

## LOK SABHA DEBATES

### (Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

7493

#### LOK SABHA

Saturday, 15th May, 1954

The Lok Sabha met at a Quarter Past  
Eight of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(N. Questions: Part I not published)

#### MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

**The Prime Minister and Minister of  
External Affairs and Defence (Shri  
Jawaharlal Nehru):** I beg to move:

"That the present International  
situation and the policy of the  
Government of India in relation  
thereto be taken into considera-  
tion."

About four months ago, in January  
last, this House had a debate on foreign  
affairs. Since then, many developments  
have taken place and from time to time  
I have come to this House and made  
statements in regard to those develop-  
ments, or sometimes in answer to ques-  
tions, placed before the House our  
viewpoint and the facts as they were  
developing. The House is, therefore,  
well aware of these developments.

I shall deal this morning with some  
of the more important ones. To begin  
with, I would remind the House that  
at the present moment, since yester-  
day, our representatives are discussing  
with the French Government in Paris

the future of the French establishments  
in India. Now, our viewpoint in regard  
to those French establishments is very  
well known. We have gladly accept-  
ed the invitation of the French Gov-  
ernment to send our representatives to  
Paris with a view to negotiations about  
the future of these establishments, and  
I would not like to say very much  
more at this stage about them, except  
this, as is well known, that the recent  
developments in Pondicherry and round  
about there are rather remarkable;  
they have been completely spontaneous  
and quite extraordinarily, unanimous.  
In fact, not only the Central Assembly  
there, but every commune in Pondi-  
cherry, Karaikal and Mahe decided  
unanimously for a merger with India  
without any referendum or the like.  
We have not in any sense intervened  
or participated; we had to take certain  
steps to avoid conflicts in Indian terri-  
tory and, therefore, we decided—and  
we informed the French authorities in  
Pondicherry—that we could not allow  
armed police or any other armed  
French forces to pass through Indian  
territory from one part of those  
establishments to another, in case  
Indian territory intervened. As a  
result of this popular and spontaneous  
movement, roughly one-fifth of those  
French establishments are under some  
kind of popular control, and, in the rest  
too, there are strong movements. We  
had no desire to interfere in this matter  
unilaterally as we thought that the  
best settlement would be the peaceful  
settlement after negotiation with the  
French Government. Therefore, we are  
now negotiating with them and I hope  
that these negotiations will lead to  
satisfactory results. I might add that  
with a view to creating as good an at-

7494

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

mosphere as possible for these negotiations and to show our own goodwill, while firmly adhering to our position, we have decided that we may, in certain matters, relax certain steps that we had taken; that is to say, in regard to permits, we allowed the permits a little more; in regard to this great lack of petrol, we allow a little more petrol and in regard to some parcels, etc., which have been held up, we may allow them to go. But we hope that the French Government, on their side, will also show by their attitude in those settlements that they are desirous of promoting a peaceful settlement.

The next thing, an event—and a very important event—that I would like to draw the attention of the House to, is the agreement between India and China in regard to Tibet. That agreement deals with a large number of problems, each one of them perhaps not very important in itself but important from the point of view of our trade, our pilgrim traffic, our trade posts, our communications there, and the rest. It took a considerable time to arrive at this agreement not because of any major conflict or difficulty but because the number of small points were so many and had to be discussed in detail. The major thing about this agreement to which I would like again to draw the attention of the House is the preamble to that agreement. I shall read that preamble. It states:

The principles and considerations which govern our mutual relations and the approach of the two countries to each other are as follows:

- (i) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- (ii) mutual non-aggression;
- (iii) mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
- (iv) equality and mutual benefit; and
- (v) peaceful co-existence.

These principles not only indicate the policy that we pursue in regard to these matters not only with China but with any neighbour country, or, for the matter of that, any other country, but it is also a statement of wholesome principles, and I imagine that if these principles were adopted in the relations of various countries with each other, a great deal of the trouble of the present day world would probably disappear. It is a matter of importance to us, of course, as well as, I am sure, to China that these two countries, which have now almost about 1800 miles of frontier, should live in terms of peace and friendliness and should respect each other's sovereignty and integrity, should agree not to interfere with each other in any way and, in fact, though not it is formally stated as such, but practically speaking, not committing aggression on each other. By this agreement, we ensure to a very large extent peace in a certain area of Asia. I would earnestly wish that this area of peace could be spread over the rest of Asia and indeed over the rest of the world.

There has been a great deal of talk of collective security, sometimes of preparations for collective war or collective war-preparedness. Collective security, good as it is and essential to aim at, assumes the garb rather of preparation for collective war. I submit that it would be a healthy approach to this problem if it was that of collective peace. Therefore, when we have talked sometimes of an area of peace in Asia especially, it has been in this context of collective peace, with no element of aggression against any country and with an idea of not only helping in the preservation of the peace of the world but, in any event, preserving peace in that area. Therefore, I should like the House to consider these wider implications of this agreement between India and China.

So far as Tibet is concerned, it is a recognition of the existing situation there. In fact, that situation had been recognised by us two or three years

ago. Some criticism has been made that this is a recognition of Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. Apart from that fact, I am not aware of any time during the last few hundred years when Chinese sovereignty or if you like suzerainty was challenged by any outside country and all during this period whether China was weak or strong and whatever the Government of China was, China always maintained this claim to the sovereignty over Tibet. It is true that occasionally when China was weak, this sovereignty was not exercised in any large measure. When China was strong, it was exercised. Always there was a large measure of autonomy of Tibet, so that there was no great change in the theoretical approach to the Tibetan problem from the Chinese side. It has been throughout the last 200 or 300 years the same. The only country that had more intimate relations with Tibet was India, that is to say, British India in those days. Even then, when it was British policy to have some measure of influence over Tibet, even then they never denied the fact of Chinese sovereignty over Tibet, although in practice it was hardly exercised and they laid stress on Tibetan autonomy. Recent events made some other changes, factual changes because a strong Chinese State was against the practical evidence of exercising that sovereignty. So that what we have done in this agreement is not to recognise any new thing, but merely to repeat what we have said previously, and what, in fact, inevitably follows from the circumstances, both historical and practical today. The real importance, I repeat, of this agreement is because of its wider implications in regard to non-aggression, recognition of each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-interference with each other, external, internal or any other like interference. The House will remember that the Prime Minister of China, Mr. Chou En-Lai sent a message to me on the conclusion of this agreement, a friendly cordial message which I heartily reciprocated.

At the present moment, there is going on in Geneva a very important Con-

ference, chiefly concerned with the Korean problem and with Indo-China. From day to day we see messages about various proposals made on either side and sometimes the two approaches seem to be diametrically opposite. And yet, the mere fact, first of all, of this Conference meeting in Geneva is important. That is why on the last occasion when I spoke after the Berlin Conference I laid stress on the importance of the coming Geneva Conference. Also at that time, I made a suggestion that there might be a cease-fire in Indo-China. That suggestion was welcomed in many quarters, but nothing we done about it; at any rate, it produced no effect. Looking back over these few months, a feeling of regret comes that perhaps if a cease fire had been thought of in more urgent terms at that time much suffering and killing would have been avoided and the position that is being faced today would have been infinitely easier and better, and the tragic and heroic episode of Dien Bien Phu might have been very different.

Anyhow, the House will see that today what we said at that time and what others said too, that is, about, cease fire, has become one of the urgent matters of consideration for the Geneva Conference. Everybody agrees now that there must be a cease-fire, and the question is only how it is to be brought about. Right at the beginning there were some procedural difficulties in Geneva, but they were settled satisfactorily. That was a good and auspicious beginning, because we must remember that the countries meeting there are full of strong feelings against each other. They do not want to give in to the other party in the slightest, in argument or otherwise. And, therefore, this procedural beginning which was settled so satisfactorily was a good omen.

In Geneva today the question of war and peace,—world war and peace,—hangs in the balance. I do not mean to say that war will suddenly descend upon us: not that, I do not think it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

will. Nevertheless, whether as a result of the Geneva Conference many steps forward are taken towards peace, or the present stalemate continues or worsens, is important. It is important for all the countries of the world and it is natural that the Great Powers are deeply interested in this matter. But let it be remembered that both these major questions that are being considered in Geneva, that is, Korea and Indo-China, are Asian questions. Both the countries are in Asia, and whether we are small Powers or great, whether we have great military or other potential or not, naturally as countries of Asia we are intimately concerned with what happens in Korea and Indo-China. Indeed, we are even more intimately concerned—if I may say so—because of our geographical proximity with Indo-China. It has been the misfortune of Asia during the past some hundreds of years, not only to have colonial regimes, but to be often the theatre of war for others and by others. Therefore, if we wish that this business of warfare in Asia should cease, and more especially the business of others carrying on warfare for their own purposes in Asia should cease, it is not an illegitimate desire on our part. As I said on a previous occasion, peace for us, countries of Asia, who have newly emerged into freedom is not merely a pious hope, but an emergent necessity. In a sense the fate of Asia depends a good deal on what happens in Indo-China or Korea.

Now, recently I attended a Conference of five South-East Asian Prime Ministers at Colombo and long reports have appeared about this Conference and a statement too which the five Prime Ministers agreed to then. This Conference was not a formal conference, with a formal agenda and formal resolutions at the end of it. Such conferences are normally held on an informal basis; more so, this conference, which was the first of its kind. And I think, this fact has to be remembered—that of the uniqueness of this Conference. It was for the first time,

in a sense, in history, that representatives, the Prime Ministers, of these five countries met together to discuss common problems. Quite inevitably, there were somewhat different approaches to some of the problems and different suggestions were made in regard to them. Yet, the remarkable thing is that in spite of those different approaches, in spite of, sometimes, in the case of some countries certain entanglements, which kept them back, nevertheless, we had the statement, this unanimous statement issued by those five countries referring to a wide field of public affairs, more especially concerning Asia. It shows that sometimes, whatever differences there may be between us, the countries of Asia, there is a vast common ground in regard to which we think alike, and that is an important factor.

Now, in this Colombo Conference many questions were discussed. I should like to read out—if I may—a part of the joint statement issued after the Colombo Conference. It has, of course, been published in the Press and hon. Members know it. Nevertheless, I should like to draw the attention of hon. Members again to this.

“The Prime Ministers reviewed the situation in respect of Indo-China where a long and tragic war threatens the establishment of the freedom and independence of the people of Indo-China as well as the security and peace of Asia and of the world as a whole. They welcome the earnest attempts being made at Geneva to find a solution to the problem of Indo-China by negotiations, and hope that the deliberations of the Geneva Conference would bring about a speedy termination of the conflict and restoration of peace in Indo-China. They consider that the solution of the problem of Indo-China required agreement and a cease-fire should be reached without delay. The Prime Ministers felt that the solution of the problem required direct negotiations

between the parties principally concerned, namely, France, the three Associated States of Indo-China and Viet Minh as well as other parties invited by agreement. The success of such direct negotiations will be greatly helped by an agreement on the part of the countries concerned, particularly, China, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, on the steps necessary to prevent a recurrence and resumption of hostilities. The Prime Ministers contemplated that this negotiating group would report to the Geneva Conference the final decision. They propose that France should declare at the Geneva Conference that she is irrevocably committed to the complete independence of Indo-China. In order that the good offices and the machinery of the United Nations might be utilised for the furtherance of the proposals of the Geneva Conference and implementation of the decisions on Indo-China, the Prime Ministers were of the opinion that the Conference should keep the United Nations informed of the progress of its deliberations on Indo-China."

This is more or less a summary of what we have decided. It said something—the House will remember—about colonialism and racialism, about non-interference by other countries. It has expressed its opinion strongly about any interference—external or internal, communist or anti-communist, in fact any type of interference in our countries. That of course, has been the policy or the feeling of most countries; no country likes interference of any type. Therefore, it was as well that this fact was clearly stated. Without meaning any disrespect to the great countries of the world, I would like to point out the fact that is well known, that we have today not only two great groups hostile to each other, but what may be called, two crusading spirits trying to undermine each other. It is, I may use the word, a kind of *Dharm Yudh* (धर्म युद्ध) going on

between the two. [An Hon. Member: *Adharma Yudh* (अधर्म युद्ध)] whatever the virtues of the *Dharm Yudh* (धर्म युद्ध) might be, somehow other countries unfortunately get entangled, and are bound to get entangled if matters go worse. It has been our desire, both for ourselves as well as for the sake of the world because of the wider aspect of the problem, to keep apart from this conflict. Therefore, this declaration is of great importance. The House will see that this declaration fits in exactly with the preamble to the Indo-China Agreement that I read a little while ago. In that agreement, therefore, we had in mind more or less the same approach of non-interference as we have mentioned in this Ceylon statement.

In this statement also, the Colombo statement, there is reference to Tunisia and Morocco. Why, it may be asked, were Tunisia and Morocco specially mentioned, when there are many other areas of colonial control. You can hardly make a list of them. But the fact of the matter is that Tunisia and Morocco are not colonies in the real sense of the word. They are both, or they are both supposed to be, sovereign countries in alliance. In effect, it is perfectly true that their sovereignty is non-existent and has been gradually pushed aside and colonial conditions have been produced there. But in law and in fact the position in Tunisia and Morocco is different from the normal colony. Actually the conditions are much the same. But this was one of the reasons why we wanted to mention Tunisia and Morocco separately, because colonies included all colonial territories, and these two places were not directly colonies in that sense.

One thing else we mentioned in the statement, about the possibility of having an Asian-African Conference. This was a proposal made by the Prime Minister of Indonesia. We all of us welcomed that proposal. There are some obvious difficulties in organising such a conference. And the Prime Minister of Indonesia undertook to explore this matter and to consult with

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the other Governments concerned about it later.

Another matter in which we were deeply interested was the economic problem of South Asia. We were hardly in a position there to discuss this with any detail, because one wanted experts and others. Also, we had exhausted the time at our disposal in discussing other matters. But certain proposals were made by several countries; and those proposals, it was suggested and agreed to, should be circulated to all the Governments concerned with a view to our corresponding about these and, if necessary, meeting to discuss these either at a technical level or any other level. Because, it was considered important that in economic matters as well as in cultural matters these countries of South East Asia should come closer together.

Just previous to going to the Colombo Conference I made six proposals in this House. It was not my intention to push those proposals exactly as they were at this Conference at Colombo. I naturally wanted the general background and approach of those proposals to be appreciated and accepted by the Prime Ministers present there, but not everything, word for word, as I had stated here. And so I placed these proposals in their general outline. There was much discussion about them, and as a result I have already read out to you what we unanimously agreed to. Now, much has been said about this matter; about disagreement over these questions. Of course, they were different approaches, but the fact is, I would like the House to read the Colombo decisions and read the six proposals in regard to Indo-China and see how much similarity there is in that approach. The basic approach that I made in those proposals was, cease-fire, direct negotiations and non-intervention. These were the three basic things. Now, in the Ceylon statement, cease-fire has been given prominence, direct negotiation has been given prominence, but the word 'non-intervention' does not appear. But, what appears in its place? It is said that the

success of direct negotiation will be greatly helped by an agreement on the part of all countries concerned, particularly, China, U.K., U.S.A., and U.S.S.R., on the steps necessary to prevent a recurrence and resumption of hostilities. Now, if they come to an agreement on the steps necessary to prevent a recurrence and resumption of hostilities, it inevitably means non-intervention or 'non-aid'. It has got that meaning. In fact, non-intervention as such was in a sense negative. This is a positive approach to the problem including that negative approach of non-intervention, so that, if I may say so, the way the Colombo Conference has put it is a much better way than I had put it previously.

The real question where you consider Korea or Indo-China is the question of how far we can get a negotiated settlement, or of how far these countries are going to try to impose a settlement. Imposition is hardly a settlement still. But, now one thing is quite clear. It is this: that the various forces and powers are so matched that it is not possible for either group of powers to impose any settlement on the other wholly against the will of the other one. One can of course incline the settlement this way or that way. It depends on the desire for settlement. It depends on the strength behind one. But, in the final analysis there can be no imposition quite apart from the merits of the question. We have seen even in Korea the war dragging on for three years and ending in a stalemate, not in the victory of the one or the other and a desire for settlement naturally came after that three years of warfare on both sides. Now, if after that stalemate they speak—and I regret to say that both sides are in the habit of speaking that way—as if they have won a great victory; if either side wants to function as if it was victorious, well, the facts belie that position. It was a stalemate and if we are to have a settlement it will have to be based on that stalemate position. I do not mean to say that geographically it is on that, but I may say the

mental approach has to be that there is no victor in the struggle and we have to come to terms. That in effect is the position both in Korea and Indo-China. That is, if there is to be a settlement it has to be a negotiated settlement and not by imposition. Now, unfortunately our wishes sometimes do not coincide with the facts of the situation. Our desire about the type of settlement or solution we want has no relation to facts. President Eisenhower used a very interesting phrase about the approaches that were made, the 'untenable and the unacceptable'. That is, when one wants something which one cannot attain, well, one wants it rather in the air and what the other party wants is unacceptable. So, one cannot bridge that gulf. Now, in Geneva, these matters are being discussed daily in a number of groups and conferences and privately. All kinds of proposals have been made which appear to be far removed from each other. Nevertheless, the feeling that I get is that there is a very earnest desire to find some way out for a cease-fire as well as for future steps towards a settlement. I have no doubt that the great statesmen who are engaged in this work in Geneva are actuated by a strong desire for peace. Also, behind all these big differences and sometimes strong criticism of each other, there appears to be a growing area of commonness in their approach. I do not know, of course, what the result will be of these deliberations at Geneva. I earnestly hope that some way out will be found towards, first of all, cease-fire and then progressively towards settlement. I repeat that there can be no such approach towards a settlement except to a negotiated settlement, not to an imposition.

People at some times said that India is angling for some kind of invitation to go to Geneva. Speaking for myself, I can say quite frankly that not only have I no desire at all, but I would hesitate very much to assume further burdens of any type or kind. I have no desire; there is no question of angling about it. If and whenever we are

invited to any of these difficult conferences, it is not with too great a pleasure that we go, but it is only under the compulsion of events that one cannot avoid going as we went to Korea. Our attitude all along has been not to push ourselves in: at the same time not to isolate ourselves and say we can have nothing to do with it, because we are intimately concerned with it. Not only we; but other neighbouring countries in Asia are intimately concerned. We cannot say we wash our hands of this business. Therefore, being intimately concerned, we cannot get away from the fact that if a situation arises which might require some kind of initiative on our part or some kind of association on our part in any particular decision, we cannot just run away and say, no, let us drift. Inevitably, we cannot shed the responsibilities that go with a great country.

I do not wish to discuss these various proposals in regard to Indo-China or Korea which have been put forward at Geneva. That would not help at all. We are anxious to help; not merely to show our cleverness by criticising this country or that proposal. Apart from that, these proposals change daily. It is not easy to keep pace with them. Anyhow, so far as we are concerned, we are earnestly following these developments and if and when necessity arises, we express our view point privately. If an occasion arises when we can be perhaps of some assistance in the promotion of a settlement, we shall consider that with the greatest care.

9 A.M.

Of one thing in the Colombo meeting I should like to remind the House. That is, we have emphasized that all these matters in regard to Indo-China should be kept in the purview of the United Nations, that the United Nations should be brought into this picture. Now we attach importance to this. Sometimes I have ventured to criticise the United Nations—the functioning, rather, of the United Nations—but the fact remains that the United Nations

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

is the only great international body which can deal with international questions. It is far better in these matters for that large forum of the United Nations to consider these questions of war and peace than for limited conferences. Of course, limited conferences are essential, but, on the whole, when the time comes, if the United Nations is there, the weight in favour of peace is likely to be much greater, because nearly all the countries there are interested in peace. Therefore we have suggested about the United Nations being seized in a sense, that is, the Geneva conference reporting to the United Nations, and, maybe, the United Nations giving the weight of its support to that settlement and seeing that it is carried through. It is difficult enough for a settlement to be arrived at—I hope that difficulty will be surmounted—but having surmounted the difficulty of coming to some agreed settlement, the next step is equally difficult, the implementation of that settlement. And it is there even more than before that the United Nations comes in, and all of us who are Members of the United Nations have to play our part in this matter.

There are one or two other matters I should like to refer to rather briefly. I refer to the French settlements. There is, of course, the old problem of Goa, and, quite frankly, we have not taken any special step in regard to Goa. Questions are put in this House from time to time, and I quite recognise the impatience of hon. Members and the country, and I give a reply which even I consider very unsatisfactory, but there it is. I hope that this problem will become easier of solution because of other developments, but the real difficulty, if I may venture to say so, dealing with Goa, is that the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries come up against the middle of the twentieth century. It is quite extraordinary for this three or four hundred years' gap suddenly to be bridged. We are told of alliances like the Anglo-Portuguese alliance which I

believe in some form or other dates back six or seven hundred years and which was renewed in the sixteenth, seventeenth and early nineteenth century in various forms. We are told that His Holiness the Pope three hundred years ago issued a bull giving half the world to Portugal. We are told of the more recent NATO alliances and agreements, and we are told that Goa has become an integral part of Portugal. Well, apart from that being somewhat of a violence in geography, now, in this matter, the Prime Minister of Portugal lays stress on the Anglo-Portuguese alliance of some hundreds of years ago. Naturally, the world was rather different then. In fact, India was hardly in the picture. Even the British were not in India then, and partly, I think, India came into the picture in the sense that the island of Bombay was about that time given as dowry. Now, the ruling authorities of Portugal still live in the mental climate of the time when the island of Bombay was given as dowry, and it is naturally difficult for us to adapt ourselves to that climate. But this reference to the Anglo-Portuguese alliance has no relevance obviously to events in India or Goa, nor has NATO which was an alliance for the Atlantic communities. First of all, as I have stated, we are parties neither to the Anglo-Portuguese alliance nor to the NATO alliance, and, therefore, we are not bound by any treaty whatever, to which we are not parties. Secondly, we do not think that either of these, even from another point of view, has any relevance in this respect; and in fact, some of the countries associated with the NATO alliance have expressed this view themselves. Nevertheless, we have addressed some of the governments concerned, and drawn their attention to Prime Minister Salazar's statement and pointed out that we do not recognise this alliance, and hope that they also do not recognise that to be the correct position.

Then there is the unfortunate problem of people of Indian descent in Ceylon. I find a great deal of difficul-

ty in dealing with this matter, because I am quite convinced that this is, more so than other questions, a question which can only be solved in a friendly and peaceful way, and I do not wish to say or do anything which ruffles the atmosphere or makes it a little more difficult. The House knows that some months back—in January, I think—there was what was called the Indo-Ceylonese Agreement. That was rather a big word to describe it; it was an understanding of how to proceed about this matter; it was not a solution, but it was an understanding as to how to proceed about this matter, in order to reach a solution. There were certain procedures, and among those procedures, one of the things that we have laid down specifically was that neither Government would take any step without consulting the other about this matter. That, of course, does not make less the sovereignty of either government. It is a very common thing for countries to come to a decision that they will consult each other. That does not make them less sovereign or less independent. Since then, nothing very much has happened, and yet many small things have happened, which have made large numbers of people in Ceylon very apprehensive about the future. There is the problem, hon. Members will remember, of these persons, who, at the present moment, can only be described as Stateless. They are certainly not Indian nationals. They and their families have lived there for a long time; many of them have been born there.

Now, normally they would be Ceylon nationals, but, of course, Ceylon has the right and authority to decide about that matter, about its own nationals. So long as it does not accept them as nationals, they are nationals of no State—certainly not Indian nationals—and so they have become Stateless people living in Ceylon and hoping for Ceylonese nationality. In fact, they have applied for it, nearly all of them or a very large number of them. I am not for the moment referring to the Indian nationals who are there. They are in large numbers

too, may be 150,000, and the House should always distinguish between the two. We talk vaguely about Indians here and Indians there. That is confusing, because an Indian is normally an Indian national; it does not matter what the colour of his skin is, or he may be, if I may use the word—let us say—a 'European naturalised Indian.' Well, he is an Indian from that point of view. Now, there are Indian nationals in Ceylon who claim only the normal rights of no discrimination, of freedom to function there as any foreign national can claim. The others are people of Indian descent who have been there for a long time, some of them for generations. Nobody has been able to go to Ceylon from India as an immigrant legally for the last 15 years, I think since round about the late thirties. There have, of course, been illegal immigrants—leave that out. Now, so far as the Indian nationals there are concerned, that is a separate problem. It is a bit of a problem too, because there is a certain process of squeezing them out. While I may regret the manner of doing it, I cannot challenge the right of the Ceylonese Government of dealing with any individual they choose to. But when it is not a question of an individual but large groups, then the situation becomes more difficult. Most of these Indian nationals there are professional people—merchants, domestic employees and the rest. The other problem, and the real problem, is of that of the so-called Stateless people; they have nearly all applied for Ceylon nationality and the matter is being considered by some committee etc. in Ceylon which accepts some applications and rejects the others. Lately there have been far more rejections than acceptances. Anyhow I do not wish to go more deeply into this question except to express my regret at the trend of events in Ceylon which has produced this strong apprehension. There are, after all, 600,000 or 700,000 of these persons in Ceylon, it is a fairly large number and it is to the interest of Ceylon, as it is to the interest of these people, to settle this matter peacefully; otherwise,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

naturally an unfortunate feeling of conflict persists, which does no good to anybody.

