

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

for all practical purposes, Ceylonese. And, they want India to recognise that every applicant of the Indo-Pakistan origin, who has not been able to acquire citizenship rights under the stringent laws of Ceylon is an Indian. I submit that if you recognise that, not only 100,000 or 150,000 but 850,000 persons of Indian origin will have to be taken back. The Ceylon Government are not in a mood to give citizenship rights to more than 100,000 or 200,000 Indians. They want essential labourers for scavenging or for tea-plucking whom they want to keep with them and call them Indians. They want us to recognise them as Indians. They want us to be their coolie depot. Therefore, I submit that in our dealings with Ceylon, though we wish them well, as our Prime Minister wished well to Pakistan, we should be firm. They are conjuring up bogeys of future Communist India invading Ceylon. This is the answer that they give to their people for not having taken over the Trincomali base from Britain. This is the answer given by Mr. Kotelawala, the Ceylonese Prime Minister. If this is the sort of attitude, I see no reason why India should give in even a bit. Not that I suggest that we should liberate the Indian settlers as some other countries are liberating their people, but, if we cannot help the Indian settlers, let us not hinder them, by pleasing Ceylon and allowing them to use their Communist bogey to oust the Indian settlers and throw them into the Palk Straits.

Let us not give recognition to the Pan Sinhalese movement which is there now. This movement says that nobody who is not descended from those Sinhalese who were there in the country in 1815 the descendants of the people who betrayed King Ehala-pola to the British invaders is a Ceylonese and should not be recognised as such.

More than that, there is another population of about a million Tamils. Another bogey is also raised that the

Indian Tamils and the Jaffna Tamils jointly will become a Tamil race and become the Tamil masters in Ceylon. It is all wishful thinking or fear complex. We cannot allow our people to be uprooted and thrown away like this to allay the fears of the Ceylon politicians.

One more point, Sir. It has been reported that our Finance Minister said that the Indian Government cannot take the responsibility for the Indians who are being deported from Ceylon. I do not know whether he said so or not. But, there was a Press report to that effect. I would like to have a clarification and an assurance from the Prime Minister that those people who are displaced from Ceylon will be treated as displaced persons—as the displaced persons from Pakistan are treated in India. If people are rich and have got the means of livelihood, we do not mind much what happens to them. But, there are lots of people who are of the middle class, who are labourers, who have nothing to fall back upon in India and they will have to be beggars in the streets of South India. It will not be healthy or good for our country, for our prestige and peace and tranquillity in our country. In our own interests and in the interests of justice and fairplay, I request the Government to deal with Ceylon in a proper and firm manner and not yield to enticement of intimidation.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Chairman, Sir....

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

...I am deeply grateful to the House for the generous terms in which nearly all the Members have spoken, and have referred to our broad policies in regard to international affairs. I am particularly grateful to the hon. Member opposite, Acharya Kripalani, for his overgenerous language in this respect. And, may I say that, in a large

measure, I accept many of his criticisms also. He referred not only to our successes but to our failures. I admit the failures, except that I would describe them somewhat differently. Failure has some finality about it. I would say: 'lack of success'; because we continue trying for success and I hope that we shall achieve success. But, I admit that completely we have not achieved success in regard to the many matters he mentioned—Kashmir, Pakistan, South Africa, Ceylon and Goa. He referred to one or two other points. For instance, he said that we were unable to stop the formation of the South East Asia Treaty Organisation. Well, I do submit that we can hardly be accused of being unable to do that. All we can do is not to associate ourselves with it. We do not control the ways and activities of the nations of the world.

Now, perhaps, it would be as well if I dealt with some matters, which will not take much time, to begin with, and having disposed of them, then dealt with two or three questions which have attracted much attention in this House—Goa, for instance, more specially—and I should like to say something, again, about what is called the 'Commonwealth link'; then finally, about our broad policy which covers all these matters.

I should like the House to remember that, if we have a broad policy, other smaller matters have to be integrated to that broad policy. Hon. Members may like one part of it and not like something else; but, I should like them to see the link between the two, the logical link, that if we do not follow up something here, that affects our doing something elsewhere.

Acharya Kripalani hinted at the fact that our policy in regard to Goa was perhaps influenced by what the United Kingdom said, the Commonwealth said or somebody else said. Prof. Mukerjee also said, in stronger language, much the same thing. Now, I am not dealing with the Commonwealth question at the present moment—I shall do so later—but what

I am venturing to suggest is this: that, what we did in Goa—whether it was right or wrong is another matter—or what we are doing there, has nothing to do with what the United Kingdom said or any other country said to us. It had not the slightest influence on us. In fact, if I may say so, the effect of it on us was a contrary effect; because one does not like to be told as to what is right or wrong in regard to one's policy, by another country. Also, I would add, that in regard to Goa, what we were told by some countries was not exactly what, perhaps, some Members imagine. No country told us to do this or not do that. They certainly expressed their concern about the situation and their hope that this will be settled amicably.

Now, I am free to confess that even the manner in which they expressed their concern in this matter did not seem to be the right approach or a proper approach. As the House knows, in our replies to them we made that perfectly clear. But, I can assure the House that those representations to us had not the least effect on our policy in regard to Goa—whether it is right or wrong we can judge. That policy was governed by our understanding of our broader policies and our trying to fit in Goa in the context of those broader policies.

