You cannot separate life into bits. Therefore, this House has to face this tremendous responsibility. This new Republic begins full of strength, vigour, hope and earnestness, at the same time, with these tremendous problems before it. I must say that, if we apply ourselves in a spirit of concerted effort, earnestness and understanding to these problems, we shall go some way to achieve success.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have now to put the amendments as well as the original motion to the House. I will first place the amendments.

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Madhya Pradesh): Before you put the amendments to vote, may I enquire if one could withdraw one's amendment if one so chooses in view of the Prime Minister's definite assurance?

**Mr. Speaker:** Certainly, yes. I will enquire if the hon. Members wish me to put their amendments to the vote. If they wish, I shall certainly place them.

**Shri Hossain Imam** (Bihar): In view of the Prime Minister's statement, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

*The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.*

**Prof. K. T. Shah** (Bihar): I would wish my amendment to be put to vote.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

“That at the end of the motion the following be added:

“but regrets—

- (a) that Government still adheres to the decision to continue India's association with the Commonwealth of Nations notwithstanding the policy of some members of that Commonwealth showing racial inequality; and