There is one matter which came up the other day here and in answer to a question, I made a brief statement, that is, clemency for Japanese war criminals. Now, this is a very important matter, not because of the exercise or not of clemency; we were strongly in favour of clemency for these people. But I realise that our voice could not go far when others, who normally differ, are of one opinion about this matter; other countries who have normally differed, that is, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are of like opinion that there should be no clemency. However, that is almost a matter affecting a few persons. But what is important is the procedure adopted in this,—the way India is pushed out because she did not sign the San Francisco treaty and Pakistan is brought in. We have no objection to Pakistan coming in the normal course anywhere. They are welcome. But the arguments advanced were really remarkable. I had paid much attention to this. We, of course, consulted our lawyers and others repeatedly, although I thought no great legal knowledge was necessary in this matter. But the way this has been dealt with casually, rather cavalierly, without any intimation to us, without anything—just we go out of the picture and we are informed later by the Japanese Government that they are told that India has no say in the matter and that Pakistan comes in—all this is a most extraordinary thing which one cannot think of in international affairs. But apart from its being arbitrary and all that, an attempt has been made there to undermine, if you like, the very basis of the agreement after the partition with the United Kingdom. All these are recorded facts. Here was this agreement in which India was a continuing entity, not only the name of the country but the country of India. We assumed all the liabilities, all the debt, all the international obligations, everything. It is all recorded, and now

we are told calmly that Pakistan, as a successor State to British India, because she signed the San Francisco treaty—what the San Francisco treaty has to do with this, I do not understand—is brought in and India goes out. It is a matter of grave concern that great countries should function in this way and deal with the international obligations in this casual and cavalier way. In particular, I must express my great surprise that the Government of the United Kingdom, even more than the others, should have agreed to this, because that Government there has a special responsibility. It is with that Government that we came to an agreement on these matters. Then, casually to deal with this question in this way shows, if I may say so, with all respect, that in some matters the normal considerations of international law or, if I may say so, even international conventions and behaviour are not respected, and just any decision one wants is imposed. Yet all this does not make very much difference to us—whether our opinion towards clemency to the Japanese war criminals is accepted or not. Ours was a lone voice any way. But it does make a great deal of difference, this approach. This approach is applied repeatedly in other matters. No country, least of all India, likes to be imposed upon. It likes to be played with, in this way. I mention this not because of its own intrinsic importance, but as a sign and a symbol of the way highly respected and great countries function now—days in such matters.

There are of course, in the course of these debates, many matters which are often referred to but I have tried to concentrate upon relatively a few important ones, because, after all, they cover this wider situation. If it so happens that out of this Conference at Geneva some good emerges—and I earnestly hope it will—the whole aspect of affairs changes and other problems are affected by that change. I earnestly hope that the great and wise statesmen assembled at Geneva will

find a way out of these problems. If they find a way out, I am sure, other countries who have no desire to push themselves there, but wherever they might be, would like to help in the settlements arrived at, provided, of course, they are settlements—no country can help in imposing anything. That is a basic difference between our approach and the approach sometimes taken by other countries.

I come back to what I said a minute ago; our approach is that of trying to work for collective peace and, in fact, that collective peace is the only collective security. The other collective security—that, all the time, by threats and fear of mounting armaments—is not even bringing a climate of peace. It brings in a climate of fear. In fact, in the world today there are very few people who have any sense of security and hardly enough the people belonging to the most powerful countries of the world have the least feeling of security. It is curious; it shows that security necessarily does not come with power and armaments when the powers and armaments are matched by somebody else with power and armaments. Security springs by bringing about a new climate, a new approach and recognising that in this world, we can only exist by a policy of 'live and let live', by tolerating others—tolerating no aggression, tolerating no interference—but tolerating others to exist as they want to exist. Here, we are in India—it may apply to other Asian countries trying hard in our way to shape our own destiny, political, economic, social, cultural, whatever it may be. We have sometimes our own internal arguments or conflicts. That is natural, we settle them. We may accept and we do accept many things from other countries. We have to because we are backward in industry, in science, in technique, in hundred and one things, many new concepts and ideas. We do not wish to be isolated. We want to accept them, but it is we who accept them of our own free will. The moment anything is imposed upon us, even if it is a good thing, it becomes poison in our system. Therefore, this idea of imposing good

—even some of us I am afraid, I include all of us not excluding myself in that number, try to be good to others and we get very annoyed if our good is not accepted and acted upon—is not good. We are unduly thrusting ourselves on others; may be this Parliament might occasionally thrust itself on the people of India today by trying to do too much good to them. However that may be, when it is a question of other countries trying to do good to you, it is a dangerous matter, and immediately there are bound to be conflicts. I mean that a thing you might accept in grace normally, you reject even a good thing because you are roused against that imposition, so that in this world today we must accept this 'live and let live' business. Let there be no interference, external or internal, and let ideas freely flow and let each country evolve itself and that is the only basis on which you can have a gradual return of feeling of sanity and security. I have no doubt that if there is in the world a value of ideas—as there is, of course—the right ideas will prevail in the end. They would prevail far less by fear of armaments because that produces a new context of things. Now, of course, if you know about force and arms in the world of today, the arms are such that at the end of the conflict between these arms no ideas may be left at all finally to prevail. So, I earnestly hope that the efforts of the Statesmen at Geneva will meet with success and, while we are perfectly entitled as individuals or as groups to express our opinion and criticise, I think, we should also send them our goodwill for that purpose.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

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

I have received notice of some amendments, but the hon. Members who have tabled them have forgotten the rules, I mean rule No. 311, which

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

I shall read out. I have to make some modifications to these amendments, otherwise they will be out of order. I do not want to throw out these amendments. If the hon. Members concerned are agreeable to this slight modification. I can take them.

**Several Hon. Members** *rose*—

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order please. No hon. Member ought to get up while I am standing.

Rule No. 311 says:

"A motion that the policy or situation or statement or any other matter be taken into consideration shall not be put to the vote of the House, but the House shall proceed to discuss such matter immediately after the mover has concluded his speech and no further question shall be put at the conclusion of the debate at the appointed hour unless a member moves a substantive motion in appropriate terms to be approved by the Speaker and the vote of the House shall be taken on such motion."

The hon. Members evidently addressed themselves to the rules as they stood originally before they were amended. Anyhow, I do not want to throw out any of these amendments on the technical ground.

I will now begin with Shri Raghunath Singh's amendment. I propose that it should be amended like this since "That in the motion, the following be added at the end, etc." is not appropriate and does not fall in line with rule 311:

"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 thereon, approves of all the steps taken so far by Government in the matter."

**Shri Raghunath Singh** (Banaras Distt.—Central): I agree, Sir. I beg to move:

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 thereon approves of all the steps taken so far by Government in the matter."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Likewise, verbal alterations are also necessary in the other amendments that have been tabled. If the hon. Members agree, they can move their motions.

**Sardar A. S. Saigal** (Bilaspur): I beg to move:

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 thereon approves of the steps taken by the Government."

**Shri T. K. Chaudhuri** (Berhampore): I beg to move:

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 thereon regrets that the Government have—

- (i) failed to take such steps as would strengthen and reinforce India's security against the danger of colonial aggression in Asia and elsewhere, and against the danger of aggressive U.S. expansionism in particular, as evidenced by the extension of U.S. military aid to Pakistan and other neighbouring countries of India;
- (ii) generally followed in the wake of Great Britain and

the British Commonwealth and failed to forge an independent line of policy of their own in international affairs; and

- (iii) by their recent statements and proposals on Indo-China, by their participation in the Colombo Conference of Asian Premiers conjointly with the governments of such countries as Ceylon and Pakistan and by their support to the Colombo decisions sought to exert the weight of their influence in favour of a negotiated settlement between France and Indo-China which is ultimately directed towards bringing the states of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia in some form of association with the French Colonial empire and securing the puppet pro-French Governments of these States a share in power in the new scheme of things in Indo-China."

**Shri Raghuramaiah** (Tenali): I beg to move:

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 thereon approves of the policy."

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy** (Salem): I beg to move:

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 thereon approves of the steps taken by the Government."

**Shri N. L. Joshi** (Indore): I beg to move:

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 thereon appeals to all the peace-loving citizens of the world to get themselves united against the common danger facing humanity as a whole in the threat of war endangering world peace."

**Shri Sadhan Gupta** (Calcutta—South-East): I beg to move:

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 thereon is of opinion;

(a) that all the diplomatic privileges and immunities of American experts in India who enjoy such privileges and immunities should forthwith be withdrawn;

(b) that all American experts working in India should be removed at the earliest opportunities, and where they cannot be replaced by our own nationals, they should be replaced by experts from foreign countries not connected with NATO or the ANZUS;

(c) that steps should be taken to remove the stranglehold of Britain on our economy;

(d) that foreign enterprise should at once be banned in sectors of our Industry which are vital to our national security and defence;

(e) that all kinds of propaganda, whether through the cinema or through literary works or otherwise, designed to propagate the necessity or advisability or inevitability of war with other countries should forthwith be banned;

(f) that all propaganda against the people of Pakistan should be actively discouraged; and

(g) that efforts should be made to establish friendship and goodwill between the people of this country and Pakistan through

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

exchange of official and unofficial goodwill missions, sports and other kinds of cultural delegations and other means."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Amendments moved:

(1) 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 thereon approves of all the steps taken so far by Government in the matter."

(2) 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 thereon approves of the steps taken by the Government."

(3) 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 thereon regrets that the Government have—

(i) failed to take such steps as would strengthen and reinforce India's security against the danger of colonial aggression in Asia and elsewhere, and against the danger of aggressive U.S. expansionism in particular, as evidenced by the extension of U. S. military aid to Pakistan and other neighbouring countries of India;

(ii) generally followed in the wake of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth and failed to forge an independent line of policy of their own in international affairs; and

(iii) by their recent statements and proposals on Indo-China, by

their participation in the Colombo Conference of Asian Premiers conjointly with the governments of such countries as Ceylon and Pakistan and by their support to the Colombo decisions sought to exert the weight of their influence in favour of a negotiated settlement between France and Indo-China which is ultimately directed towards bringing the states of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia in some form of association with the French Colonial empire and securing the puppet pro-French Governments of these States a share in power in the new scheme of things in Indo-China."

(4) 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 thereon approves of the policy."

(5) 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 thereon approves of the steps taken by the Government."

(6) 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 thereon appeals to all the peace-loving citizens of the world to get themselves united against the common danger facing humanity as a whole in the threat of war endangering world peace."

(7) 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 thereon, is of opinion—

(a) that all the diplomatic privileges and immunities of American

experts in India who enjoy such privileges and immunities should forthwith be withdrawn;

(b) that all American experts working in India should be removed at the earliest opportunities, and where they cannot be replaced by our own nationals, they should be replaced by experts from foreign countries not connected with NATO or the ANZUS;

(c) that steps should be taken to remove the stranglehold of Britain on our economy;

(d) that foreign enterprise should at once be banned in sectors of our Industry which are vital to our national security and defence;

(e) that all kinds of propaganda, whether through the cinema or through literary works or otherwise, designed to propagate the necessity or advisability or inevitability of war with other countries should forthwith be banned;

(f) that all propaganda against the people of Pakistan should be actively discouraged; and

(g) that efforts should be made to establish friendship and goodwill between the people of this country and Pakistan through exchange of official and unofficial goodwill missions, sports and other kinds of cultural delegations and other means."

**Shri Velayudhan Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Scheduled Castes:** I do not propose to move my amendment as a similar amendment has been moved by Shri Raghuramaiah.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam) rose—**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the discussion of the original motion and also the substantive motions which I just read out.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Before we proceed further, may I ask whether the Business Advisory Committee has

allotted two days for this discussion? I want to know whether it is two days or only one day.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It does not appear that the Business Advisory Committee has decided anything so far as this matter is concerned. I have got other work for the House which is admitted, and there are occasions when the international policy comes up before the House from time to time as international situation changes and references have to be made to some events or other. I believe one day is enough, or let us see at the end of the day if it should be extended to any extent. I propose doing this alternatively. If the debate closes today, I will request the hon. Prime Minister to reply tomorrow.

**Sardar A. S. Saigal:** Tomorrow is Sunday.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It means the next day the House sits.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-east):** It is good that we get an opportunity from time to time to discuss the foreign policy of our country because it is important that we recall the categorical imperatives of our foreign policy. It is important that we remember the major premise of our patriotism in the setting of foreign policy, which is that we shall always raise our voice, and wherever we can, we shall raise our hands also, in support of the people who are fighting for freedom wherever they might be. Today it is of special importance that we are having this debate because at Geneva a Conference is taking place where Asia is above all on the agenda. The question of war or peace in Asia has come to the forefront. Today the peoples of the world are confronted with hope and despair at the same time because of what has actually happened; those who want to retain their stranglehold on peoples struggling to be free have been compelled by the pressure of circumstances to agree to the holding of this Conference but they are trying even now to sabotage this Conference and see to it that this Conference does not

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

produce the results which our Prime Minister is hoping for along with the rest of the peoples of the world.

I am reminded in this connection of what was said once, at least what was reported to have been said once, by Clemenceau in 1919. It appears that a British diplomat was going with Clemenceau in a car along the streets of Paris and on that day there had been a railway accident. It was placarded on the newspaper hoardings; at one place it was described as "an accident on the railway" and the other report said, "disaster on the railway". The British diplomat then asked Clemenceau: "In French, does 'accident' and 'disaster' mean the same thing?". He barked in reply: "No, of course it does not. For example, if President Wilson falls into a well, it would be an accident but if he gets out of it, it will be a disaster." What has happened today in regard to the international situation is that Mr. John Foster Dulles and his tribe find themselves in a position where they can no longer resist the urge for peace and freedom in Asia and their agreement to have this Geneva Conference particularly with People's China participating is really a sort of an accident which has happened, but if Mr. Foster Dulles and his tribe can get out of this accident, that would be a disaster. And that is a disaster against which the peoples of the world have to take every possible precaution.

I was happy to see the Prime Minister getting rather angry over the peculiar improprieties of the imbroglio which has happened over the San Francisco Treaty in relation to Japan and the treatment which has been cavalierly meted out to us. I say I was happy to see him angry because he said a little earlier that India is not angry at her exclusion from the Geneva Conference. I do not expect our Prime Minister to say that he is angry at our exclusion from Geneva. I do not say that India has need to be angry. But at the same time there is no use getting away from the fact that, in spite of

India today possessing something like a moral initiative in world affairs, an initiative which has from time to time been exercised with positive courage, in spite of all that, this pernicious effort to keep India away from Asian deliberations, from deliberations in which she rightfully ought to have a part, this effort is continuing, and this effort is having the utmost support from our friends of the Commonwealth, from the United Kingdom.

This happened not only in regard to our exclusion from Geneva but also in regard to our exclusion from the Disarmament Commission, from the Subcommittee on Disarmament which has been appointed by the United Nations. M. Vyshinsky had suggested that India, China and Czechoslovakia should be on the Disarmament Commission. The United Kingdom came forward first of all to prevent our being a member of the Disarmament Commission. India actually being present on the spot and contributing her share of wisdom and understanding and insight to international deliberations is today an important factor in world affairs. But today there is a definite effort being engineered, a deliberate effort, to keep India out, if at all that is possible. That is why I say I was happy to see the Prime Minister angry at least at one thing where these people have shown us that they do not greatly like the idea of India's participation. Because, the voice of India today is always raised on the side of peace and freedom of the peoples.

Most of our attention is naturally riveted on the Geneva Conference. And there we certainly wish that a settlement is arrived at over the question of Indo-China and of Korea. Why is it that the peoples of the world today are so very anxious about the outcome of this Conference? It is because with the hydrogen bomb experimentations and with the talk of "massive retaliation" which the United States

of America was going to practise against whoever incurred her disfavour, it was in the context of these things that the people of Asia realised above all that peace is a need, peace is something which has got to be achieved here and now. And this feeling of the people of Asia is today so paramount that no force on earth can prevent it. And that is why a very fine setting has been provided to the Geneva Conference by the great victory of the people's forces at Dien Bien Phu. They try to say it is only an effort on the part of those who are fighting for the freedom of Indo-China to negotiate from positions of strength. That is their phrase, the phrase of imperialists. They choose to forget that the planning for the Dien Bien Phu battle was made by the French imperialists with American instigation and assistance in order that they might give a death blow to the fight of the Indo-Chinese people for freedom. But it came back like a boomerang, and came right on time, so that we know what is what in Asia. Come all the hydrogen bombs and atom bombs all together against the spirit of the people, that spirit cannot be daunted. That, therefore, is the background of what is happening at Geneva today.

There is no need for me to go into any detail over the questions which are being discussed there. But I wish that we make clear that if we are going to have a settlement in Indo-China and in Korea—and surely a settlement must come in these two countries—then we must concentrate on the essential points. Of course there should be a cease-fire. Of course there should be a negotiated settlement. Of course, there might be a dispute about who are going to take part in the discussions preliminary to a settlement and as to who are going to constitute the supervisory commissions of those supervisory Commissions are going to be appointed if and when elections are held in order to give the people an opportunity to determine their own destiny. But, the crux of the matter is that the foreign troops who are there, either in Indo-

China or Korea, must quit. A time limit must be fixed for their evacuation because we cannot have anything like free and fair elections in spite of supervision through United Nations or any other kind of agency, if we have got foreign troops still in operation in those areas. Therefore, the real demand of the people of these areas—and surely, that is a demand which we can support enthusiastically—is that the crux of the matter in regard to the settlement of the issues at stake in these areas is that there must be an evacuation of these areas by all foreign troops of whatever description, Asian, European, American or African, before the people can choose their destiny; before the people can decide on what kind of Government they are going to have. This is a matter which is escaping the attention of our people. To our people, Sir, the whole picture is painted in a very confusing fashion. The idea is presented that the two camps are fighting for power in those areas; that the Soviets and China they are putting forward certain claims and the Americans, British and others are putting forward certain other claims; that there is a tug-of-war and there is a stalemate. We have to find out what exactly are the positive proposals which are being made. Therefore, I say, that General Nam II of North Korea has offered certain proposals, very concrete proposals, and there this question of evacuation by foreign troops within six months is made a condition precedent to any kind of real settlement. I say, that is absolutely important in regard to this Indo-China war which has gone on for seven years. At one time the French used to say, it is a forgotten war "*le guerre oublié*", yet they could not forget the wounds the canker eating into the very vitals of French spirit and economy because of the dirty war "*le guerre sale*". Whether it is forgotten or whether it is dirty, they have got to come to some kind of settlement with the people of Indo-China. That is something which they realise. In spite of that, what are they doing?

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

They are not really taking any positive steps for the settlement of the question. The settlement can only happen if we get not only the suggestions regarding supervisions, but a definite proposal that the foreign troops of any kind of shade or colour should all quit the scene. We know ourselves how the United Nations Observers and such other authorities behaved in regard to Kashmir. We know only too well how the United Nations Observers behaved in regard to Kashmir. In regard to Pondicherry once in 1948 the French Government conducted the elections in its possessions and the results were so dismal that the India Government had to scrap the agreement to have a plebiscite under United Nations auspices and had to demand unconditional merger of those colonies without any kind of strings whatever. We know what happens when this kind of supervision is in the picture. If the foreign troops are out of the scene altogether, then surely, there can be agreement. In regard to the method of supervision, I find in the papers that M. Molotov has made certain suggestions about how the Supervisory commissions may be constituted which may be acceptable to either side. I need not enter into the details of the matter, but the crux of the matter, I repeat, is that there must be evacuation of these areas by all foreign troops as soon as possible. If these foreign troops are there, it will only create certain factors which are extremely undesirable. That is a point which I would like to emphasise with all the strength at my disposal.

Now, Sir, as the Prime Minister has said today, these Asian questions are the most important of all. In connection with it, naturally we are reminded of what is happening in our own land and our own soil. The question of Pondicherry and other French possessions, as well as Goa, would come to our mind. These questions have been repeatedly discussed on the

floor of this House, either by way of questions or otherwise, and the Prime Minister also has said that as far as the negotiations with the French are concerned, they are being pursued at the present moment. He has also made certain observations in regard to Goa. I do not want to go into the details of this matter, because our Government has taken a stand in regard to these foreign possessions, a stand which we wish to see materialised in practice as soon ever that is possible. Therefore, I do not want to embarrass the Government in any way. But, I do wish to say one thing. The patience of our people is being very sorely tried. From time to time, questions come up in this House as well as in the other House and the answers which we get from the External Affairs Ministry are by no means really satisfactory. Because, the thing hangs fire; the stalemate continues; the humiliation of these foreign possessions on our soil does not appear likely to be effaced within a short span of time. This is the kind of thing which happens. I do not know if you got also, I suppose all Members of Parliament were sent, a copy of the speech made on Goa by Dr. Salazar on the 12th April, 1954, along with a covering note from whoever is the diplomatic representative in charge of the Portuguese legation in New Delhi; it is, I see the Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Paolo Cunha who has sent this circular as well as the speech to all Members of Parliament as far as I know. I entirely agree with the Prime Minister that the Portuguese are trying to make up something by way of a treaty in the 17th century and they are importing it into the 20th century. But, even worse things are happening. Passions which are worse than primitive have been resuscitated by the neo-imperialists of today, those who are flaunting the possession of hydrogen bomb and atomic weapons and other instruments of mass extermination. The Portuguese are reviving something of the 17th century which was a gra-

cious period by comparison with certain other periods in history. These people are raking up pre-primitive days. Perhaps I may be insulting our ancestors in saying that they are raking up the spirit of those days. I do not think there was ever any period in human history when people of a certain sort could move about in respectable society and get away with it people who are merchants of death, people who brag about their possession of weapons of destruction on a scale which is absolutely unprecedented and which on any computation is immoral to the nth degree. This sort of thing is happening today. When this gentleman Dr. Salazar, the Prime Minister and Dictator of Portugal, invokes the Anglo-Portuguese treaty, when he says openly that he has had a talk with the Prime Minister of Canada who says something which contradicts what the Prime Minister had reported to have been the Canadian reaction to the Portuguese possessions like Goa, when he says these things and when I put two and two together, when I recall the British conduct in regard to India's role in world affairs today, when I find that forgetting all canons of propriety and decency, even diplomatic immunity of our representatives is ignored altogether by the British marauders, who talk about law and order, in Africa, when these things happen, I think something should be done about it. We are in the Commonwealth. The guardian angel of the Commonwealth is the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom takes up this kind of attitude from time to time.

In regard to Goa and in regard to Pondicherry, in regard to these foreign pockets in India, I think it is time that we set a target date and we say, look here, we are not going to tolerate this nonsense any longer. I remember what was said in the days of the war for Italian independence: "*le cri de douleur*" "the cry of sorrow" is coming from our people who live some miles away. We can no longer turn a deaf ear to the cry of sorrow which is coming from

these areas. That is what we have to say. That is what we have to tell the French and Portuguese imperialists. However much they might bank upon the support which the Americans have promised and the support which the English, somewhat timidly, have tentatively promised them, they must give an undertaking that after a certain date they will quit. If they do not quit, we are no longer responsible for whatever action the people of that area are taking and we must not be internationally criticised if our people also assist those of their countrymen who are living in these foreign pockets. I should say, therefore, that we ought to take a very strong line in regard to this matter.

Now, the Prime Minister referred to the Colombo Conference and I certainly should concede that, in spite of the somewhat unpropitious composition of the conference, the pressure of public opinion was such that the decisions of the Colombo conference has largely been a blow, a powerful blow, directed against American imperialism and other imperialisms which are trying to dominate over Asia. But, I did not quite understand when the Prime Minister said that reference was made to Tunisia and Morocco and not to places like Kenya or Malaya which are mentioned so often in this House. He said that mention was made of Tunisia and Morocco because they are not under colonial powers, but they had quasi-sovereign jurisdiction and therefore they stand in a different category. I say by all means let us mention Tunisia and Morocco, but let us not forget Malaya and Kenya and such other areas of the British Empire as British Guiana. Why should we forget them, I see no reason. Tunisia and Morocco might stand in a different category. When we speak of Tunisia and Morocco, our arguments are different, but in regard to Malaya, in regard to Kenya, in regard to British Guiana, in regard to so many other areas of the world, we also have to say

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

what we feel. There, I have a suspicion I do not want to put it more strongly than that—that it is only because of our association with the British Commonwealth that we cannot take a forthright attitude on this point. I know I annoy the Prime Minister, but I am quite used to it. I do annoy him, but what can I do? I cannot help it. I do say, I aver it, I assert it, with all the emphasis at my command that this kind of discrimination, when we try to attack the imperialist process in Tunisia and Morocco and do not attack or condemn the heinous activities in Malaya and Kenya, is something which I do not like.