Here I may mention that I was myself grieved at a certain development that took place about four or five days ago on the Diu border, where the police there had to indulge in what is called 'mild lathi charge' on some volunteers who were endeavouring to enter the Portuguese territory in Diu. I do not blame the police for that, because the police got into a difficult situation when they were being stoned by those volunteers. Of course—if I may say so in parenthesis—the so-called 'satyagraha' takes a very curious turn in India. Nowadays everything is 'satyagraha' however violent, however aggressive and however far removed from our own conception of satyagraha it might be. Anyhow, the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

poor police were put in a somewhat difficult position when they were being stoned and, apparently, they indulged in some kind of a lathi charge which injured some people. But, that apart, I was grieved by that, because it is not the function of our police or our people to indulge in any kind of violence in this matter. Suppose we decide—as we did decide—that it is better for large groups or bands of Indian nationals not to go into Portuguese possessions in India; that we should discourage them; that may be a right or wrong policy, but, certainly, it does not mean that we should indulge in violence and give effect to that policy. We made that perfectly clear to the State Governments and to the police concerned.

I should like to refer to another matter. I am told—I was not here then—that an hon. Member objected to our having given recognition to the Pope on the ground that it was wrong to give recognition to any religious dignitary. Further, he added that the Pope has created so much trouble for us in regard to Goa. Of course, both those statements are completely wrong. We recognised the Pope not in his capacity as a religious head—that, of course, is there—but as a temporal head of an independent State. It is true that he is the temporal head; sovereign head of an independent State that follows from his other positions, status etc. It is not our recognising any religious head as such, though, of course he is the religious head of a very big, large and widespread community. Further, it is quite wrong to say, and I do repudiate it, that the Pope has given us any trouble in regard to Goa. In fact, the dignitaries of the Catholic Church in India—I am not talking and I cannot of course speak about every individual here,—but the religious leaders of the Catholic Church in India—publicly expressed themselves in favour of the movement of the Goans for merger with India.

In fact, the House will remember that one of the main arguments advanced by the Prime Minister of Portugal in this respect was, that Goa was a Christian, and more particularly, a Roman Catholic sanctuary with remains of Francis Xavier, and that, somehow or other, if Goa became integrated with India, these remains and the place will be desecrated and all that; which was, of course, an absurd statement to make. It showed either complete ignorance of the fact that five million Roman Catholics live in India and have every opportunity to live, practise their religion and such other activities as they might indulge in. They are equal citizens as anyone else. Also because reference was made to St. Xavier, perhaps many Members of the House will know that in Bombay City, St. Thomas is supposed to have existed and I believe St. Thomas Mount is there.

Some Hon. Members: In Madras.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I said Bombay, but I meant Madras, and nobody has yet complained about anything being done to the relics of St. Thomas there. So, the Catholics of India have very clearly shown and demonstrated that they are non-political people who are quiet, but even the non-political people have clearly demonstrated that they are in favour of the popular movement in Goa for merger with India.

Two days ago, day before yesterday, I met some leading Goans—and Catholics, I think, most of them were who came to me—who, I believe, call themselves the Goan Liberation Council. I was glad to meet them because they were a different type of persons from what one normally meets in political affairs, that is, they were not politicians, they were professors, professional men and others who had nothing to do with politics as such. I believe one or two of them have received decorations from the Pope and from the Portuguese Government too

in the past, so that they were not political people, but because of the development of the situation in Goa, they were moved out of their normal non-political existence and they had formed themselves into a Council, or whatever it is, for this particular purpose, to help in this. That is a very significant thing. There is, of course, the Goan National Congress and there are various other organisations who have been working for the liberation of Goa for many years, but in a sense, it was more significant that these sage and sober people, who have nothing to do with all politics, also felt the urge of the times and came forward. Many of these are Catholics and it is very unfair, I think, for any Member of the House to say that the Catholic Church or the Head of the Catholic Church, that is, His Holiness the Pope, are, in any sense, coming in the way of this movement or encouraging the Portuguese Government in its conduct.

Shri Kottukappally (Meenachi): As a Catholic, I endorse every word of yours.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Thank you. One or two other matters I wish to say.

Mr. Asoka Mehta asked: Why was not Japan invited to the Colombo Conference?—I am sorry it is not Japan but Nepal—Why was not Nepal invited to the Colombo Conference? Mr. Asoka Mehta should know that we were neither the sponsors of this Conference nor those who issued the invitations. It was the Prime Minister of Ceylon who invited us and we went at his invitation, and he decided to invite the four countries that you know of and not others. He could very well have extended this invitation to others. Then Mr. Mehta quoted from a letter which he had received from Acharya Narendra Deva about the danger of the cry of 'Asia for Asians'. If I may say so, with all respect, I entirely agree with what Acharya Narendra Deva said in that letter and I do not wish that our

people should associate themselves with any such cry. What we have said is something rather different. What we have said is that other people should not interfere in Asia, which is a different thing, whether it is Europe or America or any other place, and that Asia should be left to develop according to her own wishes or genius. Asia, of course, is a huge territory and one may talk about it, of course, but to consider Asia as a big unit is to delude oneself. Asia is not only big but there is enormous variety in it. It may be, I believe it is true, that there are certain features which may be said to be similar and one of the major features is that a great part of Asia has suffered for a hundred or two hundred or more years under foreign domination, whether it is direct colonial domination, whether it is indirect, but Asia has been, during all these years, chiefly under European domination. That fact alone has given a certain commonness of outlook, the struggle against foreign domination, etc., and, therefore, as I have said previously, hon. Members or I or any Indian can perhaps understand the mind, let us say, of a Burman or an Indonesian or anyone else a little better just as an Indonesian can understand our mind a little better than perhaps a European or an American might do. That is because we have had common experiences, common sufferings and common struggles, and, therefore, we react more or less in a common way. Naturally we differ, our backgrounds differ to some extent, they are similar to some extent, and I do not think of this business of 'Asia for Asians', 'Europe for Europeans' and so on except in the sense that no country or no group of countries should be dominated over, should be interfered with by other. As a matter of fact, all this talk is rather out of date because in the modern world, today there can be no isolation of a country or even of a continent. We have to pull together, whether we like it or not; the world is too closely knit together to be thought of in terms of even national units or continental

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

units. We overlap and everything happens together, but the very cry—you might even say that we respect so much and feel so much—that is, the very idea of nationalism itself is becoming somewhat out of date. It is true that it is not out of date again, if you compare it with something like, let us say, provincialism or communalism. It is not out of date because provincialism and communalism and the like are retrograde and reactionary, and nationalism is a shining beacon and an example for us to follow when compared to that, but nationalism itself becomes a narrowing force progressively in the modern world. All that is true. So, in effect, we have to be at the same time nationalistic and international just as in our country we are at the same time talking in terms of centuries; most past and present centuries are represented in this country at the same time. We are passing through this tremendous phase of transition. But let us not do anything which will narrow our vision or come in the way of our growth. But intense feeling of nationalism, as opposed to some idea of world internationalism, will be bad. Nationalism is good; nonetheless at the present age because there are forces which oppose unity; nationalism is a uniting force or liberating force and it continues to be a liberating force. It may become a narrowing force. We have to beware. The House knows that nationalism has sometimes a curious history; that is to say, the very nationalism that struggles for freedom has in the past, in some cases, denied freedom to other countries; it has become aggressive; it has even become imperialistic. All these things merge into one another and one has to be careful lest even a good custom does not bring harm to us or injure us.

I do not know if there is any other minor matter for me to deal with. Someone stated—I forget in what connection; perhaps Shri Asoka Mehta said—that Japan was ignored. It is not quite clear to me: who ignored

Japan: how and when? We have had very friendly relations with Japan and we continue to have them. It is true that in the larger policies that we are pursuing, Japan is not wholly in line with us; that is perfectly true. In these larger policies that we pursue there are many countries in Asia—some outside Asia—that are friendly to us and they co-operate with us either in the United Nations or elsewhere. But in effect the two countries that are closest to us are Burma and Indonesia in South East Asia area. The Arab countries are close to us and we are friendly with them but they are so tied up with their local problems that they tend to concentrate too much on them whether it is the Palestine problem or the like problem. But because of common interests and common backgrounds of many things. Burma, Indonesia and India have progressively functioned together and been drawn closer to each other. I welcome this development. Of course we welcome Ceylon too; Ceylon has also functioned with us since the Colombo Conference. To some extent we would like Pakistan and we would like every other country to do so but I mention two or three. In this context, it is perfectly true that Japan's policy has been somewhat different. We are not coming into conflict in any sense because we are functioning in different spheres but merely we are not wholly in line. What Japan's policy may be in future, I do not know because we must remember that Japan has gone through a terrible crisis—war and defeat—and subsequently all that has happened. They are a great people, hard-working people and they have built themselves up again. But which way Japan will go in the future, I do not know.

Now, there is another matter. Several hon. Members have referred to Tibet—'the melancholy chapter of Tibet'. I really do not understand. I have given the most earnest thought to this matter. What did any hon.

Member of this House expect us to do in regard to Tibet at any time? Did we fail or did we do a wrong thing? I am not going into that matter now but I would beg any hon. Member who has doubts about this question to just consider and try to find out what the background, the early history and the late history of Tibet and India and China have been what the history of the British in Tibet has been and what the relationship of Tibet with China or India has been. Where did we come into the picture unless we wanted to assume an aggressive role of interfering with other countries? Many things happen in the world which we do not like and which we would wish were rather different but we do not go like Don Quixote with a lance in hand against everything that we dislike; we put up with these things because we would, without making any difference, merely get into trouble. We have to see all these things in some larger context of policy.

Big things have happened in the world even since the last war. And among the big things has been the rise of a united China. Forget for a moment the broad policies it pursues—communist or near-communist or whatever it maybe. The fact is—and it is a major fact of the middle of the 20th century—that China has become a Great Power—united, strong and great power. I do not mention that in the sense that because China is a Great Power, India must be afraid of China or submit to China or follow the same policy in deference to China—not in the least. The fact of the matter is, with all respect to all countries of the world,—today or, looking into the future, even today of course—the two Great Powers striking across the world are the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Now, China has come into the picture with enormous potential strength not so much actual strength, that is, developed strength, because remember this, even now China is far less industrially developed than even India is. Let us not forget it—these facts. Much is being

done in China which is praiseworthy and we can learn from them and we hope to learn from them but let us look at things in some perspective. India is more industrially developed than China—India has got far more—let us say—communications, transport and so on which are also essential for development of China. China no doubt, will go ahead fast; I am not comparing or criticising but what I said was that this enormous country of China, which is a Great Power and which is powerful today, is potentially still more powerful. This is a country which inevitably becomes a Great Power. Leaving these three big countries, United States of America, the Soviet Union and China for the moment leaving them aside, look at the world. There are great countries, very advanced countries, highly cultured countries and all that. But if you peep into the future and if nothing goes wrong—wars and the like—the obvious fourth country in the world is India.