Then, I heard the Prime Minister with much interest in regard to the Colombo conference decision that there should be no interference—Communist or anti-Communist or any other—in the areas of Asia. He said also the world today is a place where it appears as if a *dharma yudh* is going on, a crusade is going on, and we do not like it, we want to be left alone. I agree entirely that we want to be left alone, and I say as a Communist what has been said over and over again that Communism is not a matter for export. It cannot be taken in a suitcase from one country to another. The Communist influence on India is something which can only have validity and reality if it grows out of the conditions of our country. That goes without saying. That is one of the primary pre-suppositions of Marxist thought. I would ask the Prime Minister what exactly are the influences which we have so far experienced. Since 1947 when the Prime Minister came to his office, who has interfered in India's internal affairs—Britain, United States of America or the Soviet Union or China? In Kashmir who has been continuously interfering and plotting against our sovereignty and independence? Did not the Prime Minister once say in regard to Truman and Attlee that they were trying to bring

some kind of pressure on us in regard to Kashmir?

As far as the people of Pakistan are concerned, did the Soviet Union impose a pact on them, or is it the Americans who are now having their domination over that area by imposing this pact on them? The people of Burma can justly ask their Prime Minister: "Who let loose the Kuomin-tang bandits on the people of Burma? Was it the American imperialists, or was it the Soviet Union or China?" The people of Ceylon—I mention those countries which were represented in the Colombo conference—would certainly ask their Prime Minister: "Who put terrific pressure on the Government to see to it that there was not an advantageous economic deal between the People's Republic of China and Ceylon—the rubber-and-rice transaction? Who put the kind of pressure which was wrong?" The people of Indonesia might certainly ask their Prime Minister: "Who intervened against us when we were fighting arms in hand against the Dutch colonialists? Was it the United States, or was it the Soviet Union?" Who are these foreign interventionists? Are they Communist interventionists? Have you ever been able to spot them? We know, everybody knows, in Indo-China who are supplying the French with arms and ammunition. They are openly bragging about it. They have not yet found one single Soviet soldier or anything like that. There is no evidence to show that the Soviet or Chinese are interfering directly in the war. (*An hon. Member*: Indirectly.) Of course, they are neighbours of China and, so to speak, they have their own affiliation, but that is a different matter. But, where is the intervention? I would beg of the Prime Minister to remember what he knows more than most of his followers, that countries with a socialist economy do not require imperialistic areas of exploitation. They do not have their super-profits to sink in other areas where they

can mulct the labour, sweat the labour and squeeze super-profits. They do not need this sort of thing. He knows it very well. That is why, the danger today to our freedom is not from communist influences abroad, but from these imperialist influences which are stalking all over our land, which are stalking over Asia and Africa and which are trying to dominate the whole world. That is a point which I would like the Prime Minister to remember, because, as I say, he has made a study of these things. He knows that more than many of his followers, who have rather no idea in regard to how these affairs are being conducted in the world today.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह (शाहाबाद-दीक्षण) :  
फालांतरस ही नहीं, आप से भी ज्यादा ।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In regard to the *Dharm Yudh* he has said:

“सत्यमेव जयते नानृतम्”

It must be written somewhere or other on the panels of this House. He said that truth will triumph. We say, yes, the truth will triumph. He has asked for peaceful co-existence. I could give you chunks of quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung and all the authoritative exponents of communism, who have spoken on co-existence. But we do not believe that this co-existence will last for ever. We believe that the stamp of doom is on capitalism. Capitalism will go. We can co-exist for quite a long time as far as we can see. But in competition, real competition, capitalism will go down before socialism. There is no doubt about it. As sure as I am speaking here, and as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow, capitalism will go, and socialism will come. But we say we do not have to fight, we do not have to send arms and ammunition, we do not have to send spy rings into different countries, because we depend upon the objective development of social and economic forces in every country, which would lead to the inevitable success or victory of socialist forces. That being

so, the *dharm yudh* is going on, and

“सत्यमेव जयते नानृतम्”

Truth will triumph. Do not try to vitiate the truth by giving a handle to imperialist powers to distort reality, to intimidate people, to thwart their spirit, and to depress their courage which is going to recreate the world nearer their hearts' desire.

I do not wish to take any more time of this House, but I think it is a happy coincidence that we are discussing foreign policy on the eve of a very auspicious day, *vaishakhi poornima* day, the day when the prince of peace, the Lord Buddha was born, the day when he achieved enlightenment, and the day when he departed from this world. But what did the Buddha stand for? He has left us a heap of treasure that neither moth nor rust can corrupt, that not even our traitorship, if we become traitors to that legacy, can sully. He has left us that heap of treasure. But what did he preach? He preached peace, but peace based on right living and right thinking. Let us try to live rightly and to think rightly. That shall certainly make us find out who are our friends, which ideas are welcome to our country, and how we are going to recreate our country. Then, and then alone, we shall be able to rid this world of ours today—this lovely world which we want to recreate in the manner it should be recreated—of the ugly miasma which haunts it today, and then we shall make up our minds to fight those forces of evil which are threatening the very existence of man and his possibilities of peaceful and happy existence.

संठ गीबन्त दास -(मंडला-जबलपुर-दीक्षण):  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का सम्बन्ध है मैं समझता हूँ कि पीडितजी और इस लोक सभा के सभी सदस्य इस बात को भली भाँति जानते हैं कि मैं शुरु से ही इस वैदेशिक नीति का बड़ा भक्ती समर्थक रहा हूँ । इस का कारण है, इस कारण को मैं ने अनेक बार कहा भी है, और वह

[संठ गौर्वन्द दास]

कारण एसा है जिस को अनेक बार कहा जाना चाहिये इस नीति के समर्थन करने का मेरा कारण यह है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति भारतीय संस्कृति की परम्परा के अनुसार है। भारतवर्ष के इतिहास को आप देखिये तो स्पष्ट ज्ञात हो जायेगा कि भारतवर्ष ने हमेशा हर देश और हर राष्ट्र से मैत्री का सम्बन्ध स्थापित रखने का प्रयत्न किया है। उस ने सदा शान्ति चाही है। आधुनिक युग में महात्मा गांधी के जिस अहिंसात्मक तरीके से हमें स्वराज्य मिला, वही तरीका आज भी हम इस वैदेशिक नीति में बरत रहे हैं। इस लिये मैं, जैसा कि मैं ने निवेदन किया, आरम्भ से ही इस का समर्थक रहा हूँ बहुत बड़ा समर्थक रहा हूँ और आज भी उतना ही बड़ा समर्थक हूँ।

श्री हीरन्द्र नाथ मुकर्जी का भाषण अभी हुआ। मुझे यह देख कर खुशी होती है कि अब उन के, जिसे अंगरेजी में टोन कहते हैं उस टोन में परिवर्तन हो रहा है। कुछ बातें ऐसी हैं जिन बातों में हमारी राजनैतिक दलगत नीति को कोई जगह नहीं मिलनी चाहिये। इस देश में अनेक ऐसी बातें हैं जो हम भिन्न भिन्न दलों में रहते हुए भी एक साथ कर सकते हैं। हमारे देश में इतने निर्माण कार्य हो रहे हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इन निर्माण के कार्यों में हम एक क्या न हो जायें। इसी तरह वैदेशिक नीति भी है। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति एक ऐसी नीति है कि जिस का हम कांग्रेसवादी, प्रजा समाजवादी, साम्यवादी, जन संघ वाले, हिन्दू सभा वाले, राम राज्य परिषद वाले, राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ वाले और जो स्वतंत्र व्यक्ति हैं, वे भी सब मिल कर समर्थन कर सकते हैं।

अब हम एक बात और देखें। हम देखें कि धीरे धीरे हमारी इस नीति का क्या नतीजा निकल रहा है। मैं हाल ही की कुछ बातों को आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। कोरिया का युद्ध अभी समाप्त हुआ, लेकिन उस के समाप्त होने के बहुत पहले हम ने यह कहा था कि उस का समाप्त करने का अमुक अमुक

तरीका है, और हम ने देखा कि हम ने उस के समाप्त करने के सम्बन्ध में जिन बातों का प्रतिपादन किया था उन्हीं के आधार पर कोरिया का युद्ध खत्म हुआ।

जब हाइड्रोजन बमों का इधर उधर प्रयोग हुआ और उस से हम को चिन्तित नजर आने लगी तब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सब से पहले आवाज उठाई कि हाइड्रोजन बमों का इस प्रकार का प्रयोग बन्द होना चाहिये, और हम ने देखा कि धीरे धीरे उन की इस आवाज में कई देशों के कई नेताओं की आवाज मिली।

हम ने हिन्दू चीन के लिये कहा कि युद्ध बन्द होना चाहिये, जो कुछ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सब से पहले कहा वही आज अनेक देशों के नायक कहने लगे हैं।

हम ने अपनी वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में जब से हम स्वतंत्र हुए तब से ले कर आज तक देखा है कि हम ने जो जो बातें कहीं वे सत्य निकलीं। जब हम ने कोई बात कही तो उस वक्त चाहे अमरीका नाराज हुआ हो, चाहे रूस रुष्ट हुआ हो, परन्तु अन्त में हमने देखा कि हमारा कहना सही था और इसी लिये हमारा विश्वास है कि आज जिस सामूहिक सुरक्षा, सामूहिक युद्ध, सामूहिक शान्ति की बात कही जाती है, और मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से इस विषय में सर्वथा सहमत हूँ कि यथार्थ में सामूहिक शान्ति की बात ही कार्य रूप में परिणत हो सकती है, उस में जो कुछ हम यहां कह रहे हैं दुनियां उस बात को मानने वाली है।

मैं तो वह स्वप्न भी देखा करता हूँ कि जिस से सारे संसार में एक सरकार स्थापित होगी। दो बातों में से एक बात हो सकती है। या तो इस दुनिया का सर्वनाश होगा, युद्ध नहीं रुकेगा। जिस विस्फोटक पदार्थ का आरम्भ बारूद से हुआ था वह धीरे धीरे अणुबम और उद्भूत बम तक पहुँच गया है। एक ऐसा समय आ सकता है जब किसी ऐसे बम का निर्माण हो कि जिससे हमारे इस भूमंडल, हमारे इस

प्लेनट के टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायें। तो या तो युद्ध बढ़ेगा, विस्फोटक पदार्थ अधिक से अधिक बनाये जायेंगे और या संसार में समृद्धि होगी और युद्ध बन्द होंगे। दो में से एक बात होने वाली है। यदि मानवता का कल्याण होने वाला है, मानव उत्तरोत्तर उन्नत करने वाला है, तो युद्ध बन्द होने ही चाहिए, और मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि युद्ध सम्पूर्ण रीति से तब तक बन्द नहीं हो सकता जब तक कि सारं संसार में एक सरकार की स्थापना न हो। आज यह बात एक कपोलकल्पित बात मानी जायगी पर मानवता का इतिहास आप देखें और देखें कि जो बातें किसी समय कपोलकल्पित मानी जाती थीं सत्य हुईं या नहीं हुईं। एक समय था जब मानव मानव को खा जाता था। उस समय कुछ लोग आगे आये और उन्होंने कहा यह भीषण्य में न हो सकेगा यही हुआ आज ऐसी परिस्थिति नहीं है। एक समय था जब मानव के शरीर गुलामी व्यापार में विकृत थे, इसके विरोध में भी आवाज उठी। आज चाहे शांषण हो पर कम से कम मानव शरीरों का क्रय विक्रय नहीं हो रहा है। मैं मानता हूँ कि लीग आफ नेशन्स जिन उद्देश्यों को लेकर स्थापित हुई थी वे उद्देश्य सफल नहीं हुए। आज भी हमें यह दिखता है कि यू० एन० आ० की सुरक्षा परिषद् और दूसरी चीजें कामयाब नहीं हो रही हैं पर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके सिवा दूसरा कोई राण नहीं है। लीग आफ नेशन्स चाहे सफल न हुई हो, यू० एन० आ० को चाहे आज सफलता न मिल रही हो, लेकिन इस प्रकार की संस्थाओं का निर्माण होना आवश्यक है। बहुत बड़ा काम हम करने जा रहे हैं। उसमें ये असफलतायें बहुत छोटी छोटी असफलतायें हैं। दो, चार, पांच, दस, बीस, पचास वर्ष किसी मानव की जिन्दगी के लिए बहुत बड़ा समय होता है, पर किसी देश, किसी राष्ट्र और संसार की जिन्दगी के लिए यह समय कोई बहुत बड़ा समय नहीं है। इसलिए यदि आज यू० एन० आ० सफल नहीं हो रहा है, तो भी यह कहना कि यू० एन० आ० की आवश्यकता नहीं है और यू० एन० आ० को सफलता होने वाली

नहीं है, इससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। अगर संसार में एक सरकार की स्थापना होनी है तो लीग आफ नेशन्स यू० एन० आ० इस प्रकार की संस्थाओं का निर्माण होना एक अवश्य-म्भावी बात है।

मैं श्री हीरन मुकर्जी की एक बात से और सहमत हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि वैदेशिक नीति की चर्चा आज बड़े मौजू वक्त हो रही है। वे बिल्कुल ठीक बात कहते हैं। एक ओर जहां जनेवा में एक बहुत बड़ी परिषद् एशिया के मसलों पर विचार करने के लिये बैठी है, वहां हमारे प्रतिनिधि इस समय फ्रांस में बैठे हुए हमारे यहां की फ्रांसीसी बीस्तियों के सम्बन्ध में भी चर्चा कर रहे हैं। एशिया की दृष्टि से, हमारे देश की दृष्टि से, सारं संसार की दृष्टि से आज कुछ महत्वपूर्ण चर्चाएँ चल रही हैं। फ्रांसीसी बीस्तियों के सम्बन्ध में यहां पर न जाने क्या क्या कहा जाता था। पर हमने देखा कि जिस शान्तिपूर्ण नीति का हमने अवलम्बन किया उसका यह नतीजा निकला कि हमारे प्रतिनिधियों को बातचीत करने के लिए बुलावा फ्रांस से आया। हमें उन्हें प्रार्थना नहीं भंजनी पड़ी कि आप हमसे बातचीत कीजिये। उन्होंने हमको बुलाया यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात है। मैं इस छोटी बात नहीं मानता, और मैं तो यह मानता हूँ कि जो स्वाभाविक बात है वह होकर रहेगी। फ्रांस में जो चर्चा हो रही है उसका क्या नतीजा निकलता है मैं नहीं कह सकता लेकिन फ्रांसीसी बीस्तियां भारतवर्ष का एक भाग हैं और भारतवर्ष का वह भाग आज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परसों हममें मिल कर रहेगा।

गंगा के सम्बन्ध में अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ठीक कहा कि इस विषय पर जो प्रश्न उठाये गये उनका वे कोई संतोषजनक उत्तर नहीं दे सके। ठीक है। ऐसी बातों का बहुत जल्दी संतोषजनक जवाब नहीं दिया जा सकता। पर मुझे विश्वास है कि फ्रांसीसी बीस्तियों के सवाल के हल होने के बाद गंगा का प्रश्न भी

[संठ गाँविन्द दास]

उठंगा और उस सम्बन्ध में भी एक स्वाभाविक हल होगा। जिस तरह फ्रांसीसी बस्तियाँ हमारे देश का एक भाग हैं उसी प्रकार गोआ भी हमारे देश का एक भाग है। जब हमने समूचे देश को ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य से मुक्त कर लिया तो फ्रांसीसी बस्तियाँ के ऊपर फ्रांस का या गोआ के ऊपर पुर्तगाल का अधिकार रहना यह एक अस्वाभाविक बात है और यह बात रह नहीं सकती।

हमने उपनिवेशवाद का सदा विरोध किया है। अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि ट्यूनीशिया और मोरोक्को दर असल उपनिवेश नहीं कहे जा सकते। मैं मानता हूँ कि वे उपनिवेश नहीं कहे जा सकते परन्तु फ्रांस वहाँ पर जो नीति बरत रहा है वह नीति उपनिवेशवाद की ही नीति है, और अगर हम उपनिवेशवाद का विरोध करते हैं तो चाहे वह उपनिवेशवाद मोरोक्को में बरता जाय, ट्यूनीशिया में बरता जाय, इंग्लैंड के द्वारा कैनिया में बरता जाय, कहीं भी बरता जाय, हम उसका विरोध करेंगे। इस संसार में शान्ति सम्भव ही नहीं है जबतक कि यह उपनिवेशवाद किसी भी रूप में फ्रांस के द्वारा, इंग्लैंड के द्वारा या किसी भी राष्ट्र के द्वारा चलाया जा रहा है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भारत और चीन का इस समय जो एक समझौता हुआ है उसका भी जिक्र किया। जहाँतक तिब्बत का सम्बन्ध है उस समझौते की कुछ आलोचना हुई है लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप चीन के इतिहास को देखें तिब्बत के इतिहास को देखें तो कोई समय भी ऐसा नहीं था कि जब तिब्बत सर्वथा स्वतंत्र देश रहा हो। तिब्बत हमेशा किसी न किसी प्रकार से चीन के अन्तर्गत एक राष्ट्र रहा है। इसीलिए मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस समझौते की, जहाँतक तिब्बत का सम्बन्ध है, क्या आलोचना होनी चाहिए।

कोलम्बो में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को जो समर्थन प्राप्त हुआ उस समर्थन के लिए वे बधाई के पात्र हैं। मतभेद तो बड़ी बड़ी बातों में रहना एक स्वाभाविक बात है। मतभेद सदा रहे हैं। आज भी हैं, सदा रहेंगे। परन्तु मतभेदों के बावजूद जब हम यह देखते हैं कि मतभेद कितने क्षेत्रों में हैं और एकता कितने क्षेत्रों में है तब हमें हर्ष होता है। अभी कोलम्बो में जो परिषद हुई उसमें कई बातों में जो प्रधान मंत्री वहाँ पर एकत्र हुए उनमें मतभेद रहा, इसमें संदेह नहीं, किन्तु जो अभी वक्तव्य प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पढ़ा उससे साफ हो जाता है कि मतभेद का स्थान बहुत थोड़ा था और एकता का क्षेत्र बहुत बड़ा था।

मैं सदा यह मानता रहा हूँ कि इस संसार का भविष्य एशिया और अफ्रीका के ऊपर निर्भर है। यूरोप के उत्कर्ष का समय करीब करीब खत्म हो गया। यूरोप की इस समय की हालत को कोई भी यूरोप में जाकर देख सकता है। मैं हाल ही में उसे देख कर आया हूँ। अमरीका और रूस के आपस के झगड़ों का निर्णय हम एशिया की भूमि पर नहीं होने देना चाहते। हम यह स्पष्ट कहते रहे हैं कि आष लोगों को लड़ना है तो लड़िये। आपकी संस्कृति यूरोप की संस्कृति रही है। रूस का कुछ भाग यदि एशिया का हिस्सा है तो रूस का कुछ भाग यूरोप का भी हिस्सा है, बल्कि यदि यह कहा जाय तो अनुपयुक्त न होगा कि रूस का वह प्रधान हिस्सा जो उसकी नीतियों निर्धारित करता है, यूरोप का हिस्सा है। तो यूरोप और अमरीका की लड़ाई का निबटारा एशिया की भूमि पर हो, भारत भूमि पर हो, यह हमें कभी मंजूर नहीं होगा। इसीलिए अभी अमरीका ने जो पाकिस्तान को सैनिक सहायता दी उसका हमने इतना विरोध किया। हम चाहते हैं कि एशिया में लड़ाई न हो। हम तो यह भी चाहते हैं कि अमरीका और रूस का भी किसी न किसी प्रकार से समझौता हो जाय। उनमें भी हम लड़ाई के इच्छुक नहीं हैं। पर यदि वे लड़ना ही चाहते हैं और यदि वह लड़ाई नहीं रुकती

हैं तो हम यह कदापि नहीं चाहेंगे कि उस लड़ाई के लिये भारत भूमि को अड़ड़ा बनाया जाय। हमने उसका हमेशा विरोध किया है। आज भी हम उसका विरोध करते हैं।

प्रधानमंत्री जी ने धर्म युद्ध की बात कही। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यथार्थ में यह धर्म युद्ध नहीं अधर्म युद्ध हो रहा है। धर्मयुद्ध के तो हम हमेशा पक्षपाती रहे हैं, यदि शान्ति से चीजें नहीं निबटतीं तो युद्ध अनिवार्य हो जाता है। यह ठीक है कि हम धर्मयुद्ध का पक्ष लेते हैं पर जो युद्ध हो रहा है वह धर्मयुद्ध न होकर धर्म अधर्मयुद्ध है और इस प्रकार के अधर्मयुद्ध का हमारा द्वारा समर्थन हो यह कदापि नहीं हो सकता।

दुनिया बहुत छोटी हो गयी है, शीघ्रगामी साधनों के कारण। दुनिया चाहे किसी समय बहुत बड़ी रही हो, चाहे आज भी भिन्न २ राष्ट्र हों, चाहे भिन्न २ देश हों और चाहे भिन्न २ संस्कृतियां हों लेकिन यातायात के साधनों के कारण दुनिया अब बहुत छोटी हो गयी है। आज जो लोग अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय बातों पर विचार किये बिना सिर्फ अपने देश और अपने देश से सम्बन्ध रखने वाली चीजों पर विचार करते हैं उससे कोई बड़ा नतीजा निकलने वाला नहीं है, इसीलिये हमको अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय बातों पर विचार करना ही होगा। इसी विचार के कारण आज हमारा इस संसार में एक स्थान हो गया है। वह स्थान महात्मा गांधी के कारण हुआ है, पीडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के कारण हुआ है। इसीलिये हम नेहरू जी की वैदेशिक नीति का हृदय से समर्थन करते हैं और हम इस बात का प्रयत्न करेंगे कि जिस सामूहिक शान्ति की स्थापना की आज हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं, वह कार्य-रूप में परिणत हो।

**Shri Raghuramajiah (Tenali):** I am sorry Mr. Mukerjee is not here. I would have liked him to be here. I appreciate very much his references to our Prime Minister and the great tribute he has paid that the Prime Minister knows more than anybody else on this side. It is only an echo

of the worldwide tribute that is slowly pouring in, but he seems to imply that as compared to some Members on this side of the House, he (Mr. Mukerjee) knows a little bit more. I wish he had proved that, but the reference he made to Malaya and the attitude taken up by the Colombo Conference belies that. I would draw your attention, Sir, to a portion of the statement issued by the Prime Ministers' Conference. It reads as follows:

"The Prime Ministers discussed the problem of colonialism which they regretted still existed in various parts of the world. They were of the view that continuance of such a state of affairs was a violation of fundamental human rights and a threat to the peace of the world."

I do not know how else one could condemn the colonial system in its entirety. Unlike Mr. Mukerjee, we do not distinguish between British colonialism and any other colonialism. We have no partiality towards any particular colonialism, either of recent types or of ancient types. We detest colonialism and we have never hesitated to condemn it in any quarter where it may find itself. Mr. Mukerjee's comment in this matter shows only a certain attitude of mind which is always obsessed by feelings of one-sidedness. I agree that Mr. Mukerjee knows a lot more than some of us, but only in certain subjects. He knows, for instance, more about Russian policy than Malenkov himself knows. I agree and do not dispute that, but whether he knows all sides of the picture, I leave it to the House to judge and to those Members who have been following his speeches.

Having said that, I must express my surprise at the reference he made to Buddha. The Deputy Leader of the Communist Party made a reference to Buddha and his peaceful preachings. Even that of course I appreciate and I do not want to make any comment on that. It is

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

good they (the Communists) are looking to Buddha. Probably their mind, with the spread of communism to china, is now turning more to Confucius and Buddha. We welcome that and we do hope there will be a change in their overall policy also. On one matter, however, I am inclined to agree with him and that is in relation to the Conference now going on in Geneva. I think and I feel strongly that we have a right to be there. When I say 'we', not only India but everyone of the Prime Ministers who assembled recently at Colombo, has a right to be there, and perhaps we have a much greater right than some of the countries who are there. We are more intimately connected with it. As the Prime Minister said, the decisions taken there will have ultimately to get the approval and co-operation of all the nations of Asia. From that context, we should have been there. In fact, there are some nations there which should never have been there. There is a feeling that some of the nations who have assembled there have been trying to sabotage the Conference. They are anxious to see that the Conference does not succeed; they are anxious to see that a kind of military intervention becomes possible. I am referring, Sir, to the recent policy of Mr. Dulles. His policy reminds one of the Damocles' sword; of the mailed fist theory of the older times. He seems to think that Asian nations can be coerced into agreement. His whole approach has been objectionable; it has of course been publicly criticised in very many capitals of the world. While we have been anxious for a peaceful settlement of the Korean and Indo-China issue at the Geneva table, while very many nations there have joined us and echoed our sentiments here is Mr. Dulles going about from Washington to London, Paris etc. asking for joint intervention, military intervention in Indo-China, and having not quite succeeded in that, because, fortunately, the British seem to have taken a little more moderate, a little more human view in this

matter,—he is now trying to bamboozle the Conference into an agreement by pushing forward this South-East Asian Defence Pact idea.