3 P. M.

I am not speaking in the sense of any vain glory and all that but I am merely analysing the situation and given—much has to be given—the economic growth, given unity, given many factors, India, by virtue of her general talent, ability of her people, working capacity, geographical situation and all that, will rise. Countries like China and India, once they get rid of two things—foreign domination and internal disunity—inevitably become strong; there is nothing to stop them. They have got the capacity; the people of India or the people of China have got the ability and the capacity. The only thing that weakens is internal disunity or some kind of external domination. As soon as the external domination is removed from India, we go ahead. We may go faster; that is a different matter. But inevitably the force, regardless of the individuals or the governments that may have to do anything with it, is at work. Ultimately, if the people have it in them, they go ahead. Even if governments

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

are stupid, they go ahead. Acharya Kripalani completely agrees with me! So here we have these great historical forces at work, historical transformations taking place. These great countries, after some hundreds of years of being submerged, are coming up. You have to realise that. Do not get mixed up and tied up with these rather superficial arguments, important as they might be, of communism and anti-communism. Communism is important as a force. You may like it or dislike it; you may like it half and dislike it half, as you like. But they somehow confuse the issue. Therefore it is far better to forget these for the moment in order to analyse the world situation. And the misfortune has been that in western countries, or in some of them, they are so obsessed with communism and anti-communism that they completely fail to see the forces or anything working in the world. We are not obsessed with that thought. We may like it or dislike it, but we are not obsessed with that thought of communism or anti-communism; because we think of other things also, we think of ourselves we think of our own good, we think of how we should progress, etc. So other countries get rather irritated at us that we do not see the light as they see, that we are perverse or that we are blind, because they can only see one thing and nothing else. What to us appears a lop-sided view on their part, to them it appears perversity on our part, whatever it may be. So there are these great historical forces. No doubt in time to come they will adjust themselves, something new will emerge.

Let us look back on history, let us look at European history a hundred years, or a hundred and fifty or a hundred and sixty years ago, at the time of the great French Revolution. The reaction on the Europe of the day was terrible. It was a kingly Europe. It was tremendous. They thought the end of the world had come. And even

when Napoleon came with his counter-revolution and all that, Napoleon became the devil incarnate to all those people in Europe. And if you read the books written then, the newspapers written then, you see the passion there was behind these feelings. If one compared that with the present day and with the passions that are roused today, well, one somehow begins to look at things in a little more perspective. These passions come and go and the world adjusts itself. For hundreds and hundreds of years, as you know, Europe and Western Asia struggled over the crusades, Christianity *versus* Islam. Several hundred years these things lasted. Fortunately for our country we have had no major religious conflicts, at any rate except recently. Europe had these conflicts Thirty Years War, Hundred Years War. Each of them appeared then to put an end to civilization and everything. And there were these crusades which lasted hundreds of years. Well, things adjust themselves somehow, and oddly enough, certainly Christianity did not win in the crusades; nor, you might say, did Islam remain as it was. So that, you have to look at things in their perspective and not get over-heated or over-excited over things that are happening today, and think of them as mighty crusades of communism on the one side or anti-communism on the other.

It is my conviction—I speak for India, but it may apply to other countries too—that we can only progress according to our own light and reason. We can and will no doubt profit by things we learn from other countries, forces, movements, ideas. But we must have our roots in the Indian soil. Keeping our roots in the Indian soil is important, but it is also important not to be just a root and nothing else. It is, because there is a tendency to be just a root. And one has to grow and put out branches and leaves and flowers. And in the world today, as I

said a little while ago, it becomes difficult to be just even narrowly nationalist. So many things develop which are common for the world.

Now, about this talk of the Commonwealth and objection or disapproval of our continuing the Commonwealth link, some Members seem to imagine that thereby we are doing violence to the pledge we took on the banks of the Ravi in 1929-30, as 1929 turned into 1930, or subsequent Independence pledges. Well, I should like you to refer to those pledges and see what our condition is. I say we have kept to those pledges hundred per cent. That has nothing to do with the desirability of keeping the Commonwealth link. We may or may not keep it. Because when we talked there of breaking away from the Commonwealth, that meant something definite. Breaking away from that overlordship of Britain or the monarchy of Britain or the crown of Britain and all that, it meant something definite. And even though that overlordship was rather theoretical, not practised, even then it was there. We had to break away from that. Well, we did break away from it and are now a Sovereign Republic. We are not a Dominion in the Commonwealth. We are as independent and free a sovereign republic as any in the wide world. As the House knows, there is nothing in our Constitution, no mention of the Commonwealth link or anything. It is by an agreement.

Acharya Kripalani said: have a treaty. I should like him to consider how a treaty is better than this particular agreement. A treaty is more binding. A treaty involves give and take. A treaty involves assurances, all kinds of things. Here we are as free as ever to do what we like, whether domestically or internationally, with nothing to come in our way. And our whole record of the last four or five years bears witness to that. Nothing comes in our way. If we had a treaty we would be bound at least by the terms

of that treaty, whatever they are. And to that extent we would be limited.

This whole question has to be viewed, not from a background of sentiment this way or that way but, if I may say so, pure advantage, advantage to our country nationally, advantage to the policies we might pursue internationally. That is the only test, does it come in the way or does it help? I do submit that our association with the Commonwealth has not come in our way in the least. Everybody knows that there are countries in the Commonwealth with which we do not get on well together. We are, in fact, completely cut off from the Union of South Africa. Although we do not fight actually, we are as much in conflict as two countries can be, who are not fighting. We have no representation in each other's countries. Unfortunately, we are not on very cordial terms with Pakistan.

I should like it to be; I hope the time will come when it will be. That has nothing to do with the Commonwealth. Merely because we are neighbours, people of the same root and branch, it is a sad thing that we should be ranged against each other. Our relations with any country and the Commonwealth have not been governed in the slightest or affected by the Commonwealth link. They are individual separate relations. Of course, the country that counts most in so far as international relations are concerned, in this matter, is the United Kingdom. Canada counts also. So do other countries to some extent. In what way have our policies been changed, interfered with, by this link? That is the point that we have to consider.

I submit that in no way, in either the internal economics, or external policy or anything, has this come in our way. On the other hand, it has been definitely helpful to us and helpful to the cause of world peace. If that is so, that is a big thing. Acharya

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Kripalani, as I said, was over-generous in his praise of our foreign policy.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh—West): Partly.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Partly: apart from certain exceptions which he enumerated. I put it to him and I put it to the House to consider how far in pursuing that foreign policy, we have been helped, not helped directly, but nevertheless helped indirectly or psychologically by the fact that we were associated with the Commonwealth. It has helped. You may say that our being in the Commonwealth has been of some advantage to the United Kingdom. I agree. I do not say it is a one-sided affair. Nothing is one-sided. It has been of some advantage, if not actual physical advantage, advantage in terms of prestige and all that. May be so. My point is that in these international affairs, the fact that there was this thin tenuous link with the Commonwealth has helped the cause of world peace. Hon. Members must have noticed that the relations between the People's Republic of China and the United Kingdom are growing a little more friendly than they have been. It is rather difficult for me to refer to private conversations. But many people—I am not talking of Indians or British people, non-British, non-Indian people—who were surprised at first at our continuing the Commonwealth link, have confessed that we were very wise in doing so, because it has helped in international affairs and also in our work for world peace. Therefore, I submit that the test is whether it is helpful or not. I say it does not hinder in the slightest degree.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee talked something about our Commander-in-Chief going to Camberley. Or you may refer to some economic contracts we may have with England. That has nothing to do with the Commonwealth link. We may or may not have those economic contracts. They are independent

of the Commonwealth link. You may have economic contacts with America; there is no Commonwealth there; with France or with the Soviet Union. Nobody can stop us from doing that. So that, that has to be eliminated. You may dislike the economic contacts. Say so. But, do not connect that with the Commonwealth link, because it is independent of that. It is true that our Commander-in-Chief has gone in the last two or three years to Camberley to take part in certain military exercises there. We have sent some senior officers. It is also true that from time to time our little Navy puts out to sea and either goes to the Mediterranean or the eastern waters, South East Asia, etc. In doing so, we encourage it to come in contact with the British Navy for some exercises. The Cruiser "Delhi" cannot have exercises by itself. It cannot go round and round itself. It has to keep itself in exercise; it wants that.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: What is the charm in the British Navy?

An Hon. Member: What is the charm in the Soviet Navy?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The charm of the British Navy is this. If hon. Members want us to have exercises with different countries annually, that is not a practical proposition. One cannot do that. The hon. Member, if he knew anything about a Navy, would probably understand what I said. One cannot do this kind of thing. As a matter of fact, we have had exercises with the French Navy; we have had exercises with some other countries: I forget now where we have gone. It so happens that, among the several things we have, the House knows very well, our Navy more particularly, has grown up after the pattern of the British Navy. They are British ships which we have got. We have been trained by them. Our methods of training are British. We may change them tomorrow. But, so long as we have those methods of training, etc., it is easier for us to fit in exercises on that basis, than independently of them. For a mere matter of convenience, we

sent the Commander-in-Chief and two or three senior officers to take part in these exercises. We can send them, we will send them if invited, to the Soviet Union or China if the opportunity occurs, to take part in their exercises. I may tell you that we have invited to our exercises representatives of various countries, including the Soviet Union and China. Of course, our exercises are in a small way. We do not pretend to teach anything to the Soviet Union. It is not like that. So far as we are concerned, we treat these countries on a level. It is true that our contacts, not because of the Commonwealth link, but because of historical factors, may be this or that, are greater with the British. We can get greater advantages and facilities than with the rest. That is helpful to us.

Another thing in connection with the Commonwealth link is this. There are large numbers of Indians living in other countries. The question of Ceylon comes up; true. There are quite considerable numbers still living in various countries, Malaya, Fiji, Mauritius, and other territories. It is going to be a problem. It is going to be a bigger problem in the future. That is, their future is going to be a problem. In regard to Indians abroad, we have taken up a firm line regarding those Indians who are living in what may be called independent countries. We have said that we do not want them to remain apart from the people of those countries where they are living, and that they may associate themselves. It is perfectly open to them to become nationals of that country or remain our nationals. They may choose. They are welcome to be our nationals. If they remain our nationals, they cannot participate in the life of that country to the same extent, naturally. They cannot become voters there. If they become their nationals, culturally they are connected with us, but otherwise they are not. They are not our concern. The connection is cultural, not political. We have encouraged them to do that, and in

Africa etc., we have said repeatedly that we do not want Indians there in the slightest degree to exploit the people, to develop any vested interests which are against the people of the country and that they will get no protection from us as against the people of that country, i.e., the Africans. But now, questions arise about Ceylon—difficult questions. In other places like Malaya and elsewhere, apart from the political and other questions there, the fact that there is the British link, the Commonwealth link, makes the situation of these millions of Indians in those countries somewhat easier in the sense that while retaining Indian nationality, if they so choose, they can get civil privileges there, which they cannot otherwise. The time has not come for them, they are not compelled to choose, to have this or that. They can have both, and we do not wish to put them in this dilemma of having to choose till the time comes. It will come some time or other. All these are minor considerations I admit. The major considerations are different. But I say even the major considerations point to the fact that we should continue this very loose association which does not come in our way and which helps us in many ways.