The situation today is very extraordinary. In this morning's papers we were surprised to see two contradictory positions. While you read the proceedings of what is happening in Geneva, you will find that slowly, by and by every country there is coming to realise the necessity and the urgency of a cease fire. In fact, the Russian Government,—has agreed for a neutral supervision in Indo-China. Mr. Eden has put forward some pertinent suggestions so far as Indo-China is concerned, one of them indicating a cease fire arrangement and the circumstances in which the various combatants could withdraw to certain defined positions. While that climate of peace is slowly being developed there news comes from the United States that they are pushing ahead with arrangements for South-East Asian Defence Pact. They go a step further than Mr. Churchill and the British Government. The British Government, leaving aside all contradictions, talk only of conversations with a view to explore the possibilities of this pact; but the United States seems to emphasise that there have been not only conversations, but a definite decision by certain countries in this respect. There is also a piece of news in this morning's newspapers that the United States and France have agreed to enter into discussions which will make it possible for a joint military intervention in Indo-China. I hope, Sir, that the nations of the world will not allow this kind of attitude. At any rate, we the people of Asia should not allow this interference with a possible peaceful settlement of the issue.

Not only that, Sir, the very approach of the United States in this matter comes in for considerable criticism and we cannot help it. They think that peace is a thing which they can

impose on the world around by flinging a NATO there and a PATO and a SEATO here—by PATO I refer to American military aid to Pakistan and Turkey. They forget that the best safeguard for peace in Asia is to leave it to the Asiatic countries themselves to solve their problems. But then, Sir, they (the Americans) are too much obsessed by this anti-communism. Those of us who have had any occasion to read the Jedd Report, the report of the American Congressmen who went to China, know what exactly is the mental approach of the United States in this matter. They have given their view, with reference to Geneva, that while they wish the Conference every success, they feel that one essential condition for the success of the Conference is good faith on the part of the nations assembled there and that the one evidence of that good faith will be the destruction of communism in China. They seem to be, therefore, more particular about the communist form of government being erased from China than really about the peace of the world.

We are a democratic people. We are opposed to communism: we do not approve of it in this country. But then as our Prime Minister made it very clear, it is for China to choose her own form of government and it is not for us or for anybody else to interfere. At the very beginning of my speech I said, there has been a great echo of the foreign policy of this country in various parts of the world, especially its cardinal principles, namely, non-interference of other nations in the affairs of Asian recognition of China as a member of the United Nations and cease fire in Indo-China. All these have been accepted *in toto* at Colombo.

Before I conclude, I would only like to refer, Sir, to the amazing statement of the Prime Minister of Portugal that once Goa is given freedom it would be a ravaged country and not a bit of a nation. Sir, it is a very extraordinary statement coming from the Portuguese Prime Minister.

I happen to read something about Portugal the other day. I had a look at the kind of justice, at the kind of civilisation which Portugal has brought to Goa. I am told that the administration there is being carried on by a Governor-General assisted by a Council of 12 people of whom 7 are nominated and only 5 are elected. They are elected in a population of about 7 lakhs by 40 voters, the richest magnates of that area. None of the Members of the Executive Council can bring up a matter without the prior permission of the Governor-General. There is no freedom of speech there; there is no freedom of meeting. Without permission no meeting can be held, let alone political meetings. A meeting which was held once to express condolence on the death of the Father of the Nation was originally banned. I am told that even for issuing invitations for marriage one must get prior sanction of the Government of Portugal. There is absolutely no industry there. The only bank which is in operation there is the bank incorporated in Portugal. It takes deposits without interest. It lends very little; what little it gives is at an exorbitant rate of interest. The country is undeveloped and is greatly taxed; the natural resources are not harnessed; there are no proper roads, no proper sanitary arrangements; and as already said no freedom of speech, no political freedom and no economic improvement of any kind. For the Prime Minister of that great State to say in those circumstances that once this great civilising influence of Portugal goes from Goa it would be a ravaged country and not a bit of a nation, is an extraordinary statement.

We have been of course, very moderate with regard to Portugal so far. But, I think, once the question of French possessions in India is settled, we must give it high priority. I agree with Shri Hiren Mukerjee that the patience of this country is being sorely tried by the attitude adopted by Portugal and Sir the sooner these

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

foreign pockets are liquidated the better it will be.

**Acharya Kripalani** (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have always felt that it is undesirable to have a discussion on foreign affairs in every session. This time it is twice in the same session. I would again repeat what I said on a former occasion that the foreign policy of the nation should be a national policy. Leaders of parties should sit together and discuss it and there should be as little discussion in the market place as possible. This I suggest because sometimes words are spoken by individuals and quoted out of context in other countries and such words may be misconceived to be the opinions of India. The foreigner does not generally know what section of opinion is represented by expressions used by some members here. I believe that India should speak in foreign politics with one voice. This could be easily done by the dominant party taking into confidence the leaders of the opposite groups. I realise that there are many groups in Parliament and collecting representatives of all groups and discussing international problems with them would again be like a discussion in the market place. It is for the Prime Minister to decide what parties really are patriotic and national and whose opinion should count in foreign politics and leaders of such parties should be invited for joint discussion.

Why is it dangerous? I will give an example. Recently, we have entered—I do not say the Prime Minister has, I do not say the Government has, but I say India has entered into—a treaty with China. This treaty concerns the whole of India; it does not concern a party or a person. It affects us all and we have to say something about it. We feel that China, after it had gone communist, committed an act of aggression in Tibet. (*An Hon. Member: Question*).

**An Hon. Member:** Did you commit aggression in Hyderabad?

**Acharya Kripalani:** The plea is that China had the ancient right of suzerainty. This right was out of date, old and antiquated. It was theoretical; it was never exercised or very rarely exercised and even then theoretically. It had lapsed by the flux of time. Even if it had lapsed it is not right in these days of democracy, by which our communist friends swear, by which the Chinese swear, to talk of this ancient suzerainty and exercise it in a new shape in a country which has and had nothing to do with China. Tibet is culturally more akin to India than it is to China, at least communist China, which has repudiated all its old culture. I consider this as much a colonial aggression on the part of China as any colonial aggression indulged in by Western nations. The definition of colonialism is this, that one nation by force of arms or fraud occupies the territory of another nation. In this age of democracy when we hold that all people should be free and equal, I say China's occupation of Tibet is a deliberate act of aggression.

Whether certain nations commit aggression or are peaceful does not always concern us. But I say this, in case of China and Tibet we are intimately concerned, because China has demolished what is called a buffer State. In international politics, when a buffer state is abolished by a powerful nation, that nation is considered to have aggressive designs on its neighbours.

It is also said that in the new map of China other border territories like Nepal, Sikkim, etc. figure. This gives us an idea of the aggressive designs of China. Now let us see what the Chinese themselves did in the Korean war. As soon as the U.N. troops—or more truly, the American troops reached the borders of China, China

felt insecure and it immediately joined the Korean war. Even the mere approach of a foreign army to the borders of the country made China to participate in the Korean war. I refuse to believe that Chinese had sympathy with North Korea. If their borders had not been endangered, they would not have bothered themselves about this Korean business.

That is how they behave. I do not say that because China wanted to conquer Nepal we should have gone to war with it. It was possible. But we did well in not going to war. But this does not mean that we should recognise the claim of China on Tibet. We must know that it is an act of aggression against a foreign nation. It is as abominable as colonialism of any Western Power.

Coming to Kashmir—I may say that I would not like to talk of these things, but when a discussion on foreign affairs is initiated one cannot refrain from saying what is in one's mind—in Kashmir we trusted Sheikh Abdullah absolutely, and we spent millions of money. This went down the drain. The poor people of Kashmir did not benefit. Not only was Sheikh Abdullah all-powerful in Kashmir, but he had very great influence in this capital of ours. No Department could refuse him anything because he was a special pet. Anything said against him however justified was never listened to. I am afraid having put our faith in one man who let us down we are trying to repeat that kind of thing. Now it is the Bakshi Saheb who has become our favourite. Whatever he does is absolutely right and no objection is raised. Recently Bakshi Saheb declared Jaiprakash Narain to be an outsider. I was reminded of what happened in 1917 when Gandhiji went to Champaran. The European planters there said that Gandhiji had no right to go to Behar and that he was an outsider. It may not be quite on a par but it is in the same strain. While Jaiprakash Narain is an outsider, Dr. Ashraf

with his new foreign wife and I suppose a Communist wife—is welcome in Kashmir. It is very strange that he is not considered foreigner but a native of Kashmir.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** On a point of order, Sir, is it permissible to refer by name to any particular person and his marital connections and make some oblique observations thereon?

**Shri C. D. Pande** (Naini Tal Distt. cum Almora Distt.—South West cum Bareilly Distt. North): It is in the manner of illustration of a fact.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not think it is oblique at all. Now, in a question of foreign relations, in order to show how far our borders have been safeguarded, the attitude of an adjoining country, or a part of the Indian Union may be criticised. The person mentioned is a foreigner. He can say this with any other foreigner.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy** (Mysore): He is not a national of India.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** How can the hon. Member know that a particular person is a foreigner? To amplify the illustration he said this.

**Shri Nambiar** (Mayuram): The person about whom the reference has been made has no chance to defend himself here. We have never allowed such things and we have had a convention already in this respect.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I agree. but what is the misconduct attributed to this? There is nothing of that kind. All that was said was that the Kashmir Government allowed another foreigner, while Jaiprakash Narain, a native of India, was not allowed to go in there. I do not think it is irrelevant.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Sir, the House can see how sensitive our friends are. They had nothing to say when Bakshi Saheb declared Jaiprakash Narain to be an outsider. Then it must be remembered that

[Acharya Kripalani]

Jaiprakash Narain spoke about the continued detention of Sheikh Abdullah, only in connection with civil liberties. Our friends, when any one of them is imprisoned without trial, raise a howl about civil liberties, I humbly tell my friends that it is this that makes their words and conduct suspicious. They believe in a dual morality, one for themselves and another for their opponents. They only think in terms of defending communism in Russia and elsewhere.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** That is absolutely wrong.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I am an old professor and my friend is a new professor. My knowledge may be antiquated and may be out of date. I yield to Prof. Mukerjee as having up-to-date knowledge. But, I say this that Russians manage their affairs quite well. Take for instance this hydrogen bomb. The Americans made experiments, but they made them so carelessly that they were discovered. But, Russians made experiments in hydrogen bomb and nothing was discovered.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** They wanted to have a ban on it.

**Acharya Kripalani:** They wanted to ban it and they did not make any experiments! I am only saying how clumsy the Americans are and how clever the Russians are. I am only paying a compliment to the favourites of my friend; but he neither wants criticism nor would he accept a compliment. I am sure, if America had managed its affairs as well as Russia did, our Prime Minister would have had no occasion to issue a statement about the hydrogen bomb. That is apart. What I was saying is that we have got to be very careful about these matters.

I must say that I also fail to understand what has happened in this one month and a half since we discussed foreign affairs that necessitated another discussion on the same subject. It is true that conferences have been

recently held. Take the Geneva Conference: I am afraid the participants in it do not know where they stand or where they would be standing. How does it benefit us to discuss the question raised there, here. Then recently there was the Asian Prime Ministers' Conference; a very important Conference indeed. I think it was in pursuance of the idea of consolidating a third area of peaceful nations. If it was so, it was too late, because, when there was a greater area of neutral nations, we took no steps to consolidate it. An Asian Prime Ministers' Conference without, what is called the Near East, without Japan, without even China, does not become an Asian conference. What has been the result of this conference? It is that the Prime Ministers agreed upon the common minimum. What was the minimum? The minimum was words and generalities and platitudes without any substance. The whole conference was vitiated by the presence of the Pakistan Prime Minister, who had already pledged himself to the American bloc, who had already declared allegiance to one of the power blocs. I can safely say that if things become a little more hot, Ceylon will not be as neutral as she appears to be today; nor will Indonesia be. However, it was a useful conference. It added to the prestige of India and Ceylon.

When I have said all this, I must add that I am in general agreement with the principles of the policy we are following in our foreign affairs under the leadership of our Prime Minister, though sometimes it would appear that we are more powerfully influenced by England. We are following the line chalked out for us by England. Sometimes when England cannot say many things about America loudly and says them in whispers, we come to England's help and say them loudly. I agree with my friend Prof. Mukerjee that while in the Prime Ministers' Conference at Colombo mention was made about French colonial possessions in Tunisia and Morocco, no mention was

made about the English colonial possessions in Malaya and Kenya where worse things are happening than in Tunisia and Morocco. We may follow a line that is in conformity with that of England if it benefits our country. But it is not always so. Even where we derive no benefit we toe the line of England. What does England herself do? It was and is the greatest propagandist against us so far as the Kashmir question is concerned. Today it stands in our way on the question of the trial of war prisoners in Japan. We gain nothing by following England. We needlessly raise a suspicion that we are in the leading strings of England. I do not think this is so merely because we are in the Empire or rather in the Commonwealth and because of our old associations with England but also because of our Prime Minister's associations, of all sorts, with England.

I have said that I agree with the policy of neutrality or what is called dynamic neutrality or, better still, the policy of non-alignment with the two power blocs. If that is really our policy I humbly submit that we will have to give more attention to developing our economy. I am sorry that so far we have relied for our economic advance upon the money we get from America. If we really want to have an independent foreign policy, we should consider American money as good as tainted. As soon as possible, and progressively, we must do away with this foreign help and increase and use our resources. And if we are to muster our resources, we must see that we eliminate as much of foreign interests in our commerce and industry as possible. What has been our economic policy? It has been that in one shape or another we are introducing and encouraging fresh foreign interests. Our tea trade is in foreign hands. Our oil is absolutely in the hands of foreigners. A good deal of our banking and our insurance is in the hands of foreigners. Our export trade is almost entirely in the hands of foreigners. Foreigners are starting companies called "India Ltd.,"

for the manufacture of all sorts of things—things which we could manufacture ourselves if we were a little more careful. Unless we eliminate these foreign interests in tea, oil, rubber, banking, insurance, etc., it will not be possible for us ultimately to follow an independent foreign policy and convey the message of our goodwill to the people of the world and impress upon them the idea that we stand for peace, that we stand for the freedom of nations, that we stand for democracy.

**Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury** (Nabadwip): When I hear some of the speeches in this House on foreign affairs, I am reminded of a story that is credited to Gladstone. Gladstone once took a little child to the House of Commons. As every one knows, the House of Commons began with prayers. The child afterwards asked Gladstone "Why does the House of Commons begin with a prayer?" And he said: "Well, the Speaker looks at the Members and he prays for the country." I imagine you yourself must feel that way sometimes.

A large part of India feels today that people are one with the Prime Minister in his foreign policy. It has been given to India to understand the difficulties of all struggling nations for she has gained that sympathy by passing through fire herself.

It is strange that there is very often fear expressed about American expansionism, but in all honesty, is this fear any greater than from some other countries? Anyway, any threat of this kind has been met by our attitude of non-alliance with any power block.

The fundamental objective of the foreign policy of India is peace.—not only because in itself it is desirable, but peace because it is an absolute economic necessity for India, to get ahead with her nation-building programme. For this world peace is also a condition. A world-war of any kind would absolutely cripple any aid that we need to carry on our own reconstruction efforts.

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury]

It may appear that we have associated ourselves more closely with the countries of the Western world and questions may arise as to whether this ties our hands in any way in international councils and would present us with the onus of voting with a country even though we may not agree with that country's point of view. But that argument has been set at nought many times by India expressing her views to the world fearlessly, whenever necessary. It must be borne in mind that economic co-operation does not necessarily lead to political alignment with any group, whereas political domination invariably leads to economic domination. Peace to us does not mean a romantic platitude, but a vital necessity. It is a political necessity too, for without peace, we cannot establish democracy. In fact, democracy would be overthrown, and such elements as seek to disrupt peace in any sphere whatsoever internally in India have just this in mind, namely the overthrowing of democracy or at least the creating of conditions for such a disruption. Hence, we should always follow with all the power at our command a path of dynamic and peaceful neutrality. We may be lonely but we will be on the right path.

May I submit that, to my mind, a cultural approach bears unimagined dividends? Cultural contacts may be more effective and may create better friendships than political contacts sometimes. They can never take the place of diplomatic relations, but they can always supplement them. The cultural arm of our diplomatic services can be used more effectively for creating an interest and knowledge about India in foreign countries and for interpreting her whole outlook in a fuller way to the world.

Cultural contacts between India and Asia are centuries old, and thousands of years ago, medicine, astrology, chemistry and mathematics have all been enriched, and have received vital contributions from the servants of India, Arabia and Egypt.

There is much scope for strengthening cultural contacts. It bears wide and satisfying results. If our embassies abroad are better equipped to make these personal cultural contacts, a great deal of disagreement would tend to be ironed out and wider areas of mutual understanding would result.

Let us put forward all the colour, beauty and thought of India to the world, and the world will surely be drawn to us in a closer and more pleasant relationship. It is entirely true that while we read history, we make history, and that history will be a good one for India, if there is diplomacy with clear thought on the one side, and a planned cultural approach on the other. The whole philosophy of India can be summed up in one small saying which has been very well expressed in French. The philosophy of India is 'Etre et pass Avoir', i.e. 'To Be and not To Have'. If this India's challenge to the world is presented in all its implications, the world will surely take it up in friendship and goodwill.

३० ए० ए० सिंह (सारन पूर्व): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सारं संसार की दृष्टि एशिया के देशों की ओर लगी है। खास मार्कें की बात यह है कि चाहे हमारे एशिया के देश छोटे से छोटे क्यों न हों, यह नहीं चाहते कि कोई भी मुल्क, वह कितना ही बड़ा क्यों न हो, इनके ऊपर किसी तरह का दखल रखे या किसी तरह की दस्तन्दाजी उस की ओर से हो। यह भाव आज एक शब्द में व्यक्त किये जा रहे हैं—उपनिवेशवाद के खिलाफ एक आवाज। एसी ज़ोरों की आवाज आज तक कभी भी एशिया में नहीं उठी थी और न कभी एसी कारगर हुई थी। मैं अपने देश की वाह्य नीति को इसी कसौटी पर कसना चाहूंगा विशेषकर उस संधि को जो कि पिछले दिनों हम लोगों की तित्बत के सम्बन्ध में चीन के साथ हुई है।

आप लोगों में से बहुत कम लोग इस सदन में होंगे जो कि तित्बत से अच्छी तरह से वाकफ होंगे। मुझे इसका साँभाग्य मिला है और मैं दो तीन बार वहाँ जा चुका हूँ, वहाँ के

लोगों को पसन्द करता हूँ और वहाँ के लोगों के रहन-सहन को भी जानता हूँ तथा उनकी समस्याओं का भी मैंने अच्छी तरह से अध्ययन किया है। यह कहना सरासर गलत है कि वे हमेशा चीन के अधीन रहे हैं। यह बिल्कुल गलत है, आप कोई भी राजनीतिक डिक्शनरी उठा कर देखिये, कोई भी इतिहास उठा कर देखिये तो आप उसमें पायेंगे कि एक ज़माने में तिब्बत इतना मजबूत था कि उसी ने चीन पर कब्जा कर रक्खा था और उसी से वह कर लिया करता था।

कुछ दिनों के बाद जब इतिहास ने पल्टा ख़ाया और तिब्बत कमज़ोर पड़ा तो चीनियों ने उसे दबाना चाहा, लेकिन तिब्बत वालों ने उसे कभी स्वीकार नहीं किया। पिछली शताब्दी के अन्त में जब रूसी साम्राज्यवाद और ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद में आपस में संघर्ष चला उस इलाके के लिये तो उन्होंने भी तिब्बत को दबाना चाहा, लेकिन अन्त में आपस में फँसला किया कि ज्यादा छड़ छड़ न की जाय। चीन तो एक कमज़ोर मुल्क है, उसकी नाम की 'सुज़रन्टी' मान ली जाय और यह मामला अभी का अभी तय हो जाय। रूस और ब्रिटन द्वारा इस प्रकार का समझौता हुआ जिसका नाम कन्वेंशन दिया गया। जैसे ही तिब्बत वालों को इसकी खबर लगी कि इस प्रकार का समझौता हुआ है, और उनसे इसे मनवाने की कोशिश की गई जैसे ही उन्होंने यातुंग में इसे मानने से सरासर इन्कार कर दिया। आप देखिये :

"In 1895, the Commissioner of the Rajshahi Division was told flatly at Yatung that as the convention was made by the Chinese only, the Tibetan Government refused to recognise it".

यह बात हुई पिछली शताब्दी की। अब आप इस शताब्दी में आइये। सन् १९११-१२ में जब चीन में क्रान्ति हुई तो युवान शी काई वहाँ के प्रथम राष्ट्रपति बने। उन दिनों तिब्बत ने घोषित कर दिया कि हम पूर्ण रूप से स्वतंत्र हैं, हमारा ऊपर किसी का कब्जा नहीं है। इस

197 L.S.D.

स्वतंत्रता की उन्होंने सिर्फ घोषणा ही नहीं की बल्कि उसे कारगर भी किया। उसके बाद से और सन् १९४९ तक चीन का सिर्फ एक प्रतिनिधि जिसको 'आम्बन' कहा करते थे तथा जिसको कोई अधिकार नहीं होता था, उस का सिर्फ एक मिशन होता था, जो ल्हासा में रहता था। १९४९ में तिब्बत वालों ने उसको भी मार भगाया। उसके बाद वहाँ कोई नहीं रहा। इस लिये चीन के तिब्बत पर अधिकार का कोई प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता है। १९५० में जब चीन का आक्रमण होता है तिब्बत के ऊपर, और चीन वहाँ पर फौजी अधिकार घोषित करता है तब उस सिलसिले में तिब्बत वालों का जो कहना है वह आपको सिर्फ एक ही जगह पर मिलेगा और मैं उसे आपके सामने रखता हूँ। जब तिब्बत के ऊपर चीन का फौजी हमला हुआ तो वहाँ के मंत्रीमंडल और राष्ट्रीय असम्बली ने लिखित रूप में राष्ट्र संघ के सामने अपना मामला रक्खा। उस मामले के जिक्र में तिब्बत ने कहा है :

"In 1911-12 when Tibet was under the 13th Dalai Lama, there was a declaration for full sovereign rights and there was no talk of any allegiance to China".

फिर उसके बाद उसी में आप देखेंगे कि जिक्र यह है :

"Tibetans feel that racially, culturally and geographically they are far apart from the Chinese. The conquest of Tibet by China will only enslave the country".

फिर उसके बाद जो सबसे बड़े मार्को की बात वह राष्ट्र संघ के सामने लाते हैं उस में वह कहते हैं :

"As long as the people of Tibet are compelled by force to become a part of China against their will and consent, the invasion of Tibet will be the grossest instance of the violation of the weak by the strong."

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Vishakha-patnam):** Who said this?

डा० एस० एन० सिंह: Tibetanals तिब्बती सरकार ने यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के सामने अपना मामला रखते हुए कहा था कि आप हमारी मदद करें। हमारे ऊपर हमला हुआ है। हम अपनी आजादी घोषित कर चुके हैं और उसके बहुत उपरान्त तक आजाद रहे आए हैं इसीलिये आज चीन की सुजरन्टी का भी सवाल नहीं रहा। इसको अंगूज हमारे ऊपर लादना जरूर चाहते थे जैसा कि उन्होंने शिमला कन्वेंशन में कहा था। यह सम्मेलन १९१४ में हुआ था, लेकिन तिब्बत के लोगों ने इस कन्वेंशन की चीनी सुजरन्टी को कभी स्वीकार नहीं किया। चीन ने भी उस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं किये। यदि आप न्याय की दृष्टि से देखेंगे तो पायेंगे कि जो सीध हुई थी उसको तिब्बत ने कभी स्वीकार नहीं किया और वह कभी चीन के अधीन नहीं रहा। लेकिन चीन तिब्बत छोटा सा मुल्क है, वहां की आबादी कम हो गई है, कमजोर मुल्क है इसीलिये आप उसके साथ मत्स्य न्याय से काम लेते हैं और आप चीन से दोस्ती की बात करते हैं कि उसके साथ हमारी बहुत बड़ी दोस्ती हो गई है।

इस वर्तमान सीध में मुझे एक बात की खुशी है। यह सीध आपने हिन्दी में की है और मैं इसके लिये आपको बधाई देता हूँ। इसके शब्द भी मुझे बहुत पसन्द आए, वह बहुत सुन्दर हैं। साथ ही यह भी है कि आप उन के दो अर्थ नहीं लगा सकते हैं। और यह पहली अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीध है जो कि हिन्दी में हुई है। जहां तक शब्दों का सवाल है वहां तक मैं आपकी तारीफ करूंगा लेकिन उन शब्दों के द्वारा पढ़े गये निर्णय के बारे में मैं बहुत खाल कर और बहुत थोड़े वक्त में आपके सामने कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। वे शब्द जिनमें यह कहा गया है कि हम दोनों राष्ट्र एक दूसरे पर कभी हमला नहीं करेंगे, पढ़ कर मुझे बहुत खुशी हुई।

पर जब से मैंने उसमें यह पढ़ा है कि हम एक दूसरे के घरलू मामलों में दिलचस्पी नहीं लेंगे तब से मेरी हंसी नहीं रुक रही है। जिस सिद्धान्त को चीन वाले पालन कर रहे हैं उसके अनुसार दूसरे के घर के मामलों में दस्तन्दाजी रुक ही नहीं सकती। उनका जो यंत्र है वह कुछ इसी तरह से काम करता है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपके सामने दो एक मिसाल पेश करूंगा। चीन ने जो कुछ लिया है वह रूस से लिया है और हमारी जो समस्या है वह रूस से भी सम्बन्ध रखती है। प्रायः जो रूस का मुख्य पत्र है उसे आप देखिये। वह कम्युनिस्टों की 'बाइबिल' है। इसके २ मई के अंक में क्या लिखा है यह मैं पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। आप सब लोगों ने देखा होगा कि दिल्ली शहर में १ मई को क्या हुआ और किस तरह का यहां एक जलूस निकला। इसके बारे में जो उस अखबार में लिखा गया है वह मैं पढ़ता हूँ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it in Russian?

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** Yes, it is in Russian. I will read it to you in the original Russian.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members would like to hear some portions in Russian.

डा० एस० एन० सिंह: उसमें लिखा है कि हजारों आदीमियों का जलूस निकला और उस जलूस में जो नारे लगाए गये उनमें से एक यह था:

“जा नाचियानालन्यू निएजाविसीमास्त”

इसका मतलब यह है कि हमें राष्ट्रीय स्वाधीनता मिले। अब हमें देखना है कि वह स्वतन्त्रता क्या है। जैसे हमें आज राष्ट्रीय स्वाधीनता न मिली हो। एक दूसरा नारा है:

“नी काकील वायीनिस बाज ना तेरीतीरि इदीए”

यह हमारी मातृभाषा से बहुत मिलती जुलती भाषा है। इसमें कहा गया है कि हम यहां कोई संग्राम का अड़्डा नहीं बनने देंगे। अब आप देखें कि हम संग्राम का अड़्डा बनने कब दें रहे हैं? यह सिर्फ पागलपन की बात हो सकती है और इसके पीछे क्या हो सकता है? तो आप देखें कि प्रावदा में एक खास दृष्टिकोण है। यही उनका दृष्टिकोण है। इसको आप तब तक पूरी तरह नहीं समझ सकेंगे जब तक कि आप तिब्बत के प्रश्न को न लें। कम्युनिस्ट बहुत दिनों से इसी तरह अपना काम करते रहे हैं। अब तक उनको उत्तर में कोई आश्रय नहीं था। मैं एक हिन्दी में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की नीति की किताब आज लाया हूँ क्योंकि मुझे हिन्दी में बोलना था। इससे मालूम होता है कि चीन जैसी क्रान्ति कम्युनिस्ट यहां भी करना चाहते हैं। चीन में जब तक मंचूको मैं रूसी फौज नहीं पहुँच गई तब तक कम्युनिस्ट चीनियों को कोई आश्रय नहीं था। इसमें लिखा है "इसके अलावा, इस बात को भी हम नहीं भुला सकते कि चानी चाल सेना जब तक मंचूरिया न पहुँची तब तक बार बार उसे घेरा गया और उसके नैस्तनाब्द कर दिये जाने का उसके सर पर खतरा रहा। वहां पर उसके हाथ में एक औद्योगिक आधार जब आ गया और उसके पिछाये मैं महान मंत्रीपूर्ण सोवियत संघ हो गया तब पीछे से हमले की संभावना से मुक्त होकर चीनी मुक्ति सेना ने अपना पुनः निर्माण किया और वह अन्तिम आक्रमण शुरू किया जिसने उसे विजयी बनाया।"

अब जब से चीनी फौज तिब्बत में आ गई है तब से हमारे कम्युनिस्टों को एक बड़ा आश्रय मिल गया है। और उनका असर कालिमपोंग और उसके आसपास और कलकत्ते तक पर पड़ रहा है। चीन की सेना हमारी सीमा से दो तीन मील पर है। दो तीन वर्ष हुए मॉने देखे था कि उधर के लोग हमारे यहाँ जासूसी का काम करते थे। हमने उनको तीन हजार टन चावल कलकत्ते के रास्ते ले जाने दिया, लेकिन वह

तिब्बती जनता को नहीं मिला। वह चावल चीनी फौजों के काम में लाया गया। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि एक साहब जो तिब्बत से आये उन्होंने मुझे से कहा कि हम लोग पीड़ित हैं। आपके मुल्क ने जो अभी कुछ दिन पहले तक एंसा कष्ट भुगत चुका है उसे भुला दिया और हमारे दुश्मन को जिससे हम लड़ रहे हैं आपने चावल ले जाने दिया है। उन्होंने कहा कि आप उनको सहायता दें रहे हैं जो हमको सता रहे हैं और हमारे ऊपर अत्याचार कर रहे हैं। चीनी लोग हमको घरों से निकाल देंगे हैं और इन्हीं लोगों को आपने कालिमपोंग से होकर आने का सीधा रास्ता दे रखा है।

अंग्रेजों के जमाने में एक बात थी कि वे अपनी सीमा की रक्षा के बारे में अच्छी तरह से समझते थे जो कि हम नहीं कर रहे हैं। यह बहुत गलत बात है। हमारे परराष्ट्र विभाग में आज एक भी एंसा आदमी नहीं है जो तिब्बती भाषा जानता हो और मेरा ख्याल है कि आज जितना सम्पर्क चीनी दूतावास का कम्युनिस्टों से है उतना हमारे परराष्ट्र विभाग से नहीं है।

मैं उत्तर के पैसेज (दोरो) के बारे में दो एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। आपने चीन के साथ की संधि में जिस तरफ प्रबन्ध किया है उस तरफ से १० प्रतिशत यातायात होता है और नत्ला और जलपला से जिधर से हमारा ६० प्रतिशत यातायात है उधर कोई प्रबन्ध नहीं किया गया है। जिस प्रकार रूस ने अपने लिबे एक लॉह प्राचीर बनाया है उसी प्रकार आप चीन के लिये एक तुषार प्राचीर तैयार किये दें रहे हैं। हमारी सीमा पर वे चाहे जो करते रहें पर आपको कोई अधिकार नहीं है।

वह आपके घरलू मामलों में दस्तन्वजी कर रहे हैं। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि यहाँ के चीनी दूतावास का जितना सम्बन्ध कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और बाहर के लोगों से है उतना आपके

[डा० एस० एन० सिंह.]

परराष्ट्र विभाग से नहीं और यह बहुत गलत चीज है। आप देखें कि भारत-चीन मैत्री संघ का वे यह फायदा उठा रहे हैं कि वे हर तरह से अपने गुप्तचरों द्वारा काम करवा रहे हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह हमारे लिये जीवन मरण का प्रश्न है। मैं यह नहीं मानता, न मैं इतना बेवकूफ हूँ कि मैं यह समझूँ कि कम्युनिस्ट काराकोरम की तरफ से या नात्ला की ओर से हम पर आक्रमण कर देंगे। लेकिन सबसे बड़ा नुकसान जो वह कर रहे हैं वह यह है कि एशियायी देशों में स्वाधीन होने की जो प्रेरणा है उसको आज चीन वाले दबा रहे हैं। तिब्बत के साथ हमारा अधिक मेल हो सकता है क्योंकि वह चीन की बनिस्बत हमारे अधिक निकट है। वहाँ की और हमारी संस्कृति में बहुत साम्य है। हिमालय पहाड़ हमारी संस्कृति की सीमा नहीं है। वह हमारे देश का पहाड़ है यह ठीक है। पर वह हमारी संस्कृति की सीमा नहीं है। हमारी संस्कृति का विस्तार कहीं विस्तृत क्षेत्र में हुआ है। और उन क्षेत्रों में तिब्बत एक ऐसा क्षेत्र है जहाँ हमारी संस्कृति की बहुत गहरी नींव पड़ी है। चीन के साथ हमारी वैसी मैत्री नहीं हो सकती जैसी कि तिब्बत के साथ हो सकती है। हमें सबसे पहले अपने पड़ोसी के साथ मैत्री करनी चाहिये और जो दूर है और अपने मतलब का साथी है उससे नहीं।

जब हमारी सरकार ने सितम्बर-अक्टूबर सन् १९५० में तिब्बत के मामले में कहा कि अच्छा होता यदि चीन इस मामले को शान्तिमय उपायों से हल कर लेता तो चीन वालों ने सबसे पहला इल्जाम हमारे ऊपर यही लगाया कि हम किसी विदेशी शक्ति का प्रथम लेंकर यह बात कह रहे हैं। इसी तरीके से जो मैं कह रहा हूँ उसके लिये हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई कहेंगे कि यह अमेरिकन दृष्टिकोण है। यह बहुत ही लचर दलील है जो कि किसी सच्ची बात को दबाने के लिये दी जाती है। इस तरह की लचर दलीलों से आप किसी सच बात को नहीं दबा

सकते। मैं चीन के साथ मित्रता के पक्ष में हूँ लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि उनकी चाल में हमें नहीं आना चाहिये, खासकर तिब्बत के मामले

में। तिब्बत के मामले में और खास कर इस संधि के मामले में, जो हमने चीन के साथ की है, मैं देखता हूँ कि हम उनकी चालबाजी में आ रहे हैं। हम गलत रास्ता अखित्यार कर रहे हैं। हो सकता है कि हमारे परराष्ट्र विभाग के पास और भी कुछ सामग्री हो और जो हम लोगों के सामने नहीं आई है लेकिन जहाँ तक मुझे पता है मैं उनको बतलाऊँ कि मैं हिमालय के पास में ही रहता हूँ। अब गीमियाँ के दिन आ गये हैं और लोग मानसरोवर और कैलाश जाने की बात सोचते हैं। तो देखना यह चाहिये कि इस संधि के बाद से हमारे वहाँ के लोगों का जाना कुछ पहले की अपेक्षा अवरूढ़ हो रहा है या जाने का मार्ग और अधिक खुल रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कर्साँटी होगी इस बात के जानने की कि हमारे चीन के साथ कैसे सम्बन्ध है। यह देखें कि इस साल कितने लोग सीमा पार करके उधर जाते हैं? इससे पहले तिब्बत जब स्वाधीन था। युनाइटेड नेशन्स में तिब्बत का जो बयान है और जो संधि पहले हुई है, जो यहाँ की लाइब्रेरी में भी प्राप्त है, आप में से उसे कोई भी पढ़ कर देख सकता है। उससे पता चलेगा कि तिब्बत १९५० तक बिल्कुल स्वाधीन रहा है और १९४९ में तिब्बत में जो चीनी मिशन था उसको भी निकाल दिया गया था। अब आज जो तिब्बत पर चीन का फौजी कब्जा है, उसको बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जा सकता और यह चीज ऐसी है जो किसी भी मुल्क के द्वारा पसन्द और बर्दाश्त नहीं की जा सकती। इतिहास बतलाता है कि यह चीज ज्यादा दिन तक नहीं चलने पायेगी, जैसा कि इस वक्त चल रही है। हम लोग भी किसी जमाने में गुलाम थे और हिटलर ने इंग्लैंड से संधि कर रखी थी कि हिन्दुस्तान का मामला इंग्लैंड का अपना घरलू मामला है और इस मामले में हम कोई देखल नहीं

दंगें। इस तरह की मित्रता, उसके लिये मैं इस अवसर पर कोई उपयुक्त शब्द नहीं ढूँढ पा रहा हूँ ताकि व्यक्त कर सकूँ तो भी नमूना-पूर्वक निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि इस तरीके की मित्रता हमें एक गलत रास्ते की तरफ ले जाती है और उससे हमारा देश का बहुत बड़ा नुकसान होता है। मैं अन्त में एक बार फिर माननीय प्रधान मंत्री और उनकी सरकार से निवेदन करूँगा कि वे इस मामले पर गौर करें और अपनी नीति इस मामले में और अधिक सुदृढ़ बनाएं, अगर वह गलत रास्ते पर जा रहे हों तो उसे छोड़ कर वे सही रास्ते पर जाएं।

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I regret I cannot emulate my hon. friend, Dr. Sinha by bringing into this debate questions of ideology, prejudices and even personal predilections. I find that my hon. friend, Dr. Sinha, has spoken with a certain amount of vehemence on the Tibetan question. I wish he did not do so. I have myself to say a few words about the Tibetan question and the house will recall that I have said something last year in one of the foreign affairs debates, but the basic point in this debate is this. Acharya Kripalani does not see much utility in this debate. I regret that a man of his eminence should have arrived at this conclusion. In view of the fact that we in this country have no armaments or even designs to use armaments, affirmation of our faith, of our ideals, of our difficulties, of our successes and failures, if any, is most helpful in this international world. This is the seventh of the series of the foreign affairs debates which we have had in this House since the general elections in 1952. Looking back, I daresay hon. Members will share with me this impression that the atmosphere for a debate on foreign affairs was never more propitious than it is today. Looking back at what has been said in the House and at the results and policies enunciated by the Prime Minister and the Government of India, I must say that our

prestige is perhaps at its zenith today than it has ever been so before. My hon. friend, the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party was obliged to use the words "the moral initiative of India" in his speech. I am glad even my hon. friends from the Communist Party are willing to recognise the need for unexceptionable behaviour and I congratulate them on this point.

The hon. Prime Minister, opening the debate, has made seven important points, according to my analysis. The first was with reference to the French possessions; the second was on the Tibetan agreement; the third was on Korea and Indo-China; the fourth was the Prime Ministers' Conference at Colombo; the fifth was on Goa; the sixth was on Ceylon; and the seventh was on the Japanese war prisoners' question and the role of Britain, in particular, in trying to disrupt our legal, juridical and even political position as successor State to undivided India. Each one of these is a very important issue and it will be difficult within the short time available for any speaker in this debate to deal with all these questions exhaustively. I am only sorry that my hon. friend, the Leader of the House, with his customary modesty, did not make reference to the very useful statement he made on hydrogen bomb. That is a statement of which this country can be proud. I am judging it from the reactions in the international Press and even from the comments made by spokesmen, by delegations of the Western Powers and to a certain extent, the Eastern Powers. The Prime Minister's statement on the hydrogen bomb has produced results not measurable in terms of—shall we say—physical measurement but certainly in terms of approaches, in terms of the climate which the Prime Minister referred to when he opened the debate this morning; he referred to a climate of peace based on collective security.....

**Shri C. D. Fande:** Collective security based on Collective peace.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** . . . and *vice versa* if that suits my hon. friend, Shri Pande. I must say that the positive result arising out of the statement made this morning and also the points made by my hon. friends who have preceded me so far is this: that with respect to Korea and Indo-China, particularly with respect to Indo-China, I think the role played by India has been successful; it is bound to be successful; there is no other alternative to it. It is here for me to pay my tribute ungrudgingly to the Prime Minister for the very firm stand he has taken even at times when he was swimming against the currents. Today it is easy for us to say that the Prime Minister's policy on the Indo-China issue has been vindicated. Looking back a few months, when the statement was made, there were apprehension and even difficulty in apprising the possible results of such a statement. This firmness has been useful and the doctrine—if I may use that word—associated with the Prime Minister's name of what may be called 'peace, contentment and freedom of Asia and Africa' is becoming increasingly recognised not only in Asia and Africa but also in the other parts of the world.

As I have said at the beginning, our prestige abroad is really great and our contribution to world affairs is really significant, and I have nothing to detract from that position. I hope the Prime Minister will have an opportunity to look into the points that I am going to make. Let us examine some of the points nearer home. I regret to say that in the midst of the vast canvas of world affairs which he had to cover, he did not make a reference to Pakistan. I think we in this House this morning should take note of the breath-taking events which have taken place in East Pakistan. I am not an interventionist and I have no desire to get mixed up with the domestic policies and conditions of our eastern neighbour. But I think, in the fitness of things, that the Prime Minister should invite Mr. Fazlul Huq to private conversations and friendly

talks even as Mr. Huq had gone to Calcutta and had private talks with Dr. B. C. Roy. I am making this suggestion in all seriousness and humility, and I feel so in the present context of things when the cry of *jehad* is again raising its head, and there is the Pakistan-U.S. military pact at the other end, when there are so many other important issues pending between these two countries. Mr. Huq's statement at Calcutta is heartening to most people in this country. I am sure there is nothing preventing such a meeting between the Prime Minister and Mr. Huq.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

I wish the Prime Minister had made a reference to Kashmir. This morning's papers announced a Presidential Order ratifying the Delhi Agreement of 1952. I make a reference to it because I find that after several years of continuous discussions during the course of which international intrigues were at the highest level on the part of the Security Council, and the American observers in Kashmir and so on and so forth—and these had become manifest, this question has now been settled once and for all. I consider that the announcement in this morning's papers would put firmly, finally and fundamentally the seal to the controversy over the future of Jammu and Kashmir. Jammu and Kashmir is now part integral of India, based upon the ascertained will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir State through the unanimous resolution of the Constituent Assembly of that State on this important question. I am glad that this particular announcement came this morning before this debate began, and I hope that through this debate it will be made known to the world that there is no question of the U. N. or any outside agency ever attempting to interfere with the ascertained, established and declared will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to implement the Delhi Agreement of 1952. This Agreement, if you will allow me to say so, will

now be part of our Constitution and procedure with regard to the integration of Jammu and Kashmir with India.

In this connection I should pay my tribute to the heroic work done by our *jawans* in Jammu and Kashmir during these very difficult six years. I think they deserve this tribute.

I may also say that the change-over of last year in the administration of Jammu and Kashmir has been beneficial, and I think the Bakshi Government should also get its meed of praise. And I regret that my very esteemed and eminent friend Acharya Kripalani had struck a discordant note about this matter. Because, nothing should be done to imperil the growing relationship between Jammu and Kashmir and India, particularly in the light of the announcement made this morning. I would go a step further and say, and I will venture to agree with Acharya Kripalani on this point, that we cannot keep Sheikh Abdullah for ever in prison without trial. That is a question of moral principles and also of jurisprudence and legal procedure.

On this question of the Tibet Agreement I regret that my hon. friend Dr. Sinha has gone into ideology and history. I have written down here one of the important phrases which the Prime Minister used while opening this debate, namely that "this Agreement is in recognition of existing situations." I would request him kindly to go back to 1950 and remember what exactly he said at that time, what exactly the Government of India did at that time. We had definitely encouraged the Dalai Lama in certain situations; a delegation came to Delhi. You remember, Sir that last year in one of the debates I pointed out that we should not let down the Tibetan people, having given them certain assurances. I would not go beyond that. Because I feel, even though I have the greatest friendship and admiration for the Chinese people, that our policy was not consistent with the

attitudes taken and the developments which we allowed to take shape in Tibet with reference to the movement of the Dalai Lama, the sending of delegations to Delhi, and so on and so forth.

I would draw attention to the growing conditions of instability in Nepal, our neighbour territory. I repeat I have no desire to enter into questions of sovereignty of that State or interfere in their domestic policies. But I think we should take note of the growing deterioration of the situation in Nepal.

I have two more remarks to make and I hope to have the indulgence of the House. I have more than once in these debates on foreign affairs adverted to certain missionary activities in the Terai area in the Sis-Himalayan territory. I will mention two or three names. I want them to go on record because I want the hon. the Prime Minister to investigate into these questions. Up to Khela, Mansiyari and Phurkiya in Almora District, up to Joshimath in Garhwal District, and up to Uttarkashi in Tehri-Garhwal District in U.P. is called the Inner Line. All foreigners shall have to take permits from the Deputy Commissioner of the District to cross into the Inner Line and go up to the Indo-Tibetan border. What is the position? There is an American Mission at Dharchula. It owns landed property inside the Inner Line at Sirkha, twelve miles beyond Khela. There are also American Missions at Pithorgarh, Lohaghat and Champhavat; and they send their men to Mansiyari and Milam in Johar where they have got immovable property. All these Missions send their men to the fair at Jauljibi (held from 14th November to 18th November each year) where over 70 thousand people gather from Nepal, Bhot and all the surrounding hilly regions.

Americans have got big organisations at Pithorgarh (including a big leper asylum), Lohaghat, . . .

**Shri C. D. Pande:** At Tanakour also.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:**...and Champhavat; and they own huge agricultural farms down at Tanakpur, at Banbassa and other places in Terai.

Sir, I have said on a previous occasion and I declare again that I am not smitten with any American phobia, I am myself a product of an American educational institution. The point is, today our security has got involved in these activities, and my request to the Prime Minister, rather my suggestion, would be to shift the inner line a little further and to make a little more adequate security arrangement.

One more point and I will conclude. This is an occasion for me to make a reference to our Indian Passport Act of 1920. I will be very brief and in one minute I will sit down. India is a signatory to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, but the Indian Constitution does not include the aforesaid right among the fundamental rights mentioned therein. As regards the refusal of passports to Indian nationals who desire to go abroad, the Indian passport regulations in force in the land are without the sanction of any enactment of the Parliament. I have got the Act here as modified upto 1st March 1950, which empowers the State to require passports of persons entering India but does not give the State any power to require passports of persons leaving India. I want the hon. Prime Minister to correct me if I am wrong, but I say it all in good faith. And, it so happens that almost every year, two to three thousand passport applications are rejected. I take a very serious view of this.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I know from what the hon. Member is reading?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I am reading from my notes based on the Indian Passport Act 1920 corrected up to 1st March, 1950.

The point I am making is this: that there is no legal power to withhold passports to applicants who are Indian nationals and who wish to go

abroad. If the law is defective it must be set right. In fact, I am not using the words 'unlawful', 'unauthorised', 'illegal' or 'void' in respect of the character of decisions taken by the Government in preventing the people from going abroad. This is a matter of importance in the cause of world peace and understanding, and early steps must be taken to bring our passport regulations on the British model. I have brought this up as a matter of great national duty and if my information is incorrect I stand corrected. But, the fact remains that there is no law in India to prevent an Indian national seeking to go abroad and yet thousands of applications have been rejected.