Now, hon. Members—some Members and some others outside, too—frequently criticise us, sometimes even my humble self: "Oh, you are saying this and that, criticising countries. Why do you not criticise or condemn Soviet imperialism?" Perhaps, hon. Members who care to read what I write or hear what I say will appreciate that I seldom criticise any country, whether it is in the West or in the East, a country as such;—I may sometimes pass a remark—deliberately I avoid doing so. I may say something about imperialism or colonialism, but I would try to avoid saying something about a specific country. Why is that? That does not mean I am hiding anything, but because I have found there is far too much of mutual recrimination, running down and passions roused, when you cannot

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

consider a question calmly. Either you are out to convince the other party or convince their friends about a certain position. For instance there are many things that have happened in Russia, in the Soviet Union, in the past especially, which have pained me exceedingly. I do not know all the facts. I cannot pass final judgment about any incident, and I am not competent to do that. But, broadly speaking, whatever information has reached me distressed me greatly. Well, I did not shout out from the house-tops. There are many things which have occurred in other countries, in Western countries, which have distressed me. There are things which are occurring today in the continent of Africa, which I think are horrible in the extreme. And I restrain myself because I feel that if I went about just giving expression to what I feel all the time, well, it will be neither good for me, nor for others.

Somebody asked me in a television interview in London last year: "You are in the Commonwealth and you go about criticising the Commonwealth or Commonwealth countries. Do you think that is quite fair for a member of the Commonwealth?" He said: "Is it fair for you as the Prime Minister to do this?" So, I said: "I realise fully my responsibility as the Prime Minister, and I have exercised tremendous restraint on myself because of that and on the whole succeeded. If I had not been Prime Minister, I would be shouting from the house-tops all the time." So it does not help, I feel. Somehow we have got, I think it is a bad thing, to suppress truth. But, if one shouts out unpalatable truths all the time, you do not convince or convert people, you merely create a feeling of greater conflict.

Now, before coming to the larger issues of the world, I shall say a word about Ceylon. I should not like to say much because the Prime Minister of Ceylon is coming here in about ten days time and it would not be fair or

courteous to him for me to discuss these matters. But I would say this, that the so-called agreement that we arrived at many months ago has not proved a success. There are various matters connected with it, but the principal question is about the fate of a considerable number of people of Indian descent—remember, people of Indian descent, not Indian nationals—who are in Ceylon. What is their future going to be? An hon. Member who is himself connected with this question very much mentioned something about the large numbers of Chinese who are in various countries of South-East Asia and elsewhere. It was a perfectly relevant observation. There are considerable numbers of Indians too in other countries. In fact, in discussing other questions with the Prime Minister of China, I pointed out to him the large number of Chinese in South-East Asia and a fairly considerable number, not quite so much, of Indians too; and I said to him that both because of the size of our respective countries—we are both big—and because our populations have overflowed into other countries, it is not difficult to understand that the other and smaller countries round about us are a little afraid of us—afraid of China or afraid of India, it depends upon where geography puts them. And he said that is perfectly true and we must do everything in our power to get rid of this fear in so far as we can.

Now, in regard to Ceylon unfortunately—or both fortunately and unfortunately—there is this fact that Ceylon is a relatively small island very near to India, and because of this there is a fear,—which I think is completely unjustified,—a fear that India may overwhelm Ceylon and absorb it. I have repeatedly said that, so far as I know, nobody in India thinks that way. We want an independent Ceylon, a friendly Ceylon, a Ceylon with which we have the closest contact, a Ceylon which is nearer to us in every sense than any

other country outside India culturally, historically, linguistically, as you like, in a religious sense and all that. Why should we look with greedy eyes on Ceylon? We do not. But the fact remains, there is fear, and because there is this fear, I would beg this House, Members of this House, not at any time to say things which might add to that fear. He talked of economic sanctions and the like. I deprecate that kind of thing, although I have been deeply pained by many events in Ceylon, because I want this House and this country to look ahead. We are a country. I hope, and I believe, with a great future. Therefore, look at the future. Do not get lost in the present. Have some vision of that, and do not do things now which may come in the way of that future, whether it is Pakistan, or whether it is Ceylon, or whether it is any other country. Now, therefore, we have to treat and continue to deal with Ceylon in a friendly way, even though Ceylon's response might be unfriendly.

Now, coming to this Agreement, the question is about these large numbers of people who are now sometimes called Stateless; that is to say, they are not our nationals, and if the Ceylon Government does not make them their nationals, for the moment, they have no regular constitutional position of being attached to one State—of course, they are in Ceylon.

This raises legal, constitutional issues, as well as issues of social well-being and decency. In the past two or three decades, these questions have arisen in another context. When Hitler started his career as Chancellor in Germany, Members will remember that large numbers of people fled from Germany, and they became stateless, because no other state would father them, and Hitler, far from fathering them, was after their blood. So, this question of Stateless people became an important constitutional issue in Europe and elsewhere. Much has been written;

in fact, books have been written on the subject. I do not mean to say that that question is at all comparable to this question. It is a question of people of Indian descent in Ceylon, but I am merely referring to a certain constitutional aspect, which is important. Normally speaking, people are not driven out of a country, even if they are the nationals of another country. They are not driven out; individuals may be sent out because they misbehave, but whole vast crowds, tens and twenties and hundreds and thousands of people are not sent out. It is almost unknown, excepting under these very abnormal conditions which prevailed under Hitler and the like.

So, this is the background. We shall gladly meet the Prime Minister and his colleagues, when they come here, and talk to them in a friendly way. At the same time, we hold certain views about these matters, and we shall put them before them.