تھا کر لکشمین سنگھ چرک (جموں  
و کشمیر) : صاحب صدر - دنیا کی  
سیاست اس وقت ایک بڑے نازک  
مرحلے سے گذر رہی ہے - اس لئے کہ  
دنیا کے بڑے بڑے ملک دوسری  
جنگ عظیم کے نقصانات کو بھول کر  
ایسے نو دو بڑے کیمپوں میں بت  
گئے ہیں - اس سلسلہ میں آرماسٹریٹ  
کی رییس دن بدن زوروں پر چلتی  
جا رہی ہے - ایک طرف ایٹم بم  
کی ایجاد ہو رہی ہے اور دوسری  
طرف ہائڈروجن بم کی ایجاد ہو  
رہی ہے - ایسے نازک حالات میں  
ہماری فاریں پالیسی جن اصولوں پر  
مبنی ہے - وہ ہے ہمارا پرانا اتھاس  
اور وہ نصب العین جو مہاتما گاندھی  
جی نے اس ملک کے سامنے رکھا تھا  
کہ ہم کسی بھی پاور بلاک کے ساتھ  
شامل ہونا نہیں چاہتے - ہم امن و  
امان سے اپنے ملک کی ترقی چاہتے  
ہیں اور جہاں تک ہو سکے اپنی

رائے انٹرنیشنل معاملات میں دینا چاہتے ہیں جس سے دنیا کی بہتری ہو۔ ہمیں اس بات کی خوشی ہے کہ باوجود تمام مشکلات کے ہمارے فارین منسٹر صاحب نے معاملات کو بڑی اچھی طرح حل کرنے کی کوشش کی ہے۔ اور وہ سلک کی دعاؤں اور مبارکباد کے مستحق ہیں۔ اور ہمیں اس بات کا پورا یقین ہے کہ وہ اس ملک کی اشدتی کو ان مرحلوں کے گرداب میں سے نکال کر اچھی طرح سے کامیابی کے راستے پر لے جائیں گے۔

اس سلسلہ میں - جناب والا - چونکہ ہمارے ہمسائے ملک پاکستان کے پرائم منسٹر محمد علی صاحب اور ان کے سفیر کشمیر کے معاملہ کو ہر کانفرینس میں - ہر جلسہ میں اور ہر موقع پر چھوڑ دیتے ہیں - اس لئے میں مناسب سمجھتا ہوں کہ ریاست کے لوگوں کی طرف سے اس معاملہ پر کچھ روشنی ڈالوں - یہ معاملہ اس ایوان میں بہت بار زیر بحث آچکا ہے اور انٹرنیشنل فورم پر بہت بار اس پر بحث ہوئی اور اصل موضوع ہی بدلتا رہا - جناب والا - اس سلسلہ میں میں اس سٹاؤس کے ممبران کی یاد دہائی کے لئے کچھ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں - یہ تھے وہ بدقسمت حالات جنہیں اکتوبر ۱۹۴۷ میں ریاست

جموں اور کشمیر کا الحاق ہندوستان کے ساتھ ہوا تھا - پاکستان کے کشمیر پر حملہ کرنے کے بعد اس وقت کے مہاراجہ ہری سنگھ جی نے اور نیشنل کانفرینس کے لیڈر شہخ عبداللہ نے ہندوستان سے استدعا کی تھی کہ ہمارا الحاق منظور کیا جائے اور ہماری اس نازک موقع پر مدد کی جائے - ہمارا الحاق ہندوستان نے منظور کیا اور وہ قانونی طور سے بالکل ٹھیک تھا - لیکن جمہوریت کے خیال کو قائم رکھتے ہوئے ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے یہ اعلان کیا کہ چون ہی ریاست کے نارمل حالت ہو جائیں گے کہ وہ اس ایکسیشن پر دوبارہ غور کریں اور plebiscite کے ذریعہ اپنی رائے ظاہر کریں تاکہ اگر ان سے جلد بازی میں کبھی غلطی ہو گئی ہو تو اس کو درست کر لیں - لیکن جب ہندوستان کی فوجیں لڑ رہی تھیں - تو پاکستان نے ریڈرس کے ساتھ اپنی فوجیں بھی بھیج دیں پر ہمیشہ یہ کہتے رہے کہ ہماری فوجیں شامل نہیں ہوں - پھر ہندوستان کشمیر کا کیس یو - این - او - میں لے گیا - لیکن پاکستان برابر یہی کہتا رہا کہ ہماری فوجیں موجود نہیں ہیں - جب تک کہ یو - این - او - کی ایک کمیٹی یہاں نہیں آئی اور اس نے پاکستان کی فوجوں کو موقع پر لڑتے نہیں دیکھا

[ تھاکر لکھمن سنگھ چرک ]

تب تک پاکستان نے منظور نہیں کیا - ہماری شکایت کے بارے میں یو - این - او - میں کچھ نہیں ہوا - کئی کمیٹیاں بنیں - کئی صاحبان تشریف لائے - اور آخر سات برس کے عرصہ میں ہم کیا دیکھتے ہیں کہ پاکستان جس نے جموں و کشمیر پر ایگریشن کہا تھا اس کو اور ہندوستان کو برابر کا درجہ مل رہا ہے - اور گراہم صاحب نے یہ فیصلہ کہا کہ بہتر یہ ہے کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان خود ہی آپس میں فیصلہ کر لیں - جس قسم کی رعایتیں ہندوستان نے اس معاملہ میں پاکستان کو فیصلہ کرنے کے لئے دیں وہ آپ کو اچھی طرح معلوم ہیں - تاریخ اس بات کی شاہد ہے کہ ہر موقع پر پاکستان کے لیڈروں نے یہ کوشش کی کہ ہندوستان جتنی نرمی سے کام لے اتنی ہی حجتیں ان کی طرف سے بڑھتی جائیں - اور سب حالات اگلے خراب ہیں کہ سمجھ میں نہیں آتا کہ یو - این - او - میں یہ معاملہ کیسے طے ہوگا - پہلے تو حالات کچھ اور تھے - لیکن جب سے امریکہ اور پاکستان کا ملٹری پیکٹ ہو گیا ہے حالات اور بھی نازک ہو گئے ہیں - اور پاکستان کے پوائنٹ منسٹر اور ان کے سفیر نے کھلے طور پر یہ کہا ہے کہ اب کشمیر کا مسئلہ بہت اچھی طرح سے حل ہو جائیگا کیونکہ ان کو امریکہ

کی مدد مل گئی ہے - ہندوستان کو کھلی دھمکیاں دو جا رہی ہیں ایسے حالات میں یہ امید کرنا کہ یو - این - او - سے ہم کو کسی قسم کی امداد مل سکیگی یا انصاف ہو سکیگا غیر ممکن دکھائی دے رہا ہے - جناب والا کو یاد ہوگا کہ سیز فائر جنوری ۱۹۴۹ میں ہوا - اس دن سے آج تک دونوں طرف فوجیں بیٹھی ہوئی ہیں - خلدقیں کمودی ہوئی ہیں - یہ تو رہی ملٹری پوزیشن لیکن ریاست کے اندرونی حالات کیا ہیں - کشمیر کی نمائندہ جماعت نیشنل کانفرنس نے اس بات کا اعلان کر دیا ہے کہ الحاق مکمل ہے - اس کے علاوہ وہاں کی گائیسٹھوایلیٹ اسمبلی نے بھی اس بات کا فیصلہ کر دیا ہے کہ جو الحاق سنہ ۲۷ میں ہوا تھا وہ ہر طرح سے مکمل ہے - تو اب جناب والا اب پلیمہسٹ کا کوئی سوال نہیں رہتا - اس کے علاوہ پلیمہسٹ کا وعدہ ہندوستان کی گورنمنٹ نے ریاست کے لوگوں سے کیا تھا - پاکستان کے لوگوں سے نہیں کیا تھا - اور اگر جموں اور کشمیر کے بارے میں کوئی فیصلہ کر سکتا ہے - تو وہیں کے لوگ کر سکتے ہیں - یو - این - او - یا اور کوئی اتھارٹی ہم پر وہ فیصہ عائد نہیں کر سکتی - اور جہاں تک ہم لوگوں کا تعلق ہے ہم نے پورے طور پر فیصلہ کر لیا ہے اور

میں اس ایوان سے اور اس گورنمنٹ سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اب ان حالات کو ختم کیجئے - ہم سمجھتے ہیں کہ پریسیڈنٹ صاحب کے کل نے آرڈر سے بہت سے مرحلے طے ہو جائیں گے - لیکن ابھی ہمارے سر پر یہ تلوار لٹک رہی ہے کہ نہ معلوم ہو - این - او - پلیمہسٹ کے بارے میں کیا طے کریگی - اس وجہ سے ریاست کا اکیڈمک ڈیولپمنٹ رکا ہوا ہے - اور کاروبار اچھی طرح سے نہیں چل رہا ہے - اور جسوں اور کشمیر میں جو شرارتی عنصر ہیں جب تک یہ غیر یقینی حالت قائم رہیگی اس عنصر کو موقع رہے گا کہ ایک یا دوسرے بہانے بنا کر شرارت پیدا کرتا رہے - اس لئے میں یہ استدعا کرتا ہوں کہ ان حالات کو دیکھ کر اور کانستٹیوٹو ایڈنٹ اسیمبلی کے فیصلے کو سمجھ کر اور لوگوں کی خواہشات کو سن کر یہ ذمہ داری ہندوستان پر عائد ہوتی ہے کہ جو دوستی کا ہاتھ سنہ ۴۷ میں کشمیر کے لہقر نے پھین کیا تھا - اور جس دوستی کی بنا پر ہندوستان نے کروڑوں روپیہ کشمیر پر خرچ کیا - اور ہزاروں جوانوں نے کشمیر کو بچانے کے لئے اپنی جانیں دیں - اس کو مکمل کر دیا جائے - اور ریاست کے لوگوں کو بتلا دیا جائے کہ اپنے کام کاج میں لگ جاؤ - اپنے اکیڈمک ڈیولپمنٹ میں لگ جاؤ - اور یہ فیصلہ ہو چکا ہے

اس کو ہم پورے طور پر قبول کرتے ہیں -

(English translation of the above speech)

**Th. Lakshman Singh Charak** (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, global politics is passing through a very critical stage at this time as the big countries having forgotten the tragic end of the Second World War are again dividing themselves into two Camps. The race of armaments is gathering momentum day by day. We have the Atom Bomb on one side and the Hydrogen Bomb on the other. Placed in such a critical position as we are, our foreign policy is based on the principles passed on to us from our ancient history and on the goal laid before our country by the Late Mahatma. He made it clear to the whole nation that we never wanted to be a party to any Power Bloc, wanted our country to progress peacefully and, so far as possible, give our opinion in the international affairs which would be for the betterment of the world as a whole. This pleases us most that our hon. Foreign Minister has attempted to solve in a right way all the problems in spite of the difficulties around us. He needs prayers and congratulations of the whole country on this occasion. We trust that he will steer our country out of these whirlpools and place her on the road to success.

Sir, the Pakistan Prime Minister Mr. Mohd. Ali and the ambassadors of Pakistan touch up on the Kashmir problem on every occasion, be it a meeting or a conference. In this connection I deem it fit to shed some light on it on behalf of the people of that state. Kashmir problem has been debated on the floor of the House many a time and has also been the subject of discussion on the International Forum many times, so much so, that the real

[Th. Lakshman Singh Charak]

perspective of the problem has changed.

Sir, I would like to remind the hon. Members of some events in this connection. I am referring to the unfortunate events of October, 1947 when Jammu and Kashmir State acceded to India. The then ruler of that state Maharaja Hari Singh and the leader of the National Conference, Sheikh Abdullah, came forward with the request of accession after the state had been invaded by Pakistan, and they wanted help at that critical juncture. India granted us accession which was quite sound, legally. Upholding the democratic viewpoint, our Prime Minister made an announcement that the people of Jammu and Kashmir State would be given an opportunity to reconsider the accession and express themselves by a plebiscite after the conditions returned to normal, so that the mistake, if any, made in haste by them would be corrected. When Indian army was fighting out the raiders, Pakistan sent her army along side, but kept on saying that her army had no hand in the raids. India took the Kashmir question before the U.N.O., but Pakistan harped on the same old tune that her army was never in the picture. The U.N.O. had to send a committee on spot which observed the Pakistan army fighting in the state, and then she had to admit the truth. Our complaints went unheard of at the U.N.O. Many a committee came into being. Many an observer came there. What came out of it after all these seven long years? Pakistan, the aggressor on the soil of Jammu and Kashmir State, has been given the same status as that of India. Dr. Graham in his report has said that it would be better if India and Pakistan decided between themselves. You are aware of the concessions given by India to Pakistan in this matter. History will bear witness to it that the softer attitude taken by India met with the dilly-dally ways of the leaders of Pakistan. The situation has now worsened to this extent that one cannot understand how

this dispute is going to be settled at the U.N.O. The matter was something different formerly, but the situation has become all the more critical since the Pak-American Military Pact. The Prime Minister and the ambassador of Pakistan have expressed openly that the problem of Kashmir would be solved in a better way now with the American military aid. Open threatenings are being given to India. It seems hoping against hopes to think of any help or justice from the U.N.O. You may remember, Sir, that the cease-fire took place in January, 1949. Since then the armies on the both sides are there with their trenches dug into the soil of Kashmir. That is about the military position. Now about the internal state of affairs. National Conference, the representative body of Kashmir, has made the announcement that the accession is complete. The Constituent Assembly of the State also has decided that the accession of 1947 is complete in every respect. Sir, the question of plebiscite does not come into the picture, therefore. Holding a plebiscite was the word given by the Government of India to the people of Jammu and Kashmir State, and not to the people of Pakistan. It is only the people of Jammu and Kashmir who can decide the issue of their state. The U.N.O. or some other authority cannot thrust any decision on us. So far as we are concerned, we have decided once for all; and now I would request the House and the Government to put an end to this state of affairs. We understand that most of the problems will be solved by the order of the President issued yesterday, but the Damocles' sword of the U.N.O. is still hanging on our heads and we do not know what they are going to decide regarding the plebiscite. It is on their account that the economic development of the state is at standstill and the trade is obstructed. So long as this atmosphere of uncertainty prevails in Jammu and Kashmir, the mischievous element shall always get an opportunity to make some mischief with one excuse or the other. I would,

therefore, submit that keeping in view this state of affairs and the decision of the Constituent Assembly as also listening to the hearts of the people there, it is a binding on India to complete the accession for which the leader of Kashmir extended the hand of friendship in 1947, and on the basis of which friendship India spent crores of rupees on her, and for the protection of which thousands of Indian *Jawans* laid down their lives. The people of that state need also be told to keep themselves busy in their work, take practical steps for their economic development, and know that we fully accept the decision.

**Shri Thanu Pillai** (Tirunelveli): I congratulate the Prime Minister for the able way in which the Asian Conference at Colombo has endorsed fully the view of India on the burning question of Indo-China and the Hydrogen Bomb. There was criticism in our Press that publicity was not given. We always lack in publicity and our Prime Minister does not like publicity perhaps.

When we consider foreign affairs every time, there is this obsession of ideological clashes. Our friends opposite have criticised the statement that neither the Communists nor other forces should interfere in Asian affairs. To our mind, though we might feel angry about many things that are happening round about us, we are under the control of an ideology and a leader who will not allow us to overpower us. That is our handicap, but others can be light-heartedly angry and say things which they want. But still what we feel about all that is happening we would like to express. The ideology of the Communist Party is fanning out from Russia and China and the Anglo-American ideology of capitalism is converging on and we are sandwiched between the two. We do not belong to this group or that. We do not want to belong to either of these groups, but if all people in India would only grow according to the ideology that our country's culture and the Father of the Nation have developed,

much of these ills which are confronting us can be easily solved or improved. Here is an ideology which has come through a party which is functioning here, every time sabotaging all our attempts for furthering our cause and ideology in our effort to build our country. There is another ideology which slowly comes through the backdoor, not through the agents in our country, in Parliament, but in the economic sphere, through the capitalist organisations and capitalists who think in the way of America and say: "Why not we take some more money and go that way."

**Shri Punnoose** (Alleppey): On a point of order. The hon. Member is making some aspersions against the Communist or some other party in the House. He said that there are some outside agents in Parliament.....

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. I would not allow any hon. Member to make a speech, while another is already on his legs.

**Shri Punnoose:** On a point of order....

**Shri Punnoose:** Yes, it is a point of order. I am prepared to hear the hon. Member.

**Shri Punnoose:** Yes, it is a point of order. In the course of the remarks which he has just made, I heard it distinctly said that there are agents in Parliament. Whether it refers to A, B, or C does not matter, but he said that there are some agents in the Parliament. Is that a decent statement to make? Can it be permitted in Parliament? I would like to know that.

**Shri Thanu Pillai:** The hon. Member has thoroughly misunderstood me. What I was saying was that an ideology was fanning out; it is not the party, or any nation or country which is fanning out, but an ideology. The two are quite different.

**Shri Punnoose:** But the words used by the hon. Member are, that there are agents inside the Indian Parliament. That is a reflection on the Parliament of India.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member has already said that what he meant was something different.

**Shri Thanu Pillai:** If they are zealous about guarding their prestige and that of the Parliament of India, they would have spoken in a different tone in the course of this debate. We are more zealous of guarding it than they. We all know when to laugh, and when we want, we shall laugh.

This country is beset with people, from Kashmir to Cape Comorin, who are *agents provocateur*. There is no denial of that fact. They may be in Parliament, they may have their own tactics, and they may try to flourish in Parliament. But we challenge them. (Interruptions). The hon. Member, Shri H. N. Mukerjee was speaking about 'सत्यमेव जयते' in a somewhat heckling manner but we will tell him that as long as life lasts in us 'सत्यमेव जयते' cannot be replaced by "dictatorship of the proletariat." If that is their ambition and their approach to problems, we know what answer to give. We are rather restrained, but we are not devoid of strength. They must realise that. When we are discussing our approach to international problems, why should there be a different type of attack, or a veiled attack from other quarters? That is my worry. They say that they are supporting our approach to international problems. But why should there be this veiled attack? We say, we are friends of all, with no enemies. We believe in our own ideology, and we want to be allowed to grow in that fashion. When there is intrusion from either this side or that side, externally or internally, it is only just and proper that we should be a little more angry with those that are trying to beset our progress, and do not believe in the principles and ideals that we follow, and the policies which are the outcome of those principles of faith and fearlessness.

Coming nearer home, our Prime Minister was kind enough to mention

about Ceylon. It is not a problem which affects the Ceylonese of Indian origin only, because if the people there are thrown out in the manner in which the Ceylon Government are trying to do unilaterally, that will affect the tranquillity of our country. The other day, in the Legislative Assembly of Madras, the members have spoken about the seriousness of the problem. So, it is not as if there is only a lonely voice being heard in Parliament here. It affects the whole of the Madras State especially, and I would like Government to take cognizance of that. It affects us this way. Already, there are disintegrating forces in our country, which are bringing in communalism and the North-South linguism, and this will only add weight in their armoury of disaffection, namely: "because the people involved are from South India, the Central Government are not taking due or proper care."

Though I do not exactly endorse their view, we have not been giving adequate publicity to what we are trying to do and our approach to the Indo-Ceylon problem. Rightly. Sir, we should sympathise with them and their difficulties, but the Ceylon Government also should reciprocate that sympathetic attitude which we show, and in dealing with the Indian population there, they should feel that it will upset the minds of millions of people in India too. As they do not want us to show our strength, of being a great country, we do not like them to hit us even in a small way. Because it is the younger brother, we cannot be getting slaps from the younger brother all the time. Not that we want to do anything by way of sanctions or even a quarrel and fight, but we have to tell the Government of Ceylon that the manner in which they are trying to implement the broad principles of the agreed conclusions is not desirable, and not stop with that. We have agreed with them to register the Indian settlers who want to become Indians, and to give them a certificate that they are Indians.

But if it is voluntary, we have no objection. When people have applied for citizenship and they are thrown out and their applications are rejected and when they are made Stateless, and therefore forced to come and apply for Indian citizenship, then it is a different matter.

Then it will be quite proper for our Government to say that they cannot oblige Ceylon by taking them as Indian nationals again. Though constitutional difficulties might be there, if necessary, if Ceylon can change her Constitution to suit her conditions, we may have to change our Constitution also to suit our needs. If a person of Indian origin has applied for another nationality, he must definitely forfeit the nationality of India and a second chance cannot be given in his own time. If we can arrive at that sort of understanding, we will be solving the problem considerably. Then it will be a problem absolutely of Ceylonese of Indian origin and not Indians who could be pushed out. If they are not pushed out, we are not so much worried as to what happens inside, because we know that the strength of the Indian community there is not such that we should be afraid very much. They are so good a people and they have not started fighting the Ceylon Government as yet, but if they think of fighting and joining hands with other forces there, it will be a very difficult thing for the Government of Ceylon. We do not wish that to happen also. That is one more reason why we are zealous about a settlement. If the Ceylon problem is not settled amicably, it will be giving a handle to the reactionary forces that would try to upset the tranquillity in that country. If they accept our advice as an elder brother, they would do well to settle this problem immediately.

Coming to the latest pronouncements of America and other great countries about our being in the Japanese Clemency Commission, I think what they could not achieve by dollars or guns they want to achieve by veiled insults hurled at us. Though our Government

may not take it as an insult, we feel that internationally when something recognised in an international agreement is being unilaterally flouted, more serious notice will have to be taken and stronger reproaches should be given than mild references here in our Parliament by our Prime Minister. I know that he will not try to do it in a harsh way, but still the country more and more becomes anxious about our respect and regard in the international sphere. This respect and regard which we are developing as we are growing every day is being flouted on every occasion when we do not toe the line of this country or that. It is not one group of countries which is hurling abuses at us. In the UNO, the Russian and Chinese bloc have done it and the Anglo-American bloc have also done it.

With these few words, I further appeal that the Ceylon question should be settled before we meet next and before something more dangerous happens to our people.

**Mr. Chairman:** Before I call upon the hon. Member, Shri T. K. Chaudhuri, I have to inform hon. Members that copies of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Bill, 1954, which was introduced in the Lok Sabha on the 14th May, 1954, has been put down for reference to a Joint Committee of the Houses in the Combined List of Business for May 18, 19, 20 and 21, 1954. Printed copies of the Bill as introduced have been placed in the Publications Counter for distribution to hon. Members. Hon. Members may collect their copies from the Publications Counter.

Hon. Members desirous of giving notices of amendments to the Bill may do so now.

**Shri T. K. Chaudhuri:** As usual in these discussions, encomiums upon encomiums were heaped upon the hon. Prime Minister for the 'very-able' conduct of our foreign policy and very beautiful words like 'peace' and 'India's moral influence' were bandied about. So, I must make it clear from my side that I rise to take part in

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

today's discussion not as a partisan of that internationally fashionable 'cliche peace' but as a partisan of war against all wars sought to be let loose upon the world by the Big Powers today. I speak as an opponent of the tensions that have been created by the division of the world into power bloc systems and as an opponent of the aggressions that have been let loose in the Asiatic continent today by those Big Powers. I prefer to preface my observations on the recent foreign policy of the Government of India with these remarks, because I feel that the policy statements of our Government have come very close to the wobbly, peace-mongering that has become fashionable in certain quarters in this country and outside. What is worse still, this policy, apparently meaning well and ostensibly directed towards lessening of the atmosphere of suspicion and cold war tensions and serving the cause of world peace has really acted as the cover for the aggressive and hypocritical moves of certain powers and conspiracy of these powers to cheat the oppressed people of their freedom, to divert militant struggles of the masses of different Asian countries to safer channels for themselves, and also to hide the opportunism of certain other powers so that they can use the hard-fought and hard-won gains of these struggles for their own games of power politics. World peace is a sweet-sounding, idealistic phrase all right. But the mere advocacy of peace, however, ardent and vociferous that may be divorced from basic pre-conditions, which alone can guarantee lasting peace and freedom for the common masses, can easily degenerate into a meaningless empty phrase, into a self-deceptive vacuity and be used as a cover for subtler forms of imperialist big power domination. I am afraid that the policies and pronouncements of the Government of India on international matters in recent months, have in their cumulative effect, been of such a nature as to fit in precisely this latter charac-

terisation very well. I say this with a full sense of responsibility and with full knowledge of the fact that the recent pronouncements of the Government of India's policy with regard to matters of moment in international affairs have been acclaimed by no less a person than Comrade Malenkov in Moscow, as well as many of my comrades on this side of the House, as a major contribution to the cause of world peace and to the cause of Asian freedom at least, if not world freedom. I am also aware of the fact that the pronouncements of the Government of India through the mouth of its principal spokesman, Pandit Nehru have so enamoured some of my comrades on this side of the House that instead of a few isolated gentlemen from the other side coming forward in a half-hearted and tentative fellow-travelling camaraderie with our comrades on this side, we are presented with the spectacle of Members from this side turning into fellow-travellers of the Congress and Pandit Nehru. As a matter of fact, we really witnessed such a spectacle in the shape of the much publicised National Convention against Pak-U.S. military alliance, the other day. It is necessary, therefore, to scrutinise a bit more closely the policies of the Government of India, and the steps that have been taken by the Government of India, in recent months, in international affairs.

12 Noon

Dr. Lanka Sundaram referred to six or seven matters which were mentioned by the hon. Prime Minister in his speech today. I am recounting these points once again. He first mentioned about the position with regard to French possessions in India. Secondly, to Tibet, thirdly to the Colombo Conference and in relation thereto, to Korea and Indo-China; fourthly, to the position of the stateless people of Indian descent wandering about in Ceylon and fifthly to Goa, and sixthly to the question of India's participation in granting clemency to Japanese war prisoners. If

we leave aside the question of the Colombo Conference and its decisions with regard to Korea and Indo-China and other matters not directly and immediately concerning India, I am afraid that all the other matters relating to our problems nearer home, whether they refer to French possessions, whether they relate to Goa or the Portuguese possessions in India, whether they relate to Tibet or to clemency to Japanese war prisoners, they all remain where they were. You have to look to the question of the success or failure of the foreign policy of the Government of India from this practical objective angle and you will realise the futility of the policy that is pursued.

I am aware that great things have been said in praise of the so-called 'moral influence' that is being exercised in the troubled world of today by the policies of our Prime Minister—particularly, with reference to the outlook of the present international situation which is today more or less dominated by the Geneva Conference and in connection with the Geneva Conference. Almost simultaneously with this Conference—we had a Conference in Colombo in which our Prime Minister participated with the Prime Ministers of four other South East Asian countries. There, we arrived at some sort of common agreement, no doubt; but the common agreements that were arrived at have to be looked into closely and we have to ask ourselves the question whether the decisions in the formation of which we have taken our share there have really helped the cause of India or have served to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for somebody else. I will refer you to one shrewd remark recently made by the leader writer of the British financial journal *Capital* with regard to the decisions and the alleged success of the Colombo Conference. I am reading out from the *Capital* and it is worthwhile doing so.

"The success of the Colombo Conference for India was not that

the other four Asian powers were won over to Mr. Nehru's neutralism. They were not, and all intend evidently to pursue the foreign policies they have been following before, which differ in significant respects from India's. The success was in demonstrating that for all these differences, India's foreign policy is only a stage removed from her neighbours' and given careful phrasing, can be stated with theirs in mutually acceptable language."

What are those countries with whose foreign policies we tried to bring in line the foreign policy of our own? There was Ceylon and there was Pakistan, and we know what the foreign policies and the alliances and international affiliations of these countries have been for some time past. Public memory is short, but if I remember aright, the convening of the Colombo Conference or the proposal with regard thereto was announced by the Ceylonese Prime Minister, Sir John Kotelawala, after the U.S.-Pakistan military pact came to the forefront. Very strong words were used in this House by no less a person than the hon. Prime Minister about that Pact, and we all thought when the Conference was announced or when the proposal was made, that we would be discussing the matters which would be more directly concerning our own affairs, but instead of that, somehow or other at whose instance I do not know, things were arranged in such a way that the Colombo Conference was syn' so far ed with the convening of the Kashmir of the Geneva Conference once and know the international of India and which the Geneva Conf' prosperity. held. We also know alv'ernment of ences that have been the fate of the British Imperialism and Kashmir is counterpart and ho' by a plebiscite. to take the initiat' a plebiscite and matters in its ow' the plebiscite is hands of Americeople of Kashmir

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

The *Statesman* was quite right therefore in saying with reference to the decisions of the Colombo Conference—

"There is no doubt that the Colombo attitude to Indo-China in particular has pleased the British Government and greatly strengthened Mr. Eden's hands over the negotiations for a settlement at Geneva."

That is why I say that the decisions that we took at Colombo along with four other South-East Asian countries have nothing to do with the interests of India as such. They only serve to pull or will serve to pull the chestnut out of the fire for somebody else, that is, our 'brethren' in the Commonwealth in their quarrels with U.S. imperialism.

**Swami Ramananda Tirtha** (Gulberga): As I was listening to the speeches of the hon. friends on both sides of the House, I could not resist the temptation of referring to certain remarks made by Members who have differed from us:

Sir, it should be remembered that the foreign policy that we are pursuing is based on certain fundamentals. It has been called wrongly a policy of "dynamic neutrality", or some such thing. Ours is a policy based on certain fundamental principles. Principles and fundamentals, as we know, have to set a lonely furrow and at times they can be misconstrued as isolationist policies. But the fact is that our foreign policy has amply proved that what we have been doing, lastly, to do, is in the best interests of the promotion of peace in the world to a serious and used as a guide to understand, and let us understand the spirit and the ideas behind this policy. It is a policy of the two power blocs of the world. India on the one hand, and the American bloc on the other. In our recent months, the American bloc has been tacked on to the American bloc to fit in precisely. I am sure, and the Government will

not be fully appreciated by those—I do not make any unfair charge—who look more to Russia than to India, because whatever helps either of the blocs would be either liked or detested by those friends.

I know something of the communists. It was a great pleasure to hear my hon. friend Prof. Mukerjee giving us a sermon on communists and all that they mean. I am one of those who have tried to understand the fundamental principles of communism and socialism. At times I have been accused of being a pro-Communist also. But, Sir, let me make it very clear that the foreign policy of India is neither directed towards this bloc nor that bloc; it only tries to eliminate the sinister element in both the blocs.

We want the nations not to increase their armaments. After all, what has Russia been doing? If there is a hydrogen bomb in the armoury of America, well, a greater number of hydrogen bombs are in the armoury of Russia. That is international policy. Their policy is a policy of increasing armaments. India wants international relationship to be based not on the strength of armaments, but on the strength of co-operation and peace. We do not want to lead a third bloc. India does not want to have any bloc of its own, but India wants to wield an influence so that the area of peace may be extended. Let us understand it mentally, because the policy of India is dictated, is actuated by certain fundamental ideas. Those ideas cannot be found in the foreign policies either of the U.S.S.R. or of U.S.A. Unless my friends belonging to the Communist Party dispossess themselves of this close affinity, a family affinity, with the USSR, it would be difficult for them to understand fully and appreciate the foreign policy enunciated by our Prime Minister. I say with all the emphasis at my command that the whole of the peace-loving population of the entire world will share with us this conviction that the policy that India is following is

a policy that will be remembered with gratitude by millions and millions to come. Therefore, before we come to think of this foreign policy of India, let us understand the ideas that have actuated us.

The Prime Minister has made it amply clear that we stand for a negotiated settlement. Negotiated settlement comes only through a co-operative effort, of understanding, and through the conviction that the relationships between nations and nations have to be controlled and have to be guided by ideas of peace. Therefore, Sir, our mental attitude has to be different from that which has actuated the foreign policy of the power blocs.

Sir, something has been said about the *Dharm Yudh*. I do not want to refer to it. We have opposed colonialism wherever it existed. I do not understand why the USSR is trying to expand its spheres of influence through armaments, on the strength of armaments. Is it not a sort of imperialism? I can understand the world accepting communism of its own. But with the strength of hydrogen bombs, if you want to impose communist ideology, well, we call it a different type of imperialism and a sort of expansionist policy. Sir, India does not want to impose her will, or her ideas on the world. We preach, we say what we feel, unmindful of the armaments in the armoury of the warring nations of the world. Whether we deal with the Korean issue, or the Indo-China problem, or our own domestic affairs in regard to our own relations with Ceylon, the same idea is percolating in all our actions.

Sir, I was very much amused at the remarks made by my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani. He said something about a national policy—that foreign policy, or external policy has to be a national policy. I do not understand the word 'national'. I can understand the policy of a country is always dictated by certain fundamentals as agreed to by the

party which is in power. National policy is the policy which promotes the interests of the nation, whether one party agrees with it or not. Political parties are based on certain exigencies of the situation, while the policies of the nation are based on certain fundamentals which never change. I, therefore, submit to him to dispossess his mind of this wrong idea that the foreign policy of India is only a party policy and not a national policy, if I may put it in a naked form. Therefore, I submit that the policy enunciated by our Prime Minister is the correct policy and is the only policy which will lead not only India but the vast millions of the people all over the world to the way of peace and amity.

I am not going to tire out the House by a long speech but I want to make only a reference to Kashmir which the Prime Minister in his own wisdom has thought fit not to mention in this House in the present debate. I had certain psychological nearness to the people of Kashmir and to the valiant workers of the Jammu and Kashmir National Conference. We have sympathies with each other in our struggle for freedom and in our crusade against the autocratic regimes in our respective States. The people of Kashmir have vindicated their own right to decide their own future and through the Constituent Assembly have confirmed what the instrument of accession has already enunciated. The question of plebiscite is hanging fire. I would submit that though it is difficult at the present stage to remove this item from the agenda of the U.N.O. let us be very clear in our minds that so far as the people of Jammu and Kashmir are concerned, they have once and for all decided to be with India and share in its sufferings and prosperity. I do not want the Government of India to say that still the fate of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is going to be decided by a plebiscite. We are not afraid of a plebiscite and I am sure even if the plebiscite is undertaken, the people of Kashmir

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

and Jammu will vote for accession to India. But this state of mental uncertainty has to be terminated and the people of Jammu and Kashmir have to be assured that there will be no occasion in future to review what has been already decided by the will of the people. That is all that I would submit and I support wholeheartedly the foreign policy enunciated by the Prime Minister.

श्री एस० एन० दास (दरभंगा मध्य) : सभा-पति जी, हिन्दुस्तान की वैदेशिक नीति की सफलता इस एक बात से पूरी तरह स्पष्ट हो जाती है कि जब कोरिया में युद्ध छिड़ गया तो ऐसा मालूम पड़ा कि वह संसार का तीसरा युद्ध आरम्भ करके रहेगा, लेकिन भारत ने उसके सम्बन्ध में अपना जो रुख अखित्यार किया और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मन्त्री ने जो नीति इस सम्बन्ध में निर्धारित की उससे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में युद्ध के जो बादल मंडरा रहे थे, वे छिन्न भिन्न हो गये और ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि अब तीसरा युद्ध शायद न हो। लेकिन इसके लिये कोई भी भावस्थवाणी नहीं कर सकता। जब हम दुनियाँ के जो बड़े दो गुट्ट हैं उनकी नीति की तरफ ध्यान देते हैं तो मालूम होता है कि बावजूद इस बात के कि हिन्दुस्तान जिसका मांगोलिक दृष्टि से और अनेक दृष्टि से एशिया में एक महान स्थान है और जिसका दृढ़ संकल्प संसार में शांति कायम रखने का है फिर भी जो दुनियाँ के दो महान् गुट्ट हैं, उन गुट्टों की नीति के कारण कब संसार में लड़ाई छिड़ जाय, इस के लिये निश्चित तौर से कोई बात नहीं कही जा सकती है। अमरीका के राज-पुरुष और संसार के दूसरे अधिकांश राजपुरुष हैं आज की समस्याओं पर विचार किस तरह से करते हैं उसका अगर मनोवैज्ञानिक विश्लेषण किया जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि मनोवैज्ञान के जानने वाले अच्छी तरह से इस बात को बता देंगे कि उन राजपुरुषों के व्याख्यानों में योजनाओं में और जो सम्मेलन और सभाएं इत्यादि वे किया करते हैं, उनकी तह में क्या बात छिपी हुई है ?

इतिहास का लिखने वाला जब कभी भी आज का इतिहास लिखेगा तो बतायेगा कि दुनियाँ की एक एसी भी हालत थी कि जिस हालत में अगर तत्कालीन राजपुरुष लोग चाहते तो दुनियाँ के लोग बहुत ही अमन और आजादी से रह सकते थे। लेकिन आज आदर्श की ओट में आदर्श का आवरण देकर युद्ध के लिये तैयारियाँ की जाती हैं ऐसा हम देखते हैं। मेरा ख्याल है आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी आज के राजपुरुषों को इस नीति के लिये बिना कोसे हुए नहीं रहेगी।

हिन्दुस्तान एक नया प्रजातंत्र है, इस नये प्रजातंत्र ने अभी थोड़े ही दिन हुए अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक प्रवेश किया है। और आज दो महागुट्टों के विभिन्न प्रलोभनों के रहते हुए हिन्दुस्तान जो नीति अपने सामने रख रहा है, मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद ही कोई दूसरा देश एसी परिस्थिति में इस नीति को धारण कर सकता है। यह हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास, हिन्दुस्तान की संस्कृति, हिन्दुस्तान की परम्परा और महात्मा गांधी के नेतृत्व का ही फल है कि आज ऐसे दो महागुट्टों के बीच में जिन के पास अस्त्र शस्त्र और समर के दूसरे साधन अधिक से अधिक मात्रा में हैं, रहते हुए भी हम ने स्वतंत्र और क्रियाशील तटस्थता की नीति अपने सामने रक्खी है और ऐसा करना प्रशंसा के लायक अवश्य है। क्या कारण है कि इस नीति पर जो कि शान्ति की नीति है, जो सामूहिक शान्ति ला सकती है और जिस के बारे में हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी बराबर कहते आये हैं कि हम चाहते हैं कि दुनियाँ में सब लोग शान्ति से रहें, कोई एक दूसरे के कार्य में हस्तक्षेप न करे न तो जो रूस का गुट्ट है वह विश्वास करता है और न जो अमरीका का गुट्ट है वही विश्वास करता है ? अमरीका डरता है कि हिन्दुस्तान जैसा नया परन्तु बड़ा प्रजातंत्रीय देश तथाकीर्ण स्वतंत्र देशों के गुट्ट को छोड़ कर कहीं दूसरे गुट्ट के साथ न हो जाय और इस प्रकार साम्यवाद का विस्तार सारे एशिया में न हो जाय। मैं कहता हूँ, और

हमारा निजी खयाल है, कि साम्यवाद का जो आपदर्श है वह कोई ऐसा आदर्श नहीं है जिस से घृणा की जाय। हाँ, साम्यवाद लाने का जो तरीका है, जो सिद्धान्त है, जो कि रूस और दूसरे देश आज अस्वकार कर रहे हैं, उससे हमारा गहरा मतभेद है। लेकिन जो साम्यवाद का उंचा आदर्श है कि हर एक देश, हर एक व्यक्ति शोषण से मुक्त हो, किसी के विचार पर किसी का दबाव न हो, हर एक स्वतंत्रता पूर्वक उस देश में अपने समाज में, शान्तिपूर्वक रहें, उस आदर्श को कौन नहीं मानता? फिर भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर न रूस का विश्वास है और न अमरीका का विश्वास है। हम चाहते भी नहीं हैं कि हम अनुचित नीति अस्वकार कर उनका विश्वास प्राप्त करें। हम अपनी स्थिति को देख कर, दुनियाँ की स्थिति को देख कर, जहाँ हमारा स्थान है और एशिया में दूसरों के स्थान को देख कर अपनी नीति का निर्धारण करते हैं। लेकिन सभापति जी, आश्चर्य तो तब होता है जब कि हम जो कुछ कहते हैं या हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी जब नीति की घोषणा करते हैं उस के सम्बन्ध में देश और विदेश के अखबारों को पढ़ने से मालूम होता है कि और मुल्कों को हमारी नीति पर विश्वास नहीं है। अमरीका को भी हमारे ऊपर विश्वास नहीं है और साथ ही साथ रूस भी हमारी बातों पर बहुत अंशों में विश्वास नहीं करता।

जब कोरिया के सम्बन्ध में हम ने अपना रुख अस्वकार किया और जब यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के अन्दर भारत ने उसके सम्बन्ध में अपना प्रस्ताव रक्खा उस समय चीन और रूस के रीडियो ने कौसी कौसी बातें कही थीं वह मुझे याद हैं। यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो गया है कि कोरिया के सम्बन्ध में जो नीति हमने अस्वकार की थी उस को अमरीका ने कभी स्वीकार नहीं किया और अमरीका का सन्देह उस समय से बढ़ता ही चला जाता है। और इस का फल यह है कि छोट-छोट मामलों में भी अमरीका यह कहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान हमारे साथ नहीं है। इस लिये अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलनों में जब

कभी भी इस बात की आवश्यकता महसूस की जाती है कि हिन्दुस्तान को बुलाया जाय तो अमरीका को वह प्रस्ताव पसन्द नहीं आता है। आज एशिया के सम्बन्ध में जेनेवा में सम्मेलन हो रहा है। हम नहीं चाहते हैं और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भी नहीं चाहते हैं और हम इस के लिये उत्सुक भी नहीं हैं कि हमें उन में अवश्य बुलाया जाय। लेकिन एशिया के सम्बन्ध में जेनेवा में सम्मेलन हो, वहाँ पर एशिया के सवालों पर विचार हो और उस में हिन्दुस्तान और एशिया के कई देशों को न बुलाया जाय, इस से मालूम होता है कि वहाँ किस तरह की अस्वाभाविकता फैली हुई है। अगर भारत आज अमरीका के साथ होता, अगर हम अमरीका की नीति के पूरे हक में होते, अमरीका के बताये हुए रास्ते को गृहण कर लें, तो अमरीकी गुट में हमारा स्थान रहता और अमरीका वहाँ हमारा स्वागत करता। हम नहीं चाहते हैं, भारत नहीं चाहता है कि दोनों गुटों में से किसी की नीति को आख मूँद कर अपनायें। वे कहते हैं कि शान्ति के लिये सब कुछ हो रहा है। एक कहता है कि हम इस लिये प्रयत्न करते हैं कि हम चाहते हैं कि दुनिया में सामूहिक सुरक्षा कायम रहे, शान्ति कायम रहे। दूसरी ओर रूस कहता है कि, भाई हम चाहते हैं कि दुनिया से शोषण बन्द हो, एक जाति दूसरी जाति का शोषण न करे। इन दोनों आदर्शों के बीच में छिपी हुई है साम्राज्यवादी नीति। यह उनके व्यवहारों से स्पष्ट होता है। आज दोनों के पास धन है, दोनों के पास सम्पत्ति है, दोनों के पास फौज है, अणु शक्ति है, हाइड्रोजन बम है, और आज दोनों गुट चाहते हैं कि दुनिया के दूसरे देशों को बढ़ने ही न दें, उन को दबा कर जबर्दस्ती अपने साथ रक्खें। भारत इस के बीच में खड़ा हो कर कहता है कि भले ही हमारे पास शक्ति न हो, सैनिक शक्ति न हो, फिर भी हम समझते हैं कि दुनिया की मौजूदा हालत के लिये जो आदर्श हम ने सामने रक्खा है वह अच्छा है। अमरीका इस नीति को पसन्द नहीं करता

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

और हमारे ऊपर दबाव डालता है, पाकिस्तान को सैनिक शक्ति और अस्त्र शस्त्र की मदद देने की धमकी देता है। इस का मतलब क्या है? मेरी तुच्छ सम्मति में अमरीका चाहता है कि जिस किसी तरह हो भारत उन के साथ हो जाय।

हिन्दुस्तान का विभाजन होने के बाद, पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ एक नया दश कायम हो गया, जिस को हम ने पसन्द किया और अब भी पसन्द करते हैं। लेकिन आज पाकिस्तान दूसरे दश के हाथ के हीथियार की तरह से, गोटी की तरह से काम कर रहा है। उस से गोटी की तरह काम ले कर अमरीका समझता है कि अगर हम पाकिस्तान को मदद देंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान डर कर हमारी नीति का समर्थन करेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार या हिन्दुस्तान के लोग इस दबाव में आने वाले नहीं हैं। अमरीका को भी यह समझ लेना चाहिये। मैं नहीं समझता कि उस का यह नारा कहां तक स्वतंत्र दश का नारा है कि साम्यवादी गुट के अन्दर रहने वाले लोगों के लिये वह कहता है कि वे स्वतंत्र नहीं हैं और अमरीका के साथ रहने वाले जितने दश होंगे वे सब के सब स्वतंत्र होंगे। उस की यह भावना कहां तक सही है यह मैं नहीं कह सकता। यह सिर्फ नारा है, इस में कोई तथ्य नहीं है। तथ्य तो यह है कि आज अगर अमरीका चाहता है कि दुनिया में शान्ति हो तो जिस तरह से वह आर्थिक क्षेत्र में एशिया के मुल्कों को इस तरह की मदद देना चाहता है ताकि उन का लिविंग का स्टैंडर्ड बढ़ सके, वहां जो द्रोभ तथ्य असन्तोष के कारण हों वह दूर हो सकें, यह एक अभिनन्दनीय चीज है, उस में उस का कोई स्वार्थ नहीं होना चाहिये। परन्तु हम देखते हैं कि आज उस की आर्थिक सहायता में यह आशा रहती है कि जिस दश को हम आर्थिक सहायता देंगे वह दश हमारे साथ रहेगा। ऐसी हालत में, मैं समझता

हूँ कि आज हिन्दुस्तान को अमरीका से सहायता की आशा करना व्यर्थ है। भाषा-एशिया के दूसरे मुल्क या दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्क धन के दबाव में या परीस्थितवश अमरीका के रास्ते पर चलने के लिये भले ही तैयार हो जायें, लेकिन मेरा अपना खयाल है और हो सकता है कि समर क्षेत्र में हम उन का मुकाबला न कर सकें, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की २६ करोड़ जनता का जहां तक मुझे अनुभव है, जब कि हम अंगरजों की गद्दगी से रिहा हो गये हैं, तो हम दुनिया या एशिया में किसी दूसरे दश के नये प्रकार के समर्थन को कभी कबूल नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए जब अमरीका कहता है कि हम दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया में एक ऐसा समूह कायम करना चाहते हैं जो आपस में संगठित हो और जो एक दूसरे की सहायता करता हुआ दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया में साम्यवाद को बढ़ते हुए खतरों को रोकें, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उसकी एक गलतफहमी है। अगर वह चाहता है कि दुनिया में साम्यवाद का प्रचार न हो और अगर उसकी नजर में साम्यवाद का प्रचार खसब है तो उसको रोकने के लिए भी यह जरूरी है कि दुनिया के और देशों के साथ उसी तरह का व्यवहार करे जैसा कि व्यवहार स्वतंत्र देशों के साथ किया जाना चाहिए। मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि अमरीका और रूस के जो ये गुट हैं इनका दुनिया पर क्या असर हो रहा है। गांवों के अन्दर साधारण लोग स्वतंत्रता-पूर्वक अपना जीवन व्यतीत करते हैं। लेकिन जब गांव में कोई जबदस्त महाजन आ जाता है जिसके पास बहुत धन होता है तो उसका बहुत प्रभाव हो जाता है और साधारण लोगों को वह अपने धन के बल पर दबा कर रखना चाहता है। इसी तरह से आज अमरीका और रूस के गुट अपनी शक्ति के बल से, अपने विज्ञान के बल से और अपने एटम बम और उद्‌जन बम के बल से छोट-छोट देशों को दबाकर रखना चाहते हैं। पहले वह प्रलोभन देते हैं और कहते हैं कि हम आप लोगों के

आर्थिक सहायता पहुँचाना चाहते हैं ताकि आपक जीवन का मापदंड ऊंचा हो सके, आपका स्वास्थ्य अच्छा हो सके। बात बहुत अच्छी है। उनकी उदारता के लिए उनको बधाई है। लेकिन अगर इस उदारता के साथ और स्वास्थ्य सुधार और दूसरी दूसरी सहायताओं के नाम पर अगर उनके दिल में इस तरह की आशा है कि जो हम कहेंगे वही वह दंश करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उस आर्थिक सहायता का या और भी जो किसी प्रकार की सहायता दी जाती है उसका कोई असर नहीं रहता। सभापति जी, मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहता। मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो दोनों गुटों की नीति है और जिन आदर्शों की वे समय समय पर चर्चा करते हैं वे आदर्श उनकी नीति से वास्तव में परे होने वाले नहीं हैं। दोनों का यह ख्याल है कि दुनिया का कोई दंश स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक अपनी नीति निर्धारित न कर सके और जैसे वे चाहते हैं वैसे विचार करें। संसार की शान्ति के लिये घातक है इसलिए मैं अपनी सरकार की क्रियाशील तटस्थता की नीति का समर्थन करता हूँ। जब जहाँ मौका मिलेगा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलनों में भाग लेकर हम अपनी नीति की घोषणा इसी प्रकार करते रहेंगे और जिस दंश की नीति जब हमको ठीक मालूम होगी उसका समर्थन करेंगे बिना इस बात का ख्याल किये हुए कि किसी को हमारा ऐसा करना अच्छा लगता है या नहीं। हम इस नीति को मानने के लिए तैयार हैं। इन शब्दों के साथ जो हमारी सरकार की नीति है, उसका मैं हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री बी० जी० ईशवाण्ड (गुना) : भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने आज प्रातःकाल जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सम्मुख रखा है और जो विचारधारा सदन के सम्मुख रखी है उसके लिये जिस प्रकार अन्य सदस्यों ने किया है उस प्रकार से मैं पुष्प वर्षा करने की मनःस्थिति में नहीं हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि मेरे बहुत से मित्र इस सदन में हैं कि जो समझते हैं कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की इस तरह की नीति के कारण हिन्दुस्तान

का नाम दुनिया में बहुत ऊंचा हुआ है। दुनिया में हम कितने ऊंचे बढ़ गये हैं मुझे इसका पता नहीं है। मैं नहीं जानता कि इस ऊंचाई को दखने के लिये तेन सिंह की आवश्यकता होगी। मैं तो वहाँ नहीं पहुँच सकता। मैं तो दखता हूँ कि दुनिया में हमारा यह स्थान है कि अंग्रेज और अमरीका तो हम को चाहते नहीं। हम शिकायत करते हैं कि संनक्रासिसको समझौते के आधार पर जापान के युद्ध अपराधियों के बारे में हमसे पूछा नहीं जाता। अमरीका हमारे खिलाफ है, रूस हमारे खिलाफ है, लेकिन फिर भी हम कहते हैं कि हमारा मान बढ़ रहा है। जहाँ हम दखल देते हैं वहाँ हम मार खाते हैं लेकिन हम कहते हैं कि हम जीते हैं। हमको ऐसा ही लगता है जैसा कि हमारे मुहम्मद अली साहब ने कहा था, पहले विश्व युद्ध के समय, कि अंग्रेज बहादुर की फतह हो रही है लेकिन मुल्क पर अधिकार जर्मनों का हो रहा है। इसी तरह हम चाहते हैं कुछ और और होता है कुछ और। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार की नीति मूल रूप से गलत है। और वह मूलभूत गलती वह है जो कि सिद्धांत के रूप में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन के सामने रखी है। वह सिद्धान्त यह है कि सुरक्षा सामर्थ्य से नहीं होती। मैं नहीं समझता कि अपनी सामर्थ्य बढ़ाने से, अपनी शक्ति बढ़ाने से, अस्त्र शस्त्र का बल बढ़ाने से यदि सुरक्षा नहीं बढ़ती तो क्या कमजोरी से, दुर्बलता से, और डरपोकपन से और दुनिया के सामने शान्ति के वक्तव्य देने से सुरक्षा बढ़ती है और शान्ति आती है। मैं इस पर विश्वास करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। आज मैंने अपने मित्र लंका सुन्दरम को भी अपने प्रधान मंत्री का बड़ा एडमायरेर बनते देखा। उन्होंने कहा कि उद्दजन बम और एटम बम के ऊपर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का वक्तव्य निकलने से जो दुनिया का वायुमंडल बिगड़ गया था वह ठीक हो गया और जो गर्मी पैदा हो गई थी वह ठंडी हो गई। मेरी समझ में सुरक्षा करने का एक ही मार्ग है और वह मार्ग एटम बम और उद्दजन बम के दोष बतलाना

[श्री वी० जी० दश पांडे]