Now, coming to this broad world aspect that we have to face, I mentioned something about it yesterday in this House. I was talking about the Commonwealth link. Now, you will observe that our links at present with Burma and Indonesia are far closer than the links with the Commonwealth countries. That does not come in the way. It is natural; it is a natural growth. And because of our Commonwealth link, we can serve many causes a little better than we might otherwise be able to do.

Anyhow, we have to face in the world a very difficult situation. I do not wish this House or anybody to feel overwhelmed by the difficulty of the situation, because as long as we have the perspective, we shall get over these difficulties, and the world will get over them. Undoubtedly, we are passing through a very big period of transition. The first thing in this situation is, as far as I can see, to avoid war, and especially world war because if that war comes, it destroys everything that we or anyone else is.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

working for. Therefore, our policy—and the policy of many other countries—becomes one of avoidance of this war, in so far as we can. I do not pretend to say that we can make much difference in the world, but in so far as we can, we try to do that, and in trying to do that, we try to avoid that type of bitter controversy which has taken the place of the old style diplomacy now, the diplomacy of running down and cursing each other, because we think that it will not lead to any peaceful solution. It was from that point of view that we talked about an area of peace; and our neighbours, Indonesia and Burma also talked about an area of peace, and welcomed that approach.

But there are these great fears. How are we to get rid of this fear? How are we to get rid of the fear of this great colossus, the Soviet Union, overwhelming other countries, or the other colossus overwhelming some other country? Look at the world today. It is quite extraordinary. Each party accuses the other of encirclement or encircling. Some countries accuse the Soviet Union of activities, subversive activities and the like—there may be some truth in it. The Soviet Union accuses the United States of America of encircling it with bases all round—and there is truth in it. Look at the map. There are hundreds, literally hundreds, about two hundred, I believe, bases encircling the Soviet Union and China from the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean—and I do not quite know what is happening in the North Pole. Now, obviously, each is afraid of the other, afraid not in the narrow sense of the word, but afraid of the consequences that this might bring. How can we get rid of it?

Now, it is my submission that you do not get over these fears by these pacts and alliances against each other. Certainly I cannot suggest to any country to trust in good luck and

do nothing at all to prepare itself—I cannot say that as a responsible person. But these pacts and alliances do not help. And even if they helped at an earlier stage, we have arrived at a stage when it does not help but hinders. It is perfectly clear today that if either party, either of these great colossuses, commits any major act of aggression anywhere in Asia or Europe or Africa or anywhere, that will lead to world war. It is not the pact that prevents that, it is the fear of world war that keeps the peace today. There is no doubt about it, that if there was aggression on either side, any major aggression, there would be world war. Therefore, there is no chance of major aggression today. The chance is that some petty thing might bring about this conflict. Now, we have to develop an atmosphere—the Geneva Conference helped in developing that atmosphere; it was good. Now, the SEATO arrangement comes and in some degree, upsets that atmosphere. It is a bad thing in the sense—quite regardless of what they arranged—it does not add to their defensive strength; whatever it was, it was there; it merely led to this habit of dealing with the other party with threats. Of course, it is not a very polite habit;—apart from that, it is not practical, because the other party happens to be fairly strong too—it is not that you should frighten the other party. So, it is in this larger context that we felt it.

There is talk about this communism, anti-communism and the like. As an Indian and as an Asian, it is a matter not only of great surprise to me but of distress that the racial policies of some countries do not seem to excite much notice in Europe or America. There is the racial policy of the Union of South Africa which is, in no sense, different from the racial policy of Hitler, except that they have not gone to those extremes that Hitler went to. But the theory is the same: the practice may be different—somewhat

milder. Or take other parts of Africa. We tolerate that. We talk about the bird's-eye-view which is different from the view of those who are crawling on the earth. So also the view from different places of the earth's surface is different. If we look at the world from Delhi, our view is one. A person looking at it from Washington or Moscow—his view is different. The whole picture is different, not the same, and the perspective is different. Anyhow, this particular example that I gave of racialism running rampant in Africa and of the United Nations being unable to deal with it passing resolutions, is, in our eyes, a very important thing and at least as important as all this business of communism and anti-communism—both of them.

Now, I have taken a lot of time and I have yet to deal with Goa in particular, because Acharya Kripalani was good enough to deal with this matter at some length. I shall endeavour to explain our policy which, in its basic approach might not change, I hope, but which certainly, in so far as the steps we take or do not take are concerned, may change at any time. Acharya Kripalani took exception to our not permitting Indian nationals from going there. He will be perfectly right in taking exception to it; if I state that as a principle, as a maxim, Indian nationals have every right to go there. (*Interruption*). But every right has to be exercised in the right way and at the right time. Hon. Members may have the right to walk along the road, but if they walk along the wrong side of the road, they get run down.

Acharya Kripalani: It is for the Government to send them in the right way.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a different matter. But my point is that I want to remove this misapprehension in anyone's mind that we think that it is not the right or

sometimes even the duty of an Indian non-Goan national to go to Goa. It may well be. But we did think about it. I do not differentiate at all; and I even agreed with the hon. Member when he said that such a thing might be the right of an individual in any other country to join in Goa too. I agree, but all those rights have to be considered in the context of particular situations and events. They may create grave embarrassment and difficulties to them, to their country and to others. It was in this context that we considered this matter of Goa round about the 15th August. A tremendous propaganda was taking place, encouraged by people who did not like our policies very much, a propaganda to indicate that the Goan people were in love with Portuguese rule they did not want a change, they were quite happy as they were: Goa was a peaceful idyllic spot where quiet and calm reigned while in India there was trouble all over, and in this peaceful and idyllic place where the people were completely happy and satisfied, hordes of Indians from outside were sweeping down and compelling, forcing and coercing them to accept their domination. That was the propaganda. Of course, hon. Members think it is absurd; it is absurd. But that was the propaganda believed in by numbers of people elsewhere. We had to meet that propaganda, we had to meet that position and to show what the real fact was. And the real fact was that the people of Goa themselves wanted their freedom and their association with India. How are we to show it? If we had allowed at that time large crowds of Indians to go, I have no doubt at all that the fact that the Goans wanted their freedom and were prepared to sacrifice themselves for it would never have emerged, as it is emerging today.