नहीं हैं। किसी भी राष्ट्र के लिये सुरक्षा का मार्ग यही है कि वह यह सोचे कि उसका मित्र कौन है और शत्रु कौन है, उसका अपना शस्त्र बल क्या है। यह बातें आप जब तक नहीं समझते तब तक आप चाहे कितने ही वक्तव्य दें न आपकी सुरक्षा बढ़ सकती है और न दुनिया की सुरक्षा बढ़ सकती है। आज का वक्तव्य सुन कर मुझे निराशा इसीलिये हुई बहुत दूर दूर के जो प्रश्न हैं उनकी तो चर्चा होती है लेकिन अपने दश की उत्तनी चर्चा नहीं होती। यहां बताया गया कि हमारी नीति प्रभावशाली तटस्थता की है जिसको मैं गतिमान तटस्थता कहता हूं। इसके बारे में चर्चा हुई। मैं तो समझता हूं कि हमारी नीति यह है कि दश के अन्दर कमजोरी रहे और बाहर जिन मामलों से हमारा सम्बन्ध नहीं है उनमें हम अवश्य बोलें। जो हमारा दोस्त हो सकता है उसको अपने व्यवहार से चिढ़ायें। उनको यह नहीं मालूम होता कि ऐसा करने से वे हमारे दुश्मन बन जाते हैं। तो यह बातें हमारे यहां चल रही हैं। मैं तो यह जरूर कहूंगा कि इंडोनेशिया के बारे में जो प्रोपोजल हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने रखे और जिनके बारे में बड़े झगड़े भी होते रहे, वह प्रोपोजल रखने की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी। हिन्दुस्तान को ऐसा करने की कोई बड़ी आवश्यकता नहीं थी। एशिया के नेतृत्व की एक काल्पनिक चीज के पीछे लग कर दूसरों के मामलों में दखल देने की यह जो नीति चल रही है यह ठीक नहीं है। हमारे यहां स्वयं ही बहुत से झगड़े चल रहे हैं। फ्रांस के साथ पांडेचरी के लिये हमारा झगड़ा है। गोआ के लिये हमारा झगड़ा है और काश्मीर के लिये पाकिस्तान से हमारा झगड़ा है। तो यह हमारे अपने झगड़े चल रहे हैं। मैं तो दखलता हूं कि कांग्रेस जिसके लिये कोई नीति शुरू करती है फल उससे उल्टा होता है। उन्होंने पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान को एक रखना चाहा पर नतीजा उल्टा निकला। मैं तो चाहता हूं कि हम दुनिया के झगड़ों से अपने को अलग रखें। इस डाइनेमिक न्यूट्रिलिटी की

नीति के कारण हम दुनिया के गुटों से टकरा रहे हैं। अमरीका पाकिस्तान की मदद पर है और हमें आश्चर्य न होगा यदि भविष्य में हिन्दुस्तान के नजदीक या उसी की भूमि पर लड़ाई हो। मैं समझता हूं कि एशिया की भूमि पर हम आज फ्रांस, पुर्तगाल और अमरीका इन तीन दशों से टकरा रहे हैं और हमारी इस डाइनेमिक न्यूट्रिलिटी की नीति का नतीजा यह होगा कि हम दुनिया के दशों के संघर्ष में पड़े जायेंगे। यह देख कर मैं फिर यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप अपनी नीति को अब भी बदल दीजिये। हम अमरीका के खिलाफ चीन और कौरिया के बारे में बोलते रहे और अमरीका जाकर पाकिस्तान को मिल गया। फ्रांस से आज आपका झगड़ा हो रहा है। हमारे बहादुर लोग पांडेचरी और फ्रांस के उपनिवेशों के लिये लड़ रहे हैं। उसी समय में बाकी दशों को अप्रसन्न करके उनसे लड़ाई करने का जो तरीका हम चला रहे हैं, मुझे उसका अर्थ समझ में नहीं आता। दुनिया में कालोनियलिज्म न हो दुनिया में साम्राज्यवाद न हो, एशिया का नेतृत्व हमारे हाथों में रहे और बापू जी के बताए हुए पद चिन्हों पर शान्ति के संदेश को लेकर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और दुनिया में सर्वत्र शान्ति हो और एक शान्ति समीत हो इसके लिये रूस की ओर से यहां पर भारत में बुद्ध पूर्णिमा के पर्व पर लोग आ रहे हैं और उस 'सत्यमेव जयते' का घोष करके उनका साथ दें रहे हैं और विचार किया जा रहा है कि दुनिया में कैसे शान्ति स्थापित की जाय। दुनिया में दूर 2 तो हजारों बार शान्ति के शब्दों का घोष हो रहा है लेकिन मैं पूछता हूं कि हमारी सीमा के नजदीक बसे हुए तित्बत दश पर चीन ने आक्रमण किया है, उसके सम्बन्ध में क्या आपने कुछ कहा है? अभी पांच मिनट पहले आप पुर्तगाल की निंदा कर रहे थे कि पुर्तगाल की चार सौ साल पहले की टूटी तो हम मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं, लेकिन चीन का सैंकड़ों साल का पुराना अधिपत्य तित्बत पर

हो, उसके बारे में हम कुछ कहने को तैयार नहीं हैं। आपके घर के नजदीक बाँ झगड़ा चल रहा है उस झगड़े के सम्बन्ध में आप कहते हैं कि उसमें हमको क्या पड़ना है लेकिन हमको इस बात की बड़ी फिक्र है कि इंडोचीन में साम्राज्यवाद और कोलोनियलिज्म और उपनिवेशवाद न हो लेकिन घर के नजदीक जो साम्राज्यवाद किसी पर लादा जा रहा हो तो उसमें दखल न देना और उसके बारे में कल्लू न कहना, इस प्रकार की नीति मेरी *peace* सही नीति नहीं है और मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि वे किस प्रकार की नीति बरत रहे हैं? जहाँ पर नीति सम्बन्धी बात आती है तो वहाँ हम साम्यवाद मान लेते हैं और रूस की तारीफ करने लगते हैं लेकिन जब हमारे नजदीक के ही देश तिब्बत में वह अपना आधिपत्य जमाते हैं तो हम उसके बारे में कुछ भी नहीं कहते, वैसे हमारा और रूस का भी संसार में यह दावा है कि हम शान्ति चाहते हैं और साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ हैं। रूस की जो तारीफ की जाती है तो उसके बारे में भी मुझे एक बात कहनी है। मैं रूस के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, किसी भी देश के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। मेरा और प्रधान मंत्री का एक ही मतभेद है। प्रधान मंत्री कम्युनिज्म के पक्ष में हैं और रूस के विरोध में हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज जब अमरीका और आपका मुकाबला हो रहा है, पाकिस्तान में अमरीका पाकिस्तान को मदद दे करके आपके नजदीक आ रहा है, ऐसे समय में आपको अपने सैन्यबल को बढ़ाना बहुत आवश्यक है और सैन्य और शस्त्र बल बढ़ा करके आपका मित्र कौन है और आपका शत्रु कौन है यह देखना चाहिये था। आप देखते हैं कि अमरीका आपके खिलाफ जा रहा है, अमरीका पाकिस्तान को मदद कर रहा है, मैं यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि आप आज ही रूस की मदद लें लेकिन कल यदि आवश्यकता होती है तो आप उनसे ले सकें लेकिन उस समय तो आप न्युट्रल हो जाते हैं अलबत्ता जो उनकी जो साम्यवादी विचारधारा है उन विचारधाराओं में आप उनके साथ हो जाते हैं,

इस तरह की नीति का पालन करने से इस देश का कल्याण होने वाला नहीं है। फ्रांस, पुर्तगाल, पांडेचेरी और गाँआ के सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार जो नीति बरत रही है मैं उस नीति के साथ हूँ और मैं उसका विरोध नहीं करता हूँ, हाँ, इतना जरूर कहूँगा कि इससे और कोई ज्यादा बड़ा कदम इसके लिये उठाना आवश्यक है। इन बस्तियों की जनता स्वतंत्रता के लिये आन्दोलन कर रही है। पांडेचेरी और फ्रांस का प्रश्न शायद बहुत थोड़े समय के अन्दर हल हो जायगा। गाँआ की जनता जो विदेशी साम्राज्यवाद से मुक्ति पाने का आन्दोलन कर रही है, उसको हमें देखना है कि वह अपने प्रयत्न में सफल हो और स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त करे। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने पुर्तगाल के बारे में जो कहा है उसके बारे में मैं पूर्णतः सहमत हूँ। पुर्तगाल के प्रधान मंत्री के अनुसार गाँआ पुर्तगाल का एक अविभाज्य अंग है

“Goa is an integral part of Portugal”.

लेकिन मैं उनको बतलाऊँ कि अगर उनका यह सिद्धान्त है तो मेरा सिद्धान्त यह है कि “Goa is an integral part of India”. और अगर उनका सिद्धान्त मान लें कि गाँआ पुर्तगाल का एक हिस्सा है तो उसका अर्थ यह होता है कि तमाम पुर्तगाल को गाँआ समेत हिन्दुस्तान में शामिल होना पड़ेगा, इसके अलावा कोई दूसरा अर्थ इसका नहीं निकलता। और चूँकि यह बस्तियाँ भारत का अविभाज्य अंग हैं इसलिये मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री से कहना चाहूँगा कि आज उन बस्तियों में बसने वाली जनता पर तरह-तरह के अत्याचार हो रहे हैं और वहाँ की जनता के स्वतंत्रता आन्दोलन को डरा और धमका करके कुचलने का प्रयत्न वहाँ के विदेशी शासक कर रहे हैं और अब वक्त आ गया है कि जब भारत सरकार को उस जन आन्दोलन को सफल बनाने के लिये अब ज्यादा सहायता देने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्वयं यह स्वीकार किया है कि यह जो हमारा कार्य है यह सौटस्फैक्टरी नहीं है।

[श्री बी० जी० दश पांडे]

मैं उनकी इस सम्बन्ध में जो नेशनल और इंटरनेशनल अइचनें हैं उनको मैं समझता हूं लेकिन साथ ही मैं यह भी समझता हूं कि अब वक्त आ गया है जब हम चुपचाप हाथ पर हाथ धरें जनता पर यह अत्याचार होते नहीं देख सकते और हमारा वहां की जनता के प्रति एक उत्तरदायित्व है और उसे निभाने के लिये हो सकता है कि हमें कोई पुलिस एक्शन लेना पड़े अथवा और अन्य उपायों का अवलम्बन करना पड़े ताकि वहां की जनता भारत में विलय के लिये जो आन्दोलन कर रही है, वह उसमें सफल हो और वे बीस्तियां जैसे गाँवा, पांडेचैरी इत्यादि जो पाकेट्स हमारे देश का अंग हैं, वे भारत में सम्मिलित हो जायें। अब समय आ गया है जब भारत सरकार को इस प्रश्न को हल करने के वास्ते अधिक सक्रिय कदम उठाना आवश्यक जान पड़ता है।

अन्त में मैं एक ही प्रश्न पर जिसकी ओर मेरी समझ में लंदन टाइम्स ने भी इशारा किया था कि हमारी जो कोलम्बो कॉन्फ्रेंस हुई, वह दूर २ के जितने प्रश्न होते हैं उन पर बड़ा निश्चित मत देती है। लेकिन जैसे जैसे हम अपने नजदीक के मसलों पर आने लगते हैं तो वैसे २ यह सार चुप होने लगते हैं, ठीक उसी प्रकार आज के भाषण में भी मैंने देखा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने बहुत दूर २ की बातें जैसे इंडोचीन और कोरिया आदि के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा लेकिन काश्मीर और पाक-अमरीका सैनिक सहायता के प्रश्न पर कुछ नहीं बोले, उसके लिये कहा जा सकता है कि इस बारे में प्रधान मंत्री पहले ही बहुत कुछ कह चुके हैं इसीलिये आज उनको दुहराने की शायद उन्होंने आवश्यकता नहीं समझी लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि देश के सामने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और दूसरे जितने भी घर के प्रश्न हैं उन सब में यह अमरीका द्वारा पाकिस्तान को सैनिक सहायता दिये जाने का प्रश्न मुख्य है और उसके परिणामस्वरूप युद्ध के आज जो काले बादल आये हैं उसके मुकाबले में यह छोट २ सवाल जो देश में पैदा हुए हैं, कुछ भी नहीं हैं और हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति में सबसे पहले यह बात देखना है कि अमरीका के साथ यदि पाकिस्तान का गठबंधन होता है और गठबंधन होने के बाद अगर हिन्दुस्तान और अमरीका में काश्मीर के लिये कुछ कलह का निर्माण होता है तो उस परिस्थिति में देश की विदेश नीति का एक ही लक्ष्य होना आवश्यक है कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में यदि कोई संघर्ष उठ खड़ा होता है तो हमारी सहायता कौन करेगा और उसका कामयाबी से मुकाबला करने में यह हमें किस प्रकार से आर्थिक, सुरक्षा, संघर्ष में, आदि अन्य सब दृष्टियों से अपने देश का संगठन करना है। हमें यह भी देखना है कि इस देश के भीतर जो फिफथ काल्मिनिस्ट्स (पंच-मार्गी) काम कर रहे हैं उनसे भी अपने को सुरक्षित रखना है और सावधान रहना है कि कहीं हम उनकी चालबाजी में न फँस जायें। आज जिधर देखा देश में नागरिक स्वतंत्रता की आवाज उठाई जा रही है, मैं साफ कर दूँ कि मैं नागरिक स्वतंत्रता का कोई विरोधी नहीं हूँ, मैं उसका पक्षपाती हूँ, लेकिन साथ ही अपने देश की स्वतंत्रता और उसकी सुरक्षा पर मैं कोई आंच आतें नहीं देखना चाहता। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि अभी श्री बक्षी ने श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण को आउटसाइडर घोषित किया, मैं श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण को देश के बाहर का कहने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। डाक्टर अशरफ सेंट परसेंट राष्ट्रीय माने जाँच और काश्मीर में उनके जाने का स्वागत किया जाय, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। परन्तु मैं यहाँ पर यह जरूर कहूँगा कि श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण ने जो नीति शेख अब्दुल्ला के बारे में रखी है उस नीति का मैं विरोध करना चाहता हूँ और काश्मीर की सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से वहाँ पर जो २ कदम भी उठाए गए हैं उन सब कदमों का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। काश्मीर के प्रश्न के बारे में मुझे केवल इतना ही कहना है कि काश्मीर का प्रश्न तब तक अन्तिम रूप से नहीं निबटरेगा जबतक आप काश्मीर का प्रश्न सुरक्षा परिषद् से हटा नहीं लेते और काश्मीर को बाकी दूसरी

दृशी रियासतों की तरह भारत में मिला कर और काश्मीर और हिन्दुस्तान का एक राष्ट्र बना कर पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला नहीं करते ।

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad** (Gaya—East): At the outset, let me congratulate the Prime Minister on the conclusion of the pact with China. The preamble, as he has said—and I agree with him—is far more important than the articles. I regard this pact as a non-aggression pact in embryo. The Prime Minister has said that if a similar settlement can be arrived at in other parts of Asia, then the area of peace will be extended. I suggest that a similar pact should be concluded with Russia as well.

The Prime Minister has said that collective security is not possible unless it is transformed into collective peace. May I venture to suggest that collective peace can be achieved only by changing the *status quo*? The central problem of the age is how to change the *status quo* without resorting to war. This can be done in Asia by our coming together with China and Russia. A mutual Defence Pact with China and Russia is the urgent need of the hour. For, let us try to understand that the root cause of war is the institution of the Nation State, the economic counterpart of which is the profit-seeking motive embodied in capitalism. The *status quo* cannot be maintained by any stratagem whatsoever. One thing I have felt. The Prime Minister said that what we are witnessing today is a *Dharm Yudh*, a war, a crusade between two powers. I do not think that Russia is a crusader, for, did, or did not our Prime Minister say, when he was in London last to attend the Commonwealth Premiers' Conference, that Russia stands for peace and that there is no external danger to India from communism? If this is true, how can we characterise that Russia is a crusader? I wait for an answer. Russia, as is very well known to the Prime Minister, has always been on the defensive since the emergence of communism in 1917. A defensive Power is never a crusader. I admit that in the early days, the

doctrine of communism was something like a crusade. If Russia is a crusader, it is a crusader in theory only. America, on the other hand, is a crusader in action. The days of Lenin and Trotsky, when people used to talk of world revolution, are over. I am doubtful in my own mind how far even America is a crusader, for, according to my humble opinion, there are certain conditions which must be fulfilled before we can characterise any power as a crusader. A crusader stands for certain moral values in life. Has America any moral values to uphold? In the telling phrase of President Coolidge, the business of America is business. America is not a crusader. The Mussalmans and the Christians in the days gone by, when they fought each other, believed that their doctrines and their doctrines alone were right. They were prepared to fight and shed their blood. They felt that their doctrines were universal or were capable of universal applicability. They believed that the other's creed—the creed of the rival—was all wrong. They believed that they had sufficient force at their disposal to vanquish the enemy. What about America? The wars in Indo-China and Korea have shown that they have not got the resources to vanquish the rival, Russia. They believe in democracy. A denial of democracy in the Soviet Union—I do not know how far this is true—does not mean that the whole creed of communism is all wrong. For, the goal of economic equality, the concept of a classless society, cannot be said, by any impartial mind, to be a doctrine which has got no truth in it. It is true that America says that it upholds democracy. But if there are certain elements of dictatorship in Russia, the main responsibility for the continuance and maintenance of those elements in the Soviet Union must be placed on the shoulders of America for it is the fear of America which is foremost in the minds of the people in Russia.

1 P.M.

Sir, we do not want war. This is what the Prime Minister has said. I concur with him. For war will not only

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

upset our economic plans; war may destroy the whole world. No cause is worth fighting for by war. Peace at any price. I do not say that Russia and China are our permanent friends and allies. Unless an Asian State is established and as long as power politics reigns and triumphs, we have to play the game of power politics. All Nation States are enemies of one another by virtue of the imperatives of power politics in a world of anarchy. But this picture can be changed if we have some sort of political integration in Asia. America has established her hegemony over the new world. A similar attempt on our part will not be fantastic. Twice America has prevented the political integration of Europe. Germany tried twice to establish a unified Europe. America prevented it by war. If we do not want to have war, we must foil the designs of the Americans in Asia and join hands with China and Russia. Why do I say that we must have a non-aggression pact and mutual defence treaty with Russia? We cannot ignore Russia. Russia is the strongest, the largest and the greatest power in Asia. America is an interloper in Asia. Russia, on the other hand, is an inhabitant of this part of the globe.

Let me make one point very clear and explicit. Let us try to understand the significance of what is going on in the Middle East. One by one, all the Nation States in the Middle East are falling victims to the Americans. The plan is to resurrect the Ottoman Empire with Washington as its capital. Turkey has got a symbolic value only. The Americans think that an opportune moment may arise when Central Asia, both Russian and Chinese, can be detached from the Soviet Union and a bigger Ottoman Empire will come into being. If such an Ottoman Empire comes into being, India will stand to suffer most. The days of Chengiz Khan and Timur Lame will come back once again. We were of the opinion that this threat of Pan-Islamism was not a real one. We, on the other hand, now see that something on these lines

is going on in the Middle East. It is true that without the help of an external power the Middle East has not got any cohesive force. But that external power has come into Asia. America is trying to integrate all the Nation States of the Middle East.

Let us try to understand this problem. And, I am thinking loudly so that Members of this House may also follow me. I have got no settled convictions. I believe that the purpose of real education is to unsettle all settled convictions. I feel that there are two possibilities—either the Americans will walk out of Asia or there will be a negotiated settlement or a non-aggression pact between Russia and America. Where do we stand in this picture? If there is a negotiated settlement between America and Russia, India will automatically fall within the non-Russian sphere of influence. If the Middle East is integrated and becomes a strong power under American control, then we cannot have any help from Russia, if the Middle East wages war against India we shall have no allies left. The question of Kashmir has not been solved upto this time, and probably there will not be any final solution to this question. If over this question Pakistan invades with the help of America, without which it cannot, and if there is a negotiated peace between Russia and America, where are you going to get your help from? I believe in the strategy of creating two fronts for Pakistan—India from one side and Russia from the other in West Pakistan; India from one side and China from the other in East Bengal. I have said that there are two possibilities—either there will be a negotiated peace between America and Russia, or America will unilaterally withdraw from this continent. If America unilaterally withdraws from this continent, the picture will be quite different. We have been sitting on the fence for too long. Our foreign policy is a positive one in that we stand for peace and for the maintenance of our freedom. Such a foreign policy cannot be characterised by any negative term

such as 'non-involvement'. But which kind of foreign policy we ought to pursue if we keep this picture in our mind that there is a possibility of America unilaterally withdrawing from this continent? The picture is that the two allies, Russia and China, will carve out their spheres of influence in Asia, that is, Asia will be divided between Russia and China. It is significant that in Berlin, the Russians made a proposal for the collective security of Europe. It is equally significant that in Geneva, China has propounded a plan for the security of Asia. Possibly, there is some understanding that Asia belongs to China and Europe belongs to Russia. If today we enter into some sort of alliance with the Chinese and the Russians, then our powerful position in this part of the globe will be secure. We shall be preventing the division of Asia between China and Russia. Our interests are not merely to safeguard our independence and the maintenance of peace, but over and above that, we have got certain strategic interests outside the frontiers of this country. The division of Asia into Chinese and Russian spheres will be a calamity.

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** The time is up and there are barely five minutes. I have a number of points and somehow or other I shall take the last point first and I hope you will extend the time on the next day. I would mention Acharya Kripalani's speech first. In a sense he went into the sublime and then descended unto the ridiculous. When he spoke of the national, fundamental and unanimous policy for our country, I thought he rose right to the top. That is the only policy that has been followed in this country for the last seven years. The fundamentals of this policy had been laid down by our Prime Minister according to our best traditions and according to what we really possess. We possess no arms, no great Navy or Air Force. We are only acting on the moral forces and we cannot wage a conflict with our nearest neighbour, China. I have constantly pointed out

on the floor of this House that we cannot afford to have a quarrel with China and that historic conflict between China and Japan cannot be repeated in this sub-continent. The day that is repeated will denote the down fall of the East. We ourselves will be enmeshed in a kind of international strife. We drove away the British with all the force at our command under Mahatma Gandhi's able guidance and our freedom should not be frittered away by any strife with China. We shall find ourselves in a mess from which for hundreds of years we shall not be able to extricate ourselves. Let not our friends lend their ears to foreign propaganda. This is my humble warning to my hon. friend, Acharya Kripalani. When the Kuomintang representatives came for the Asian Conference, they declared that they would not enter the *pandal* until the mark therein which showed that Tibet belonged neither to China nor to any other country was removed. Tibet belongs to China. What was good for the discredited Kuomintang is considered not good for Red China which is today a force to be counted with in the history of the world. Old China was ruined by the Jingoism of the Powers of the West, who planted opium and all sort of dangerous drugs with the ultimate object of ruining the peoples of China. Two engineers of our country were sent only last week to study the huge dam and works there. My friends who were staying in a hotel said that within 20 to 30 days they saw a building with three floors completed and here in Delhi we have still not been able to clear up the streets of Daryaganj.

I warn my friends not to be led away by propaganda. We can never afford to have that historic Japanese-Chinese conflict repeated here. The great and fundamental aim of Sun-Yat-Sen who was the first great modern leader of China was the establishment of fundamental unity between China and Japan. We sent out a three-women Parliamentary team to Japan and the first thing we asked—Ammu Swaminadhan is here to testify

[Shri Joachim Alva]

to this—how did China and Japan get along? They said that there was a great yearning in Japan for friendship with China and that they wanted to build up trade and friendship between the two countries. This was deprived by American intervention (*Interruptions*). When we refused to sign the San Francisco treaty, in their heart of hearts the Japanese were happy; they did not give any publicity. They cannot shout and say that they were indebted to India but in their hearts of hearts they felt that here was a power in the East who sympathised with them in their plight. Though they set to conquer India in 1942, India did not remember that any longer. India refused to sign a treaty to make Japan a vassal of America. Some of the women who come from America ask the Japanese: "Why not have birth control?" They claim that they have reformed the Japanese. How? They had killed the Japanese spirit and the great Japanese nation had come under their sway. Today, Tokyo is a city wherein Western customs have destroyed the original culture of Japan. We must somehow or other look at these

things in that background. When Acharya Kripalani was advocating his policy, was he advocating the policy of the Socialist Party? The present policy has been followed and it has a thumping majority; with the backing of millions of our people and peoples in England, America and other countries, appreciate it. One Australian journalist said: "Our foreign policy is that we are a vassal of America, and we take our hats off to your Prime Minister for his efforts in establishing non-violence and peace in the world." I was therefore sad when Acharya Kripalani spoke in those terms. He is a worn and tired man. But the theories cannot be worn and old.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member can continue the next day. This debate will continue till 9-15 A.M. on the 18th when the hon. the Prime Minister will reply.

The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. on the 18th.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Tuesday, the 18th May, 1954.*