Another aspect I shall bring before the House which, I am sure, my friend, Acharya Kripalani, will appreciate. In the old days, when

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

we were carrying on our struggle for independence, we took up a particular line in regard to what were called the Indian States then. We did not come in the way of their freedom movements, but we discouraged people from outside functioning from outside in regard to them. What was the reason behind it? Not that we considered that there was any difference between the Indians in India and the Indians in an Indian State—there was never any question of difference. But we wanted the people of those States themselves to wake up, to organise themselves and not merely to rely on others. Whether it is *satyagraha* or whether it is anything else, outsiders can go and help, but a *satyagraha* completely based on outside help with no foundation or strength inside, that outside *satyagraha* is not a very potent weapon. Outsiders can help, but there must be strength inside. I am no professor of *satyagraha* as the Acharya is. I speak certainly with diffidence, but I am merely pointing out that even in regard to the Indian States, we assumed a certain attitude which gradually strengthened those Indians. We were associated with the Indian States as individuals; we associated ourselves as President of the All India States People's Conference and all that. But we did not encourage numbers of Congress people and others from outside to go and invade a State.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): And the Acharya issued the circular. (*Interruption*).

Shri V. G. Deshpande: He himself broke the ban.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So this becomes a question not of high principle, but of organising and disciplining a movement, strengthening a movement and striking when the right time comes in the proper way. Let there be no mistake about it, that so far as Goa is concerned, we consider it a part of India, of course,

inevitably, and on no account, whatever the pressure or whatever might happen, are we going to give up this claim or the right to work for it and to achieve it. I do not think it is quite right for the Acharya to say that we have left those people in the lurch—I do not think it is quite correct. We have not left them in the lurch. So far as the Government is concerned, it is openly, explicitly in favour of the merger of Goa with India. Our public organisations have expressed themselves in every way, and we have in regard to other matters—economic and others—taken steps too. But there is such a thing, as hon. Members,—especially the leaders of the revolutionary movements sitting opposite,—will realise, as adventurism which is very different from adventure or adventurousness, and no responsible group or party should indulge merely in adventurism, because adventurism leads to reaction. It does not succeed. It leads to reaction and loss of morale. The success and the virtue of *satyagraha* that some of us of the older generation were taught were very largely due to its discipline, largely due to our being pulled back even when we resented it; but at no time did we fail. Success might have been postponed a little. But at no time were we allowed to function in an adventurist way.

Now, lastly, the hon. Member Mr. Chatterjee—I was not here then—in my absence, among other things referred to me as a "fellow-traveller". Well, I have been a traveller not only in many countries, but in many avenues of thought and I have been proud to be a fellow-traveller with all kinds of persons, many of whom, perhaps, might not be considered quite respectable by Mr. Chatterjee. It is rather embarrassing for me to talk about myself and I do not wish to do so. But I do believe that some things are good and some things are bad. Of course, there is a great

deal in between to choose from. I do believe firmly and absolutely that evil means lead to evil ends, that bad means should never be adopted even to gain right ends. If you tell me that I do not always act up to that you may be justified, because we are weak persons having to deal with complex and difficult situations from day to day. But anyhow I firmly believe that means are important and bad means always produce bad results.

I believe also that hatred and violence are bad—intrinsically and absolutely bad—and it is largely because of this abundance of hatred and the spirit of violence in the world that we have come to this quagmire. Violence today is represented by the atom and the hydrogen bombs. I do not think it is very helpful for me to criticise this country or that country because it indulges in hatred or violence, or because it does not care for the means. Many of my basic differences have been because of that. If you discuss economic policy with me, I may agree with you or you may disagree with me slightly. I do not mind considering with a completely open mind the communist, or the Marxian or any economic policy. It does not matter whether I agree or not; only, as I said, they must have roots in the Indian soil; they must be related to Indian conditions and the ideals we might have. If you align them to dubious means and dubious methods, then I dislike it. It is because of that chiefly that I have felt not only recently, but previously, very much out of tune with things that were happening, whether in India or outside.

One tries to function to the best of one's ability, realising that the success of the objectives one seeks is seldom attainable, nevertheless, one tries to do one's best.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendments No. 4, 7, 13 and 19

to vote, and then put amendment No. 11.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that although in many respects our foreign policy has contributed to the securing of world peace and easing of international tension, yet it has some serious drawbacks which are not only contrary to the interest of world peace but positively prejudicial to our national interest and humiliating to our national dignity and honour. In particular, the House fully endorses the five principles embodied in the Chou-Nehru Declaration but strongly resents and disapproves of the policy of banning participation of Non-Goan Indians in the struggle for liberation of the Portuguese enclaves at the intervention of Britain, the continued tie-up with the British Commonwealth, the failure to secure the removal of all the United States personnel from the U. N. Observers Team in Kashmir and weakness otherwise shown in favour of imperialist war-mongers."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted namely:

"This House having considered the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto is of the opinion that the policy of neutrality followed by Government has completely failed and the Government of India should follow a definite foreign policy which would not isolate this country in world politics."

The motion was negatived.